

## *The face to face interaction to evaluate the oral Portuguese language proficiency*

Jerônimo COURA-SOBRINHO (CEFET-MG/FAPEMIG<sup>1</sup>)  
jeronimocoura@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The Celpe-Bras is the only Exam for Certification in Portuguese Language Proficiency recognized in Brazil. Through one instrument all the four linguistic skills are accessed in this Exam. The oral skills, both receptive and productive, are evaluated from different ways, with the purpose of providing the interviewees with varied opportunities to explore their language-culture knowledge. The aim of this research is to analyze the ways the oral skills of the Celpe-Bras examinees are elicited and evaluated. One sample of the same edition of the Exam was analyzed, taking into account both contexts in which the Exam is applied – Brazil and other countries. The dynamics of dialogs was the main theoretical basis of the analyses. The results suggest that the oral interviews are impregnated with moments of enunciative symmetry and asymmetry in which the interactants try to keep a complex communicative contract unfold in two dimensions: one related with a formal situation of evaluation and the other related to an informal dialog. The main conclusion of this research is that the context of language learning is closely related with the performance of the examinees in linguistic proficient test.

**Key-words:** Portuguese language proficiency exam; face to face interaction; oral skills assessment

Foreign languages proficiency examinations are demanded by people who look for new opportunities in other countries. In Brazil, the Brazilian Portuguese for Foreigners Proficiency Examination (Celpe-Bras) is a useful tool to test the linguistic competence concerning the use of its official language, which is, the Brazilian Portuguese.

The tools which are used to assess the proficiency in a foreign language have drawn academics' attention mostly due to aspects, such as the validity and the reliability of the instruments. McNamara (2000) states that linguistic proficiency examinations need to be meaningful for the applicants, what he calls accountability. In addition to that, they should also produce positive washback effect in the teaching and learning process. Consequently, they have to have an impact outside the classroom.

Celpe-Bras examination evaluates the four integrated linguistic skills. Thus, it is composed by a written part and an oral one. The written part is the same for all the applicants; the oral one consists of an individual interview. According to the applicant's profile, the examiners responsible for the oral part use three Provocative Elements (PE<sup>2</sup>) of different genres and text types to stimulate the conversation and promote a reliable assessment. The PE are

---

<sup>1</sup> Special thanks to **CEFET-MG** and **FAPEMIG** who supported the participation in the International Association for Educational Assessment (IAEA) 2014 Conference

<sup>2</sup> Small texts used to help the interlocution between the Celpe-Bras oral part evaluator and the applicant.

multimodal<sup>3</sup> texts in their configuration. Besides the typographical devices, there are images or info-graphics which can be explored by the individuals involved to foster interaction. Therefore, it allows the applicant to comprehend what is being said about the theme of the text and s/he also makes use of her/his knowledge about the language and the Brazilian cultures. Being the motivators of the interaction, the PE also promote comprehensions full of intercultural aspects that can be discussed during the interlocution.

The communicative situation of the interview consists of a scenario where the candidates are *evaluated* and, at the same time, they have to express themselves in the dialogue. These conversations are held by themes and texts that transmit a world view since they are created to be read by native speakers of of Brazilian Portuguese language. It means that the PE are produced with a communicative intention, but used in an evaluation context with the goal of assessing the candidates' language proficiency. There is a displacement of the communicative purpose of the text when used as a Provocative Element in the Face to Face Interaction.

If one considers that the PE itself already brings a world view, or as Charaudeau (1995) affirms, it presents the *the world already signified*, the Celpe-Bras applicant is invited to speak his/her mind among these meanings. Moreover, it is a communicative situation which places the interlocutors in enunciative asymmetric positions (COURA-SOBRINHO e DELL'ÍSOLA, 2009). This enunciative asymmetry is considered in the theoretical model which is used to analyze the data of this investigation.

Different factors seem to play a role in the dynamics of the interviewers-evaluators' face to face interaction with the applicants. As this examination is applied in institutions located in Brazil and in other countries, one can foresee the impact of these two contexts involved in the dynamics of the evaluation<sup>4</sup>.

