Diagnostic Speaking Proficiency Assessment in Online Learning

Introduction

Foreign language learning is at a premium in today's global economy. One of the pushes from the Defense Language Institute (DLI) and The American Council for Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) alike is to encourage the achievement of higher levels of proficiency and the recognition of the need for "more tailored, individualized instruction as assessment" (Leaver and Campbell 2015, 5). But it has long been recognized that successful language learners come in many stripes (c.f. (Stevick 1989)), and hence at many levels. One particular topic of interest for higher level learners is the special needs of heritage speakers, as discussed later in this chapter. But even beyond higher level learners, the importance of individualized instruction and assessment stands out even more in our world of readily available resources and applications for varied types of learners.

In this push, diagnostic proficiency assessment allows the creation of a learner profile through the collection and analysis of language samples that provide evidence for determining proficiency levels from performance data. A very basic example would be discourse that shows evidence of the ability to list items (novice), to use discrete sentences that can be understood by a sympathetic speaker (intermediate) or the ability to construct paragraph style discourse with freely constructed sentences (advanced). At the DLI Directorate of Continuing Education, the diagnostic assessment used is a face-to-face interview. As they say, the learner profile "will guide their classroom and homework activities, as well as their independent study time" (Leaver and Campbell 2015, 12f).

To look at the features of a diagnostic speaking proficiency assessment instrument and how it might be applied, we are going to examine the Computer Assisted Screening Tool (CAST). In a few studies described below, a learner profile is created by learners responding to spoken prompts based on situations which are both spoken and written. The prompts are designed to induce prolonged discourse providing samples that match criteria at the relevant level. This assessment tool is used in conjunction with language learning and teacher training, where individualized learning based on the description in the learner profile is possible. In the studies described CAST is used online, on site and in hybrid scenarios.

The point here is that successful advanced language instruction, and most likely language instruction at all levels, requires a tailored approach meeting the individual language profile of the learner:

> Another hallmark of the program described in this volume is individualized instruction... Traditional classroom environments do not afford opportunities for extended discourse-level speech that defines ILR level 3 and above. Rifkin (2003) points out that instructors often attempt to circumvent this problem by having students speak in pairs or small groups; however, as he notes, pair or group work does not allow the instructor to listen attentively to each student and to attend to his or her mistakes (Brown and Brown 2015, 207).

Examples of this technique, combining diagnostic assessment with individualized teaching and learning are provided by Jackson in his review of the Foreign Service Institute's School of Language Studies in Arlington, where "such training [beyond ILR level 3] is often individualized for the student, with a mix of guided independent study, including extensive reading, watching authentic media broadcasts, and one-on-one tutoring, all designed to assist the learner to address diagnosed needs" (Jackson 2015, 193).

For a broader picture of learner progress, a portfolio of student products is required. A diagnostic assessment is then just one component in the overall evaluation of student achievement. A successful example of a portfolio system for advanced level learners is provided by the Flagship Chinese program at Ohio State University, which uses The Advanced Language Performance Portfolio System (ALPPS) created at Ohio State University (OSU) and provides evaluators with samples of actual performances.

The term used for this portfolio assessment is 360-degree feedback:

> This online system stores foreign language performance samples, evaluators' assessments of those performance samples, and students' scores on standardized tests all in a portfolio created for each individual. Along with serving as a repository of such raw data, the system also produces reports that show an individual's strengths and weaknesses, charts a learner's improvement of decline over time, aggregates data, and produces reports for selected populations within the database of portfolios (McAloon 2015, 162).

Various media types are stored in the portfolio and then evaluated by raters. The different items are scored by raters. A particularly interesting aspect of this performance system is the allowance for various perspectives on the language proficiency exhibited by the performance artifacts. As McAloon states:

> The differences in rating levels are clearly subjective, but performance evaluation is also inherently subjective: one person's "strong" is another person's "passable." The subjectivity of interpersonal evaluation largely explains why a tool designed to elicit the opinions of native- speaking professionals needs the input of multiple raters.

All together the system creates a "multi-rater portfolio assessment " (166).

