



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA



International symposium Grenoble, 24-26 October 2019

Evaluation and Language Acquisition: From Formative Assessment to Certification Exams

Call for Papers

Since the birth of testing and evaluation as a scientific discipline in the 1950s, the prevailing trends in the teaching of language and culture have always been reflected in the forms that language assessment has taken. Discrete-point testing (Lado, 1961) was inspired by the structuralist approach to linguistics and behaviorism in psychology and cognitive sciences. Then, communicative language testing (Morrow, 1979) put forward the textual unity of written and oral texts, as well as the ability to convey an understandable message beyond its formal acceptability and the assessment of reception and productive skills. In the last few decades, the scientific community has focused on new important key concepts, such as situational and interactional authenticity in task-based testing, learning oriented assessment, evaluation for diagnostic purposes, just to mention a few (Hamp-Lyons, 2016). Today, candidates are increasingly presenting plurilingual language profiles, are or will resort to international mobility, and are more and more competent in the area of information and communication technology (ICT), regardless of the formative and evaluative context of education (schools, universities, certification centers, language centers, languages for specialists in other disciplines centers, etc.). At the same time, the dissemination of tests and certifications, which often have a strong impact on the lives of candidates and even institutions, has led to a greater awareness of the need to design valid, reliable, and fair language assessments.

Axis 1: Validity applied to language assessment: Theoretical reflections and/or feedback on experience.

The presentations corresponding to axis 1 will question the relations between the various types of evaluation systems (diagnostic testing, placement, certification), their role in the language acquisition process, and their impact (low or high stake) on the stakeholders (e.g., students/candidates, teachers/examiners, and institutions).

On the one hand, we will consider the design and validation of tests in relation to the construct and in relation to the impact on the actors. On the other hand, we will reflect on the choices to be made in order to respect the principles of utility and equity in testing. Since the early 1980s ethical questions have aroused the interest of the scientific community. Spolsky (1981) in particular, warned researchers against the negative consequences that high stakes language tests might have on individuals and claimed that language tests, like drugs, should bear the mention “use with care”. According to Kunnan (2000), five aspects of language evaluation must be taken into account to respect the principle of equity: validity, absence of bias, accessibility, administration and social consequences. “In terms of justice, [...] the question that should be discussed is whether the test will generally do good to society” (ibidem, 7).

Whether they deal with theory or experience feedback, proposals should focus on plurilingual contexts and on the possible impact of the Companion Volume with New Descriptors (CEFR) on evaluation and testing:

- What is the added value of a validation process in language testing?
- How can we develop a synergy between diagnostic formative assessment and certification exams?
- How can we relate validity, utility and ethics in evaluation processes?

Axis 2: Evaluation of inter-comprehensive and plurilingual approaches.

Over the last twenty years, inter-comprehensive and plurilingual approaches have proven to be of great interest both in terms of research and of pedagogical activity. They contribute to explore and question in depth a dimension of language that appears quite spontaneously in an ecological environment but is still insufficiently exploited in institutional settings. The didactic schemes that have been developed and operationalized over the years by a world-wide academic community rely on the initial assumption that a speaker placed in an inter-comprehensive situation (IC) draws inferences based on prior linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge. This knowledge is fed, supported, expanded and formalised on a formative level so as to enrich sustainably and continuously the individual linguistic repertoire by successive positive transfers. Such schemes have long proven their efficiency among various stakeholders (from Primary to Higher education, in regular curricula and/or continuing education). Nevertheless, in order to promote such approaches in institutional settings, it is now indispensable to evaluate and certify the competences that those formative plurilingual programmes have strived to develop.

Proposals, expressed in the form of theoretical deepening or experience feedback, may be inspired by the following questions:

- Evaluating Inter-comprehensive competence (IC): what construct, measurement tools, validity evidence?

- Evaluating capacities in interaction and reception in related languages: what is the State of the Art?
- Evaluating capacities in IC: what impact does it have on “traditional” evaluation?

Third axis: Evaluation and language interaction

The development of interactionist and socio-cultural theories (Lantolf, 2000) and the publication of the CEFR (2001) have made the notion of communicative competence evolve towards the notion of oral interaction (Kramsch 1986, Pekarek Doehler 2006 , Hellermann 2009). More recently, the Companion Volume with New Descriptors (2017) has not only reasserted the importance of oral interaction in everyday life, but also the growing importance of written interaction, already analyzed in earlier research work (Vion, 1999). Many studies (e.g., Bakhtin 1984, Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1990 1992 1994, Rouveyrol et al., 2005, Sandlund, Sundqvist & Nyroos 2016, Lazaraton & Davies 2008, Mannoilov 2017, inter alia) present the notion of interaction as a co-construction. For instance Bakhtin puts forward the concept of "active responsive attitude" to describe the intersubjective relationship that a speaker and a co-speaker develop in a dialogue.