It is exactly this worry with the applicants' behavior in the oral evaluation on the examination which guided the core question of this investigation: *In what ways can the dynamics of the dialogue play a role in the oral part of Brazilian Portuguese for Foreigners Proficiency Examination (Celpe-Bras)?*

In order to discuss this question, this research looked for a data sample of fifteen interviews (among more than 3,000) which could be representative, at the same time, of the set of interviews from a same Celpe-Bras edition and also from the contexts of application, i.e., Brazil and other countries. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed, taking into consideration the moves of the enunciative symmetry and asymmetry. These moves unveil the interlocutors engagement in the dialogue, and produce some traces of collaboration and competition which are inherent to the face to face interactions (Linell, 1990, 1998). For this reason, traces of other identity dimensions, such as the individual and the social ones, so as their interactional and intercultural competencies, are present in the game of interlocution.

---

<sup>3</sup> Júdice (2009:15) draws the attention to the texts multimodality "which integrates speaking, writing and also static and movement images". In the case of the Provocative Elements, the tests integrate the verbal and the non-verbal languages (images).

<sup>4</sup> The Celpe-Bras evaluators, when in Brazil, present a point of view about their own culture and also about the applicants' culture. On the other hand, the evaluators who are abroad, and therefore, they become foreigners, present new configurations about the Brazilian culture and the applicants' culture as well, due to (i) this detachment and (ii) for being the other in the Celpe-Bras applicants' country. These intercultural aspects which depend on the contexts were object of a Master's investigation called *Ensino de Língua Portuguesa para Estrangeiros em Contextos de Imersão e de Não-Imersão: Percepções Interculturais dos Aprendizes e do Professor*, carried out by Henrique Rodrigues Leroy, in the Post Graduation Program on Language Studies at CEFET-MG, in 2011 (<http://www.posgraduacao.cefetmg.br/cefet-mg-posling/indexhp/pt/dissertacoes>).

As an assumption of this investigation, it is considered that there is room for a variability of behavior among the interviewers. They are placed in a situation of linguistic proficiency evaluation. Thus, this context leads them to challenge their interlocutors in different levels. According to Brown (2005),

“The relative freedom that interviewers have to develop the interaction within the overall interview structure might lead to candidates receiving more, or fewer, chances to demonstrate their ability. And this, in turn might lead to different ratings outcomes”. (Brown, 2005:2)

To this researcher, the variability of the interviewers’ attitude can threaten the reliability of the examination and it can be detected: (i) in the inconsistency of the questions made by them, (ii) in the lack of articulation among the questions and (iii) in the topical variation.

Considering the Celpe-Bras Exam, the interviewers receive a Questions Script for each PE in order to guide their interlocation. The situation of oral evaluation consists of a certain degree of formality because it is a context of an institutional evaluation which demands standard behaviors from the interviewers. However, there are individual differences among the interviewers which are determined by identity issues. It is noticed that they have to have the ability to stimulate the applicant’s oral expression and also, they need to have challenging speech acts utterances in order to promote positive or negative effects in the dynamics of the interview.

### **Theoretical Backgrounds**

The linguistic proficiency examinations exist for more than one hundred years, although the scientific approach of isolated items testing<sup>5</sup> exists since the 1950s, when the American government implemented the *Oral Test Proficiency – OIP* – in different languages, to be applied to the workers who would have their jobs in other countries. In the 1960s, with the increasing number of foreign students in the United States and in England, the linguistic performance tests started being applied. From the 1970s on, the proficiency linguistic tests assumed a communicative aspect, corresponding to the approach which was developed for the teaching of languages (McNAMARA 1996, 1997).

Nowadays, some countries establish strict criteria to receive foreigners, enriching the linguistic proficiency evaluations in a time of internationalization of the universities and also nations’ globalization.

Differently from isolated items testing, the linguistic proficiency examinations are considered performance tests, in which the applicants are given in situations that (i) simulate the reality; (ii) give access to several abilities and, therefore, (iii) demand inferences about their performances in similar communicative situations. Although the evaluative situation is a simulation, the performance of applicants makes possible to infer their future behavior in daily situations in a way that the validity of the Celpe-Bras exam can be achieved.

McNamara (1997) considers that the interviewers’ behavior interferes in the applicants’ performance in the interviews that evaluate the oral proficiency in a foreign language. On one hand, the applicant can be harmed if the interviewers are critical or if they take their speech

---

<sup>5</sup> Isolated items testing concerns, normally, of multiple choices questions; they are easy to correct. Performance tests are usually consisted of open and discursive questions, which demand a well defined complex correction grid, guaranteeing the reliability of the testing and of the evaluation processes.

turns without waiting for the applicants to finish theirs or if they do not contribute to the flow of the conversation. On the other hand, if the interviewers talk about relevant and plausible topics and if they use simple and accessible language forms the applicants can be benefited.