History and Evolution of CAST

The Computer Assisted Screening Tool (CAST) was a project enabled by funding provided by Application for Federal Education Assistance. Mary Ann Lyman-Hager was the original Principle Investigator in 2002. The grant was to fund a pre ACTFL-OPI screening test, with the following purposes:

- elicit online sample to assure floor (baseline) rating
- provide feedback to improve scores
- estimate OPI results
- provide positive washback for proficiency testing
- encourage more people to take the OPI

Many of the goals stated in this early grant proposal went far beyond this, including to mechanize assessment, provide a database of linguistic tools, and a database of speech samples. (A study was published in 2012 about using CAST as a tool for creating a corpus of spoken learner language (Shanklin 2012)). Based on a framework developed by The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) and ACTFL, a consortium consisting of CAL, DLI, Brigham Young University (BYU) and the Language Acquisition Resource Center (LARC) at San Diego State University further developed the framework, producing 260 test items and leading to pilot tests in Spanish and Arabic at BYU in 2006 and 2007.   After these initial pilots, LARC took the lead on developing the software, employing a full-time developer continuously. The evolution in this period has led to a highly stable online program, with ease of access, high recording quality and improved interface for rating the tests and especially for displaying the results (feedback) to the test taker, including all of the original situations, prompts and student responses.

CAST Interface

Exams are offered in fifteen languages at the advanced and intermediate levels and designed to determine threshold proficiency. Five items are randomly selected for the test taken from a pool of from 60 to several hundred in five to seven function areas and a dozen content areas. The test can be evaluated by a trained rater or by a teacher-reviewer (see below). CAST now occupies an important niche in online oral proficiency assessment, in integrating meaningful feedback into the curriculum in language skills courses as well as teacher training courses.

Recent Published Studies

In two studies published in 2016, CAST was used to collect important pre-assessment data concerning oral proficiency. Furnis examines the teaching of routine formulas to Russian learners as a part of pragmatic competence using CALL activities. CAST was used to verify oral proficiency and then classify the 34 participants in the study as at the intermediate or advanced level of proficiency. The levels were then distributed through the experimental and control groups, with 8/8 (advanced/ not advanced) in the control group and 6/12 in the experimental group. (Furniss 2016, 42f) {tests rated by two raters: "inter-rater reliability was 0.90, calculated with Cronbach's alpha" (45)}.

The oral proficiency data helped form the context for the following observation:

> Results indicate that the instructional intervention improved learners' awareness of the targeted routine formulas, and resulted in lower Listening Recognition Score (LRS) for nonce phrases. Both the experimental and control groups were comparable at the outset. However, only the experimental group showed significant improvement in their test scores. Interestingly, there was not a significant difference on pre-test scores between groups based on oral proficiency ratings. This indicates that general speaking ability is not correlated with routing formula awareness, thereby confirming the need for explicit instruction of this element of pragmatic competence at all levels of proficiency (Furniss 2016, 51).

Meanwhile, Aquino-Sterling (2016) discusses the use of CAST to determine proficiency levels of Spanish for teachers in a language preparation course for a bilingual certification program (*Foundations of Biliteracy*). There are two versions currently of CAST, the advanced and

intermediate levels. For the students in the course reviewed in this article, proficiency level achieved is part of the student portfolio that helps in the analysis of portfolio data:

> Isabel, a preservice secondary bilingual teacher who considered herself a "heritage speaker of Spanish" and achieved an intermediate level of Spanish proficiency in the course oral diagnostic assessment (administered by the University Language Center), produced the pedagogical Spanish exemplar examined in this section. I selected this exemplar because it received the highest score among the six (13%) heritage speakers of Spanish registered in the course. In addition, the intermediate level of Spanish proficiency was the highest level achieved among heritage speakers (Aquino-Sterling 2016, 57).

Heritage speakers are defined by Aquino-Sterling as: "students raised in homes where Spanish is spoken and who are to some degree bilingual in English and Spanish (see Valdés, 2001)" (Aquino-Sterling 2015, 51).