Within the institutional framework of language teaching and learning, conceiving interaction in terms of assessment raises a number of issues more particularly related to the co-construction process. What criteria should be used to assess interaction in general? How is it possible to assess a language activity that is not constructed individually? What kind of bias are student to student *vs* teacher to student interactions likely to introduce (Mannoilov, 2017) in an assessment that claims to be valid? It is now well established that nonverbal modalities (kinesic and proxemic) account for more than half of the communication (Mehrabian, 1971; Birdwhistell 1970, 1981). Should the nonverbal component be taken into account when assessing interaction, and if so, what scoring criteria should be used?

We will, therefore, consider:

- The role and the importance that should be given to oral and written interaction in assessments, especially in language certification
- The scoring criteria to be used to assess interaction
- The role of verbal and non-verbal modalities in the assessment of interaction
- The biases inherent in oral interaction and possible solutions for addressing the requirements of validity, reliability and fairness in oral assessments.

Bibliographical references (selection)

First axis:

- Alderson J. C. (2005). *Diagnosing foreign language proficiency: the interface between learning and assessment*, Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Alderson J. C., Caroline C. & Wall D., (1995). *Language Test Construction and Evaluation*, Cambridge University Press.
- Bachman L.F. & Palmer A.S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bachman L.F. & Cohen A. (1998). *Interfaces between second language acquisition and language testing research*, Cambridge University Press
- Chapelle, C. (1998). Construct definition and validity inquiry in SLA research. In: Bachman, L.F., Cohen, A.D. (Eds.), *Interfaces Between Second Language Acquisition and Language Testing Research*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Chapelle C., Enright M. K., & Jamieson J. M. (2009). *Building a Validity Argument for the Test of English as a Foreign Language*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Ltd.
- Fulcher G. & Davidson F. (2017). *The Routledge Handbook of Language Testing*, Routledge Edition.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (2016). Purpose of assessment. In Dina Tsagari, Jayanti Banerjee, eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Assessment*, Walter de Gruyter Inc. Boston/Berlin
- Kunnan A. J. (2000). Fairness and justice for all. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *Fairness and validation in language assessment*, Cambridge University Press, 1-14.
- Kunnan A. J. (2018). *Evaluating Language assessments*. N.Y/London, Routledge.
- McNamara, T. (2010). The use of language tests in the service of policy: issues of validity. *Revue française de linguistique appliquée*, vol. xv,(1), 7-23. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-francaise-de-linguistique-appliquee-2010-1-page-7.htm>.
- McNamara T. (2014). Language tests for residency and citizenship and the conferring of individuality, *Challenges for Language Education and Policy*, Routledge Edition.
- Morrow, K., (1979). Communicative language testing: revolution of evolution? In: Brumfit, C.K., Johnson, K. (Eds.), *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 143-159.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2007). L'évaluation des compétences: mythes du langage et défis pour la recherche. *Cahiers de l'ILSL*, 23, 125-136.
- Purpura J. E. (2016). Assessing Meaning. In: E. Shohamy et al. (Eds.). *Language Testing and Assessment*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Springer International Publishing, 33-61.
- Shohamy, E. (2001). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. Harlow, England: Longman

Second axis:

- Anquetil, M. (2012). L'interaction en situation de certification de français langue étrangère : un regard critique. *Spécificités et diversités des interactions didactiques*, Paris, Riveneuve Editions, 81-96.
- Anquetil, M. & Vecchi, S. (2016). Piattaforme di interazione per la didattica dell'intercomprensione, da GALANET e GALAPRO a MIRIADI: analisi di interazioni e "Référentiel de compétences en IC". C. Cervini (Ed.), *Interdisciplinarità e apprendimento linguistico nei nuovi contesti formativi. L'apprendente di lingue tra tradizione e innovazione*. CeSLiC, Quaderni del CeSLiC, Atti di Convegni CeSLiC – 4, Selected Papers, <http://amsacta.unibo.it/5069/>
- Bonvino, E. & Faone, S. (2016). Valutare le abilità ricettive. Che cosa ci insegna la comprensione tra lingue affini. *Italiano a stranieri, Rivista semestrale per l'insegnamento dell'italiano come lingua straniera/seconda*, 21, 20-25.
- Carrasco Perea, E. & Pishva, Y. (2009). L'(auto-)évaluation et la validation curriculaire des approches plurielles telle que l'intercompréhension romane. M. H. Araújo e Sá et al. (Ed.),

Intercomprensão em Línguas Românicas: conceitos, práticas, formação. Aveiro : Universidade de Aveiro – CIDTFF – LALE, 263-274.