The management of the interview is, therefore, dependable of different factors and some of them are taken into account in this investigation: the communicative potential of the PE multimodal resources; the applicants' perceptions involved in the interlocution about their own cultures; the evaluators and applicants' points of view; the contexts of application; social variables such as, gender, age, ethnic group etc; the applicants' psychological characteristics. The size of the text, the image quality and the level of the information on the info-graphics can also interfere in the interview.

### **The Face to Face interaction dynamics**

Human communication arouses the researchers' interests in the area of language, sociology and psychological studies. They are interested in it because they take into consideration the fact that the communicative goal is just partially achieved. The enunciative language studies carried out by Émile Benveniste (re)introduced the subjectivity in the interest field of the area, so as Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis, which have contributed to understand the communication phenomena.

In Brazil, the speech or the conversation constitutes room for the studies of linguistic facts present in communication. The Brazilian researcher Marcuschi (1995) supports his studies in Per Linell about the asymmetries that occur in the dialogues to discuss discursive production adequacy to the interactional context. According to Marcuschi, the conversational maxim "Be adequate!" – the basis for the cooperation principle (Grice, 1975) - leads the interlocutors to introduce themselves as true, relevant, concise and clear. Even if this maxim works as an implicit contract in which the interlocutors are inclined to cooperate themselves mutually looking for the inter-comprehension, the forms of the adequacy to different situations does not seem obvious. The difficulty to communicate in an "adequate" form seems to have relationship with the knowledge the interlocutors have about themselves and others and also to the idealized models of interlocution socially established. Other difficulties emerge from the asymmetries among the interlocutors. In a dialogue among people from the same nationality, the difference in the level of schooling can interfere in the inter-comprehension. Naturally, the asymmetry puts the interlocutors who are less schooled in disadvantage unless the interlocution happens in their speech community. When there is interaction among people from different nationalities, with one of the interlocutors using his/her mother tongue, the asymmetry places the foreign language speaker in disadvantage. Besides the level of language proficiency, the interlocutors' social conditions and also the communicative situation where they are inserted are constraints that promote instability in the interlocution.

In a situation of oral linguistic proficiency evaluation, the applicants are in unfavorable enunciative positions for several reasons. First, the face to face interaction is conducted by subjects who act, at the same time, as managers of the interlocution and also as evaluators. As managers, they ask questions, i.e., they propose topics for the conversation that *oblige* the applicants to answer, who must use their highest level of performance in the target language. The power of who makes the questions can be decreased when s/he has to evaluate the replica of who reacted to the question in a dialogical movement that empowers, up to a certain point, the one who replies. Therefore, it is natural that the interlocutors adjust their utterances in order to make the interlocution more dynamic. Thus, the intention of maintaining the conversation is an ostensible utterance of an established communicative contract: both want

to perform his or her role of evaluator and applicant, adjusting the speeches to the mutual language reactions.

In the development of an interview to evaluate the oral proficiency in a foreign language, as in any other face to face interaction, it is natural that misunderstandings, partial comprehensions caused by different cultural backgrounds, lack of linguistic knowledge, difficulties in listening to the other due to the regional accents etc occur. The power tilts to the interviewers' side, even if there are some misunderstandings, because they hold the decision to change the topics, to end the conversation, to retake an idea which was badly developed, due to the role that they are responsible for in a controlled situation of interlocution.

The asymmetry can be negotiated, mainly in the interviewers' solidarity moments. Naturally, applicants who have high intercultural competence have more conditions to worth these solidarity moments to their own benefits.

Linell (1990) considers that symmetry and asymmetry coexist in verbal interactions and also that they take part of a power game in which each interlocutor tries to gain the other's confidence according to his/her points of view. Linell also states that the asymmetry can be global or local: the global one characterizes the communicative event as a whole while the local one is related to the uttered enunciation in the interior of the interlocution. This idea of asymmetry seems to incorporate the dialogues that occur as much in the daily life as in the more or less instructed interviews, as it is in the oral part of Celpe-Bras. Linell (1990) proposes four *theoretical types* of interaction: (i) symmetric and cooperative – it predicates equality among the participants; (ii) symmetric and competitive – it predicates equality, but it can cause conflict; (iii) asymmetric and cooperative – it predicates the fulfillment of the enunciative roles and the maintenance of the status; (iv) asymmetric and competitive – there is imposition of rules by the more empowered interlocutor.