In this course, a student portfolio is developed to help create and evolve a student language profile. The online proficiency screening tool, CAST, is used by the instructors and raters to provide meaningful feedback to assist in the creation of that language profile, which goes beyond simply, at, approaching or fails to meet the intermediate or advanced level.

It is this use of the instrument that sets it apart from the ACTFL OPIc or other measurement tools. In fact, the goal is to simulate the kind of context that students will experience in taking the Oral Proficiency Interview, and allow them to develop awareness of criteria involved in proficiency assessment. One of the instructors for the course examined in this article, pointed out that "many students do not understand the different characteristics of intermediate and advanced speakers until the end of the term" [PC, 8/25/16]. This instructor is a trained rater for OPI, OPIc, Toiec and AAPPL.

Interestingly this awareness, which is also a type of metalinguistic awareness, is one of the two key features of language usage that are the focus of the course as reviewed in Aquino-Sterling 2016, namely metalinguistic awareness and 'pedagogical Spanish competencies' (Aquino-Sterling 2016, 64). Elsewhere the author states a goal as: 'developing their general and teaching-specific Spanish competencies and metalinguistic knowledge' (Aquino-Sterling 2015, 51). Aquino-Sterling goes on in this article to

compare Isabel's task with one completed by Ana Celia, a native speaker who placed at the advanced level with CAST. The task was to role-play a fifth grade teacher describing or explaining to pupils "a lesson they were going to carry out the following week" (Aquino-Sterling 2016, 56):

> For the activity, Ana Celia selected a lesson titled: '*Hacer una obra de teatro con personajes prototípicos de cuentos*/Produce a Play With Prototypical Short Story Characters.' As described in the textbook, the purpose of this particular project was for fifth-grade students to identify the structure and characteristic of a theatrical script and to collaborate with classmates in the writing of a script in order to perform a dramatized reading of it (60).

> Even a cursory review of the literature competencies indicates that it is not yet a common and systematic practice for faculty in K–12 bilingual teacher preparation programs to provide prospective bilingual teachers with opportunities to develop *teaching-specific* or pedagogical Spanish competencies as defined in this article (64).

In this curriculum, diagnostic feedback is combined with performance assessment aimed at targeting Spanish for specific purposes. The language samples collected from the students through oral proficiency assessment helped create a language profile while further activities contributed to mastering the language competencies targeted. In an article published prior to this, Aquino-Sterling spells out some specific competencies associated with this activity:

> The activity served to develop future bilingual teachers' metalinguistic knowledge (difference between the Spanish "diptongo" and "hiato") and functional teaching-specific Spanish competencies (explanation of the main differences between the metalinguistic concepts outlined) (Aquino-Sterling 2015, 47).

Also mixed with metalinguistic awareness is the need to focus on issues of translanguage (e.g. (García 2009), (Lizárraga 2015)), which as Aquino-Sterling says, students need to 'exercise the right to' while intersecting metalinguistic awareness, i.e. mastering 'multiple forms and registers of the Spanish language' (Aquino-Sterling 2016, 54) Elsewhere, the author elaborates on the concept of mastering multiple registers:

Within bilingual classroom contexts, this augmentation of language skills occurs when teachers have full control of academic vocabularies across languages. For example, when teaching algebra in Spanish to 11th graders, math teachers must demonstrate a knowledge of content-specific vocabulary, such as "associative property" [*propiedad asociativa*], commutative property [*propiedad conmutativa*], or distributive property [*propiedad distributiva*]. In addition, teachers need strong foundations in the academic discourse connectors to be utilized throughout the lesson in order to help student produce language beyond the sentence level (Aquino-Sterling, 2014), such as "combining" [*combinar*] or "rationale" [*razon fundamental*], in this particular case (Aquino-Sterling and Rodriguez-Valls 2016, 77).

Teacher Reviewer Function

Both of these studies relied on the assessment by trainer raters, either certified OPI instructors who had been informed about the objectives of CAST, or raters who had gone through the OPI workshop and then a subsequent five-day CAST assessor training. For the following two studies, the instructors use another module of CAST called the Teacher Reviewer Module. In this module, the same questions (situations and prompts) are used by teachers. The format is similar, with a series of checkboxes next to questions, and a window for feedback for each response and for the test as a whole. The questions are formatted slightly differently with a comment about the test taker 'exceeding expectations' in the key areas of discourse, comprehensibility, grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary richness. The questions for the rater are more on the current ability to meet similar criteria.