- Carrasco Perea, E. (2015). Appréhender et calibrer les résultats d'apprentissages en et par l'intercompréhension: approche empirique multi vs plurilingue. M. Matesanz del Barrio (Ed.), *La enseñanza de la intercomprensión a distancia*. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Proyecto MIRIADI, 143-161. <http://eprints.ucm.es/35033>
- Carrasco Perea, E. & De Carlo, M. (2016). Evaluer en intercompréhension ou oser le paradigme plurilingue. In E. Bonvino & M.-C. Jamet (Ed.), *Intercomprensione : lingue, processi e percorsi. Studi sull'apprendimento e l'insegnamento linguistico*, SAIL 9, 183-204. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari – Digital Publishing.
- Carrasco Perea, E. & Ortiz, J. (2017). *Estudi de seguiment de la intercomprensio a Catalunya (2009-2017)*, Generalitat de Catalunya. Subdirecció General de Llengua i Plurilingüisme. <https://agora.xtec.cat/formacio/intercomprensio/wp-content/uploads/usu928/2017/05/Estudi-de-seguiment-de-la-IC-a-Catalunya.pdf>
- CECRL – volume complémentaire (2018). Conseil de l'Europe. <https://www.coe.int/fr/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages>
- Chardenet, P. (2005). Evaluer des compétences plurilingues et interlingues. *Synergies Italie*, 2, 90-102. <http://ressources-cla.univ-fcomte.fr/gerflint/Italie2/chardenet.pdf>
- Correia Soares, P. C. (2012). Intercomprensão: uma utopia? Avaliação de competências de compreensão escrita plurilingues e não plurilingues. Tese apresentada à Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Centro Regional das Beiras. <http://repositorio.ucp.pt/handle/10400.14/10522>
- De Carlo, M. (2015). Programmer un parcours d'enseignement plurilingue à l'aide d'un Référentiel de compétences de communication en intercompréhension. M.H. Araújo e Sá & A.S. Pinho (Orgs.), *Intercomprensão em contexto educativo: resultados da investigação*. Proyecto MIRIADI, 217-242. https://www.miriadi.net/sites/default/files/livro-book_miriadi_-_v.01-08_-_final.pdf
- Garbarino, S. & De Carlo, M. (2016). Integrare l'intercomprensione ai curricoli istituzionali: le risorse della piattaforma MIRIADI. *Italiano a stranieri, Rivista semestrale per l'insegnamento dell'italiano come lingua straniera/seconda*, n°21, p.13-19. <http://www.edilingua.it/it-it/Flip.aspx?ElementID=24f2ad51-6939-4a71-aafb-6d9c9d999999>
- Hidalgo Downing, R. (2009). Actividades formativas para la auto-evaluación de un programa de aprendizaje plurilingüe. M. H. Araújo e Sá et al. (Ed.) (2009). *Intercomprensão em Línguas Românicas: conceitos, práticas, formação*. Aveiro: Universidade de Aveiro - CIDTFF – LALE, 275-286. http://www.galanet.eu/publication/fichiers/Araujo_e_Sa_et_al_Ed_2009.pdf ou https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Raquel_Downing/publication/290435659_La_intercomprension_en_lenguas_romanicas_conceptos_practicas_formacion/links/5697ec5008ae34f3cf1f29d9.pdf?origin=publication_list
- Hidalgo Downing, R. & Vela Delfa, C. (2015). Marcos de referencia para la intercomprensión y su aplicación para la evaluación de competencias plurilingües. In M. Matesanz del Barrio (Ed.), *La enseñanza de la intercomprensión a distancia*. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Proyecto MIRIADI, 117-142. <http://eprints.ucm.es/35033/>
- Huver, E. (2010). "J'ai pas pu corriger parce que c'est le mélange des langues" L'évaluation de la compétence plurilingue entre résistances et tensions. *Les Cahiers de l'Acedle*, 7(2), 2010, Recherches en didactique des langues : Les langues tout au long de la vie, 113-137, http://acedle.org/IMG/pdf/Huver_Cahiers-Acedle_7-2.pdf
- Huver E. & Springer C. (2011). *L'évaluation en langues*. Paris, Didier.
- Jamet, M.-C. (2010). Intercomprensione, Quadro comune europeo di riferimento per le lingue, Quadro di riferimento per gli approcci plurilingui e valutazione. *Synergies Europe*, 5, 75-98.
- Ollivier, C. (dir.), *Projet Erasmus +* <http://evalic.eu/>.