In the moments of asymmetric interactions, one of the interlocutor's power prevails and it is uttered in different ways or dimensions: 1) domination by the amount of speech – A speaks more than B; 2) semantic domination – A dominates the decision about the topics and also manages the interlocution; 3) interaction domination – A decides to start the phases of a same topic and 4) strategic domination – it is related to the strategies of controlling the communicative situations, such as lingering silence and insistency in an answer which matches with the expectations.

The domination in the interactions can occur through different kinds of moves or speech acts: *directive* (questions-answers); *controllers* (evaluation of replicas and procedures of reformulations); *inhibitors* (production of acts which are considered true and that can inhibit the interlocutor).

The analytical model proposed by Linell contemplates oral communicative events (interviews, conversation among friends, negotiations of shopping and sales, adults-children interaction etc), taking into consideration the four types of interaction and allowing the identification of moments in which there is the prevalence of some kind of interlocutor's domination.

In a later paper, Linell (1998) constructs a dialogical theory of the *misunderstandings* and the *miscommunications*. To this researcher, in these dialogical theories there is the preconception that the understanding is always partial in the verbal interactions and the disturbing moments are inherent to communication. Moreover, the troubles can signal the inter-comprehension because they are not intentionally neither individually caused. This idea is related to Grice's principle of cooperation in which there is a communicative intention which is directed to the

understanding and also to the inter-comprehension. In order to signal the understanding, the interlocutors have to use their body or linguistic expressions with the purpose of maintaining the flow of the conversation (smiles, signals with the head, use of interjections that suggest agreement etc). As a way to identify moments that result from misunderstandings, Linell (1998) proposes three categories of analysis: *latent events*, without clear traces of discrepancy in the comprehension; *veiled events*, with traces or indirect reflections in the interlocution; *explicit events*, in which the interlocutors clarify that there was some rut in the communication.

According to Linell (1998), the misunderstandings indicators are: repairs, reformulations (evidences of) such as clarification requests, relative comments on comprehension problems; *meaning negotiations*, threatening to the discourse flow, disconnected enunciations, incoherence or troubles in the dialogue, ostensible silences within the topic, uptake; *utterance* of uncertainty, irritation and discomfort.

Even with the several theoretical possibilities of analyzing the verbal interactions, mainly with the difficulty of finding a dialogical unit, this investigation takes into consideration the structure of Celpe-Bras oral part<sup>6</sup>. The transcription of the interactional data was done based on the enunciations produced in each turn of speech. In this research we analyze the way the interlocution manages itself, with its materialized movements in the form of the misunderstandings, with the enlargement or reduction of the enunciative asymmetry as strategies of the applicants' speech defiance.

### **The research corpus**

The oral part of the 2011/1 Celpe-Bras Edition was the basis for the composition of this investigation corpus, i.e., 15 interviews, 8 in Brazil and 7 in other countries; a set of Provocative Elements (PE) used in the interviews and a Face to Face interaction script.

### **Results**

The results of this investigation are found in Chart 1, in which the application contexts of the examination were highlighted; the moments of asymmetry or symmetry, as much collaborative as competitive, caused by interlocutors ENT (interviewers) or CAND (applicants); the moves or speech acts (directives, collaborators or inhibitors) that, according to Linell (1990) can identify the domination, mainly if it is interactional; the types of prevailing dominations that promote the enunciative asymmetry (domination by the amount of speech, semantic, interactional or strategic domination); the moments in which the competences (intercultural, interactional, and identity and linguistic reconfiguration – or communicative) that interfere in the performance and, finally the misunderstanding or miscommunication issues caused by some of the previous factors.