Unlike the official rating interface, the teacher reviewer can see the names of the test takers s/he has rated, but only after the test has been rated. Also the teacher reviewer can create his/her own registration code, and send an e-mail notification to the student with the responses.

Portuguese, 4th semester

In a recent classroom research study of Portuguese class, presented at the 2016 Luso-American Conference in San Diego (de Abreu 2016), the instructor of a 4th semester Portuguese class identified three types of learners, based on her experience following progress of the students from the start of their studies:

a)   3 heritage learners

b)   Exceptional L2 learner w/ Spanish (c.f. (Stevick 1989)) for an interesting study on characteristics that might distinguish exceptional language learners.)

c)   Developing L2 learner (also Spanish speaker)

At the beginning of the term, de Abreu had used the CAST results to confirm observations about students who represented the three language types.   Students took the CAST in late January, and the instructor compared the results of students representing the three types:

- Feedback on vocabulary was recurrent among L2 learners overall; HL did not have any need for feedback on vocabulary.,
- L2 learner with developing proficiency had more difficulty "finding the words" to express her ideas than the outstanding L2 learner.
- More negative Interference from Spanish in the Developing L2 learner's proficiency; lower self-correction;
- Some negative Interference from Spanish in the Outstanding L2 learner's proficiency; followed by immediate self-correction (de Abreu 2016).

Near the end of the term in late May, the instructor administered the test again. Now she found that in general the heritage speakers still exhibited a) lack of vocabulary – stayed the same, short answers, grammatical, did not produce a lot of feedback : "produced minimal language to answer questions; vocabulary was accurate and pragmatically appropriate, discourse native like, straight forward answers, no details" (PC, August 26, 2016).

For the excelled learner, the fluency was better; Spanish interference was almost gone; there was a greater chance of using more sophisticated words, more characteristic of native speaker. The learner produced much more language, with a richer vocabulary, making a bigger effort to provide longer and more detailed answers; she was more informative, and the instructor learned more about the speaker in terms of experiences and even personality:

The biggest surprise was with the more typical language learner, who exhibited more native like structures in discourse; she was able to self-correct {rephrasing} [*de* vs *du*]; her overall language was very productive compared to beginning; in terms of vocabulary, she was using more technical terms, 'cell phone', without problem. So whereas the initial observation was that this student had more difficulty finding the words to express her ideas than the outstanding L2 learner, had more negative interference from Spanish, and lower self-correction, by the final assessment this speaker's fluency improved with reduced Spanish

interference, more the characteristics of native speaker, and actually showed a greater improvement that the excelled learner (PC, August 26, 2016).

Using these observations the instructor is able to "develop materials and design tasks that will continue fostering language proficiency for both L2 learners and heritage learners" [PC]. One strong piece of performance assessment for this instructor to be included in the portfolio is a talent show where the students share a talent that they have with the other course participants, describing as well how they became aware of that talent and exhibiting the skill. These final class presentations are then videotaped for review.

Conversational French

The next example of CAST concerns its use in an assessment-driven asynchronous online French course. The two French oral communication courses are divided into three modules:

- Vocab and grammar, using assessment developed in Canvas
- Listening comprehension quizzes (TEF)
- Oral production and pronunciation (10 x CAST)

Each module has assessment tools: a) comprehensive online grammar review through quizzes prepared in Canvas; b) oral/aural comprehension questions based on the TEF exam [*Test d'évaluation du français*] at the intermediate and advanced level; and c) ten CAST exams (best 5 out of 10), with immediate feedback and scoring given for each individual question.

