**Huth, Thorsten**
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

**On graded scales: Interaction, proficiency, and assessment frameworks**

Conversation Analysis as a research methodology and as a field theorizing human language (Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013) continues to influence theorizing and research in applied linguistics (Sert and Seedhouse, 2011; Kasper and Wagner, 2014). This includes exploring the overall organization of language classroom discourse (e.g. Seedhouse 2004; Sert, 2015;), examining topics in language teacher training (Wong and Waring, 2010), and teaching interactional structures in second language classrooms (Barraja-Rohan, 1997; Betz & Huth, 2014). The skill, sensitivity to, and perhaps the competence, to engage in interactional behaviors are currently being encapsulated in the term Interactional Competence (IC) (Hall, Hellerman, & Peraker-Doehler, 2011). Delineating the term's scope and furnishing viable empirical studies in second language learning contexts remains a current research target (Ross and Kasper, 2013; Young, 2011).

Assessing IC in the L2 curriculum provides conceptual challenges. As a notion, IC is closely related to social-interactional views of language. These generally hold that interactants focus on anticipating, interpreting, and producing temporally adjacent turns that relate to one another, in and through which information, knowledge, and affect is negotiated and relationships are built. Interactants utilize linguistic items, temporal, and embodied resources in this process that (1) entails at least two turns, (2) connects larger courses of action, and (3) happens in a specific setting and within a history of interaction and thus relies on common ground (Clark, 1996; Enfield, 2006). The formal assessment infrastructure in second language teaching (e.g. CEFR), however, views language primarily as an assessable that (1) happens in controlled and replicable testing contexts, (2) shows an orientation to the production of primarily linguistic items by individual speakers, (3) is not viewed as contingent on interlocutor input, and (4) primarily serves to ascertain an individual's language proficiency relative to institutionally mandated, graded scales.

Focusing on (4) above, this presentation analyzes current attempts to integrate IC into linear models of language proficiency and assessment. By linear I mean the underlying conceptions of language proficiency that apply an incremental, graded continuum from low L2 proficiency to superior abilities in the L2. I argue that this continuum fundamentally undergirds language assessment and is assumed to extend to all aspects of language development, including the pragmatics and/or interactional competencies of L2 learners. Utilizing CEFR's current attempts to formalize interactional competencies of L2 learners on such graded scales, I illustrate the opportunities and connections as well as the disconnects and friction points between social-interactionist views of language and the view of language that results from the institutional constraints under which proficiency frameworks and their attendant assessment tools operate.

**References**

Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (1997). Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms with conversation analysis. In A. J. Liddicoat, and C. Crozet, C., (Eds.), Teaching Language, Teaching Culture, (pp. 71–88). Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, Series S, 14.

Betz, E. and T. Huth. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German language classroom. Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German 47 (2), 140-163.

Clark, H. (1996). Using language. Cambridge: University Press.

Council of Europe (2012). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge: CUP. Also available from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf

Enfield, N. (2006). Social consequences of common ground. In N. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction (pp. 399-430). Oxford: Berg.

Hall, J. K., Hellerman, J., & Pekarek-Doehler, S. (Eds.) (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kasper, G. and J. Wagner (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 34*, 1-42.

Ross, S., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Assessing second language pragmatics.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Sequence Organization in Interaction. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Sert, O. & Seedhouse, P. (2011). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 5*(1), 1-14.

Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In

E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 426-443). London & New York: Routledge.