Third axis:

- Bakhtine, M. (1984). *Les Genres du Discours, Esthétique de la Création Verbale*, Paris: Gallimard, 265-287.
- Birdwhistell, R. (1970). *Kinesics and Context*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Council of Europe (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference For Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment, Companion Volume With New Descriptors*.
- Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for Evidence of Language Learning in Practices for Repair: A Case Study of Self-Initiated Self-Repair by an Adult Learner of English, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 113-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830902757550>
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni C. (1990). *Les interactions verbales*. (tome I), tome II (1992), tome III (1994), Armand Colin.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From Language Proficiency to Interactional Competence on JSTOR, *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(4), 366-372.
- Lantolf, J. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory, *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, Oxford University Press.
- Lazaraton, A. & Davis, L. (2008). A Microanalytic Perspective on Discourse Proficiency, and identity in Paired Oral Assessment, *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 5(4), 313-335.
- Manoïlov, P. (2017). L'interaction orale entre pairs en classe d'anglais LV2. Analyse didactique et linguistique de la construction et du développement des compétences des apprenants, Thèse de doctorat, Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris 3.
- Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent Messages* (1st ed.), Belmont, Wadsworth.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2006). Compétence et langage en action, *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée*, 84, 9-45.
- Rouveyrol, L., Maury-Rouan C. & Vion R. (2005). A linguistic toolbox for discourse analysis : towards a multidimensional handling of verbal interactions. *Discourse studies Vol 7* (3), 289-314.
- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P. & Nyroos, L. (2016). Testing L2 Talk: A Review of Empirical Studies on Second-Language Oral Proficiency Testing, *Language and Language and Linguistics Compass*, 10(1), 14–29.
- Vion R., (1999). Pour une approche relationnelle des interactions verbales et des discours. *Langage et Société* 87, 115-129.

Comité d'organisation :

Monica Masperi, Yves Bardière (Université Grenoble Alpes, Laboratoire Lidilem)
Tania McNamara (Université Grenoble Alpes)
Jonathan Ravetto (Université Grenoble Alpes)
Rodica Brighidin Charlin (Université Grenoble Alpes)
Rosanne Zanini (Université Grenoble Alpes)
Cristiana Cervini (DIT, Università di Bologna; Laboratoire Lidilem)
Laurent Rouyverol (Université de Nice Sophie Antipolis)

Comité scientifique :

Maria Helena Araújo e Sá, *Universidade de Aveiro (Portugal)*
Mathilde Anquétin, *Università di Macerata (Italie)*
Gabriele Azzaro, *Università di Bologna (Italie)*
Yves Bardière, *Université Grenoble Alpes, Laboratoire LIDILEM (France)*
Encarnación Carrasco, *Universitat de Barcelona / UGA- LIDILEM (Espagne, France)*
Cristiana Cervini, *Università di Bologna, DIT / UGA- LIDILEM (Italie, France)*
Christian Degache, *Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais / UGA - LIDILEM (Brésil, France)*
Johann Fischer, *Universität Göttingen (Allemagne)*
Tim MacNamara *University of Melbourne (Australie)*
Monica Masperi, *Université Grenoble Alpes, Laboratoire LIDILEM (France)*
Jean-Paul Narcy-Combes, *Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3 (France)*
James Purpura, *Columbia University (États-Unis)*
Jean-Rémi Lapaire, *Université Bordeaux Montaigne (France)*
Laurent Rouveyrol, *Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis (France)*
Claire Tardieu, *Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3 (France)*
Cesare Zanca, *Università di Siena (Italie)*

Information about abstract submissions :

Submissions can be in English, French, Italian, Portuguese or Spanish.

Length: **three pages**, including references and tables.

Your proposals must be anonymous, and should not contain any personal information.

Submission deadline: abstracts can be sent until **March 15th 2019** in pdf format to the following e-mail address : eval.colloque.2019@gmail.com.

In the subject of your message, please specify «**EVAL-2019**» and in the text, provide the following information: 1. Title of your proposal. 2. Name, surname, address, affiliation (department, lab., school), mail address. This information must be specified for each of the authors if there are several authors.

Notifications of acceptance: **June, 15th 2019**.