The instructor says that he is able to give detailed feedback on pronunciation and patterns, and offers feedback he would not be able to give in a classroom situation. "You can test vocabulary and sentence structure in a way you couldn't do otherwise " [PC, 10/21/2016]. Also, he does not use the rubrics provided by CAST, but

> a more traditional rating grid based on three major areas: 1) appropriateness and complexity of vocabulary expressions for scenario 2) grammatical structures 3) pronunciation, fluency (natural flow), formal/informal register [e-mail, 6/13/2016].

There are important advantages that accrue to the instructor through this system. First of all, he has complete assessment records for all of the classes. Secondly, by having the online courses on the books, he can compensate for personnel cuts and make sure that enough classes are available to maintain French as a major and a minor, even when courses needed by the students may not be otherwise offered in the schedule for the term.

The instructor's comments give an idea of the use of CAST as a vehicle for collecting learner speech samples in any online course.

Further Reflections on Diagnostic Feedback

We have looked at diagnostic feedback in terms of learner profiles, but such an instrument can also be implemented at the department level. Another use of the CAST for oral assessment has been for placement tests. In the Italian program at SDSU, CAST is administered together with an extensive quiz on Moodle. Together all four skills are evaluated. The CAST responses are rated by the program director who has completed OPI training and CAST assessor training. Once again the value of the instrument is to collect samples of student discourse, collected in such a way as to make the evaluation of oral proficiency criteria easier. CAST has also been used in program evaluation. In the Fall term of 2014 an SDSU Spanish Dept. graduate student completed an extensive survey of all third year Spanish students using the CAST, administering the test to 171 students, after taking OPI training CAST assessor training in the summer (de Jonghe 2014). His report suggested a possible discrepancy between the stated goals of the department and the actual achievable goals to be determined at a low-intermediate level.

Differentiation of test types

Another instrument for determining oral proficiency is the computerized version of the OPI now offered by ACTFL (c.f. (Thompson 2016) for a comparison in terms of inter-rater reliability). To use the language of the early CAST proposal, OPIc (Oral Proficiency Interview by Computer) is a high-stakes test (rather than a low-stakes vehicle for feedback) that leads to an ACTFL certificate of proficiency level. The OPIc differs from CAST in another crucial way – it can scale up to the range of proficiency levels, whereas CAST is currently offered only at the threshold values of lower intermediate and advanced low.

The OPIc ratings are subject to the same inter-rater reliability review as the OPI. CAST also depends on the judgement of the professionals in the field who have been trained in understanding ACTFL assessment criteria, but there is no board to oversee the ratings. In a 2 ½ day CAST assessor training workshop (per level), participants review the ACTFL criteria and apply them to sample CAST tests, debating amongst themselves until group consensus (or willingness to disagree) is achieved. For the assessor training workshops, prior OPI training is crucial, as otherwise there is too little understanding of the ACTFL criteria.

It would be easy to claim though that the participants are simply relying on intuition. Using the framework by Kahneman (2011) and elsewhere, the assessor training workshop, helps

10

evaluators, both official raters and teacher reviewers, achieve system 2 results, by consciously reviewing the criteria applied to establishing the threshold levels of proficiency (c.f. also McAloon above).

Although CAST can be seen as a preparation for an official OPI, in some ways it avoids criticism that have been leveled against the OPI. Bachman for example questions the use of 'one global rating' rather than 'several distinct abilities' (Johnson, 31) (Bachman 1990). Though CAST offers a single achievement ('at level', 'approaching level' 'not at level'), the detailed feedback enables the creation of a broader perspective on aspects of the language performance.

When based on face-to-face interviews, Johnson questions whether the genre is appropriate for 'making inferences about an individual's ability on the basis of his or her test score' ((Johnson, 3) (c.f. also (van Lier 1989, 494)). Though the session takes place as a conversation, power to direct and change topics lies with the person conducting the test, leading to an "asymmetrical distribution of power, a feature typical of an interview" (Johnson 2001, 35). The power possessed by the interviewer to "interrupt the candidate in any place he/she considers relevant. . ." (114), is an example. The degree of the problem that this can lead to is depicted by Johnson in a recorded interview where the candidate, a refuge from Iraq, is asked about the political situation in Iraq. It is clear from the recording that the candidate did not feel comfortable with the question.