---

<sup>6</sup>The face to face interaction of Celpe-Bras is planned to happen in twenty minutes, divided in four phases: the first one consists of a five-minute conversation about the applicants' life, their interests about the Brazilian language and culture. The other three phases are conversations promoted by the reading of the PE. In other words, the Celpe-Bras oral part is consisted of two moments; the first one corresponds to the first phase (conversation about the applicants); and the second one corresponds to the exploration of three PE.

| CONTEXT               | INTERVIEW               |                       | MOVES (SPEECH ACTS)    |                      |      |      | TYOES OF DOMINATION |             |                           |                  | PROFICIENCY OF THE APPLICANT |                  |           |                           | MISUNDERS TANDINGS |          |             |        |        |          |   |   |   |    |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------|------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------|-------------|--------|--------|----------|---|---|---|----|
|                       | ENT                     | CAND                  | ENT                    | CAND                 | ENT  | CAND | Directives          | Controllers | Inhibitors                | SPEECH           | SEMANTIC                     | INTERATIONAL     | STRATÉGIC | INTERCULTURAL             | INTERACIONAL       | IDENTITY | LINGUÍSTICA | LATENT | VEILED | EXPLÍCIT |   |   |   |    |
|                       | Collaborative asymmetry | Competitive Asymmetry | Collaborative Symmetry | Competitive Symmetry |      |      |                     |             |                           |                  |                              |                  |           |                           |                    |          |             |        |        |          |   |   |   |    |
| BRAZIL (IMERSION)     | 1                       | c                     |                        | d                    |      |      |                     |             | b (ent), e (cand)         |                  |                              |                  |           | a                         | a                  |          | a           | a      | d      |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 2                       | a, b, h               |                        |                      |      |      |                     |             |                           |                  |                              |                  |           | d                         |                    |          |             | c, f   |        |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 3                       | b                     | a, d                   |                      |      |      |                     |             |                           |                  | g (ent)                      |                  |           |                           |                    |          |             |        |        |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 4                       | b, c                  |                        |                      |      |      |                     |             |                           |                  |                              |                  |           |                           |                    |          |             |        |        | c        |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 5                       | d                     | f                      |                      |      | d    |                     |             |                           |                  |                              |                  |           | a, f                      |                    | a, f     |             |        | d      | e        |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 6                       | f, gg                 | c                      |                      |      |      |                     |             |                           | a (cand)         | c (cand)                     | d (ent), f (ent) |           |                           | b                  | b        |             |        | f, fg  |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 7                       |                       | a, b, f                | b                    |      |      |                     |             |                           |                  |                              |                  |           |                           |                    |          |             |        |        | b, d     |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 8                       | c                     | a, g                   | f                    | b, e |      |                     |             |                           | a (ent)          |                              | d (ent), f (ent) |           |                           |                    |          |             |        |        | A        | e |   |   |    |
| ABROAD (NON-IMERSION) | 9                       | b                     |                        | a, c, e              |      |      |                     | d (cand)    | a (cand), c (cand)        | c (cand)         |                              |                  | a (cand)  |                           |                    |          |             |        |        |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 10                      |                       | a, b, c, e, g, i       | f                    | h    |      |                     |             | d (ent)                   |                  | a (ent)                      | a (ent)          | a (ent)   |                           |                    |          |             |        |        |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 11                      | a, k                  | b, f, h, i, l, m       |                      |      |      |                     |             | e (ent), g (ent), l (ent) | a (ent), j (ent) | a (ent), j (ent)             | a (ent), j (ent) |           | c (ent), e (ent), j (ent) |                    |          |             |        |        | D        |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 12                      | a, b                  | a                      |                      |      |      |                     |             | c (ent)                   |                  |                              |                  |           |                           |                    |          |             |        |        |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 13                      | b                     | c, e                   |                      | d    |      |                     |             | a (ent)                   |                  |                              |                  |           | a (ent), b (ent)          | a (ent)            |          |             |        |        |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 14                      | a, b, c               | a, b                   | d                    |      |      |                     |             |                           |                  |                              |                  |           |                           |                    |          |             |        |        |          |   |   |   |    |
|                       | 15                      | a                     | b                      |                      |      |      |                     |             |                           |                  |                              |                  |           |                           | b                  | b        |             |        | a      |          |   |   |   |    |
| Sum of features       | 9                       | 25                    | 7                      | 5                    | 2    | 0    | 0                   | 0           | 3                         | 8                | 5                            |                  |           | 11                        | 14                 | 6        | 10          | 5      | 3      | 1        | 5 | 9 | 6 | 15 |

**Chart 1 – The features of the dynamics of the interaction identified in the sample**  
 (the letters inside the boxes indicate the turns of speech in which the phenomena occurred and in parenthesis the responsible for the speech act)

## Result Discussions

The investigation demonstrates that the moments of competitive asymmetry caused by the interviewer prevail, in relation to the competitive asymmetry caused by the applicant. Besides, the competitive asymmetry occurs more often in the interviews which were made out of Brazil. The Celpe-Bras applicants, when they apply for the examination abroad, put themselves in a submissive enunciative position in relation to the interviewers. In the same way, the speech turns and the competitive asymmetry moments demonstrate a bigger rigidity in the communication contract among the interviewers and the applicants. The collaborative asymmetry occurs in a more balanced way in both contexts.