The point is also taken that the discourse style more closely represents classroom interaction than a conversation. For example, Csomay states in summarizing conversational research on classroom discourse with the use of corpora: "The general assumption is that turns and turn allocations are mostly controlled by the teacher. They are allocated to the other participant(s) of that context, the student, when if considered necessary or appropriate and depending on instructional goals" (Csomay 2012, 106). Moreover, "the participants turn-taking patterns (as social actions) reflect institutional rules that are determined by institutional constraints, e.g. power relations between participants, rather than the general rules of conversation" (Csomay, 104).

CAST, as a preparation for a more formal oral proficiency assessment, does not have interviewers and the test-taker can determine the scale, depth and detail of the response without interruption. In fact, the candidate has as much time as desired to reflect on the question before starting the recording. If the candidate desires to reject the question posed, s/he can refresh the browser or log out and log back in again with the test ID sent to the email

11

upon registering. All previous questions are preserved. During the test, once the recording is started, the candidate must continue without the option of pausing until the end of the recording. When the recording is stopped, the next question comes up.

Conclusions

Under discussion is an online test designed to collect samples of learner language in such a way that enhances the ability to make judgement about oral proficiency levels. Such a test can be combined with a range of performance-based assessment. This helps in the individualization of language instruction, important in advanced levels of language learning, but equally valuable in all levels of instruction as more and more options for language learning become available.

An example of such a test, CAST (Computer Assisted Screening Tool), is an online program that allows refined feedback to be shared with the test taker based on their performance in answering prompts similar to ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) questions. CAST has been piloted recently in six different scenarios important for the relevance of feedback in oral proficiency development: (i) research project on the acquisition of pragmatic competence for Russian learners; (ii) creation of a learner profile as part of a language course for a bilingual certification program in which the majority of students are heritage Spanish speakers; (iii) intermediate skills development in fourth semester Portuguese; (iv) measuring progress in an online French conversation course; (v) evaluation of a third-semester undergraduate Spanish course, designed as a program to get students to the intermediate mid-level; and (vi) for placement purposes.

 A distinctive feature of CAST, built into its DNA if you will, is its use as an empowerment device for instructors and language programs. On the one hand the questions and rating grid emulate the ACTFL OPI testing protocol. On the other hand, there is great freedom in applying the test and developing language program particular criteria for the feedback. This principle is most vividly portrayed in the use of CAST for teacher training. However it is worth noting that CAST is multi-functional in easily being able to carry out the tasks delineated above. Though CAST was taken as an example program, it really simply illustrates a means of online diagnostic proficiency assessment.

Bibliography

Aquino-Sterling, Cristian R. 2015. "Metalinguistic Knowledge at Play: using Common Core en Español to develop teaching-specific competencies in bilingual teacher education in the U.S.A." *Revista Comunicación* 24 (2): 47-57.

Aquino-Sterling, Cristian R. 2016. "Responding to the call: developing and assessing pedagogical Spanish competencies in bilingual teacher education." *Bilingual Research Journal* 39 (1): 50 - 68.

Aquino-Sterling, Cristian R. 2014. "Speaking and Listening in a New Key: discursive performances in light of common core." *Voices from the Middle* 22 (1): 30-35.

Aquino-Sterling, Cristian R., and Fernando Rodriguez-Valls. 2016. "Developing Teacher-Specific Spanish Competencies in Bilingual Teacher Education: toward a culturally, linguistically and professionally relevant approach." *Multicultural Perspectives* 18 (2): 73-81.

Bachman, Lyle F. 1990. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, Tony and Jennifer, Tony Brown, and Jennifer Brown. 2015. *To Advanced Proficiency and Beyond.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Brown, Tony, and Jennifer Brown. 2015. "Charting a New Course in the 21st Century." In: *To Advanced Proficiency and Beyond*, by Tony Brown and Jennifer Brown, 205-211. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Csomay, Eniko. 2012. "A Corpus-Based Look at Short Turns in University Classroom Interaction." *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 8 (1): 103-128.

de Abreu, Cassia. 2016. "Piloting the CAST for Portuguesae: using LARC's CAST assessment tool to provide feedback on oral proficiency to intermediate language learners." Presentation to Luso-American Conference. Accessed August 29, 2016. http://larcmaterials.sdsu.edu/Luso-American2016/.

de Jonghe, Ryan. 2014. "CAST Intermediate Spanish: Report for the Fall 2013 Semester." Internal Report, 1 - 12.

Furniss, Edie A. 2016. "Teaching the Pragmatics of Russian Conversation Using a Corpus-referred Website." *Language Learning and Technology* 20 (2): 38-60.

García, Ofelia. 2009. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: a global perspective.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jackson, Frederick H. 2015. "Expanded Understandings and Programmatic Approaches for Achieving Language Ability." In *To Advanced Proficiency and Beyond*, by Tony Brown and Jennifer Brown, 185-204. Washington D.C.: Georgetown Univesity Press.

Jasser, Amal, Rajai Al-Khanji and Betty Lou Leaver. 2005. "A Demographic Analysis of Arabic-Speaking Students Who Achieve Native-Like Levels in English Writing Skills." *Journal for Distinguished Language Studies* 3: 41-62.

Johnson, Marysia. 2001. *The Art of Non-conversation: a reexamination of the validity of the oral proficiency interview.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kahneman, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking Fast and Slow.* Farrar, Strau and Giroux (KIndle edition).

Leaver, Betty Lou, and Christine Campbell. 2015. "Experience with Higher Levels of Proficiency." In *To Advanced Proficiency and Beyond*, by Tony Brown and Jennifer Brown, 3-21. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Lizárraga, José Ramón, Glynda A. Hull and John M. Scott. 2015. "Translingual Literacies in a Social Media Age." In *Multilingual Learners and Academic LiteraciesÑ sociocultural contexts of literacy development in adolescents*, by Daniella, Edynn Sato, Timothy Boals, and Carol A. Hedgspeth Molle, 105-131. New York: Routledge.

McAloon, Patrick. 2015. "From Proficiency to Expertise: using HR evaluation methods to assess advanced foreigh language and culture capability." In *To Advanced Proficiency and Beyond*, by Tony Brown and Jennifer Brown, 153-169. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Rifkin, Benjamin. 2003. "Oral Proficiency Learning Outcomes and Curricular Design." *Foreign Language Annals* 36: 582-588.

Shanklin, M. Trevor. 2012. "Completing the Feedback Loop: creating spoken learner corpora." In *Input, Process and Product: developments in teaching and language corpora*, by James Thomas and Alex Boulton, 298-313. Brno: Masaryk University Press.

Stevick, Earl W. 1989. *Success with Foreign Languages: seven who achieved it and what worked for them.* Hemel Hemptsead: Prentice Hall International.

Thompson, Gregory L., Troy L. Cox and Nieves Knapp. 2016. "Comparing the OPI an d the OPIc: the effect of test method on oral proficiency scores and student preference." *Foreign Language Annals* 49 (1): 75-92.

Valdés, G. 2001. "Heritage Language Students: profiles and possibilities." In *Heritage Languages in America: preserving a national resource*, by D.A. Raynard and S. McGinnis (Eds.) J.K. Peyton, 37-77. Washingon D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

van Lier, Leo. 1989. "Reeling, Writihing, Drawling, Stretching, and Fainting in Coils: Oral Proficiency Interviews as Conversation." *TESOL Quarterly 23* 489-508.

Biographical Sketch

Trevor Shanklin manages the language labs as part of the Language Acquisition Resource Center (LARC) at San Diego State University. Prior to taking on the position, Trevor taught and engaged in teacher training in many different contexts including Eastern Europe as a Soros Teacher Trainer; former BIA schools on the Navajo Nation as a coordinator for an Eisenhower Grant; Northern Arizona University with the Linguistics Department and The Center for Excellence in Education; Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest as an associate professor; The University of Mannheim as a lector and the University of Maryland overseas division. Trevor's passion is teacher training, especially using and administering technology to both enhance the curriculum and promote the student voice in our reconstruction of the world we live in.