The symmetry moments are rare in both contexts, mainly in relation to the applicants. No competitive symmetry case was observed in the interviews made in both contexts.

The dynamic theory of dialogues, by Linell (1990), forecasts that the participants of the face to face interactions tend to dominate their interlocutors. There is predominance of interviewers' interaction domination in both contexts of application. This is a trace of the *design* of the oral part of the Exam: the interviewers plan the interlocution in phases; they also decide the themes and propose the sequence of questions. However, in Interview 1, the applicant dominated the interlocution for a while. Curiously, the applicant has the Portuguese Language as his mother tongue, although he has double nationality (Canadian and Portuguese). He strategically applied for Celpe-Bras to legalize his situation as an English teacher in Brazil. All the other types of domination occur, although in a lower degree, due to the interviewers' acting. Even so, there were cases in which the applicants dominated the amount of speech (interviews 5 and 9). The Interview 9 applicant started talking freely about the PE topics without any interviewer's reaction.

It is noticed a certain balance in both contexts of application considering the domination moments of the interlocution. In addition to that, it demonstrates that the examination interviewers have the same behavior concerning the control of the face to face interaction. Thus, it guarantees the reliability of the Exam.

Nevertheless, the interactional domination can be materialized moves, speech acts or turns (directives, controllers or inhibitors). The collected data show that there is a predominance of inhibitors' speech acts in the interactional domination. The observed speech acts are mainly due to the interviewers' responsibility and they equally occur in both contexts of application. No directive speech act with a reflection on the strategic domination was observed and there were few cases of controllers, in which one of the interlocutors disagrees with his/her partner's point of view.

It is important to say that the intercultural competence of applicants who did the Exam in Brazil influenced the interlocution in a higher degree, if one compares with the interviews which were made abroad. It exposes that the global context of language learning has considerable reflections on the learners' communicative performance, even when they are immersed in an evaluation context. In the same way, some applicants' identities were clearly reconstructed due to the learning of the *languaculture*. This aspect can interfere in the applicant's performance. However, it is suggested by the data that the applicants who took the Exam in Brazil, and supposedly had experience with the Brazilian *languaculture*, have more chances to be successful in the examination.

If, on one hand, the fact that the immersion context favors the applicants' performance in the oral proficiency Exam, there is also the risk of emerging misunderstanding moments (latent, veiled or explicit). If they are well managed, the discomfort moments in the communication are potentially promoters of the interlocution. The misunderstandings were more common in



the interviews made in Brazil, with more frequent moments of veiled tension. In the misunderstanding moments, there was a certain balance among the latent moments, without explicit traces in the linguistic materialization, and the explicit ones. Curiously, as much the latent moments as the explicit ones happened in the interviews made in Brazil. It indicates that the opportunities to explore the applicants' communicative abilities occur in this context of application.

Finally, one can say that the interviews made in Brazil to the applicants' oral proficiency evaluation at Celpe-Bras are different from the interviews made abroad. In other countries, the interview models are characterized by the evaluators' domination, mainly strategic, and also for avoiding the misunderstanding moments. On the other hand, the applicants' experience with the *languaculture* in the immersion context and, therefore, their intercultural competence development, favor the misunderstandings occurrences which enrich the interlocution and allow the applicants to perform their highest level of proficiency. These facts take into consideration the influence of the application context in the reliability of the Exam and also in the interviewers' behavioral variability. In order to do that, new investigations need to be done in the sense of enlarging the comprehension about the factors that can interfere in the Celpe-Bras applicants' performance.

## REFERENCES

- BROWN, Annie. Interviewer Variability in Oral Proficiency Interviews. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2005. 289p.
- CHARAUDEAU, Patrick. Une analyse sémiolinguistique du discours. *Langages*, Paris, v. 117, p. 96-111, 1995.
- COURA-SOBRINHO, Jerônimo e DELL'ISOLA, Regina Lúcia Peret. O contrato de comunicação na avaliação de proficiência em língua estrangeira. In. JÚDICE, Norimar; DELL'ISOLA, Regina Lúcia Peret. *Português-Língua Estrangeira: novos diálogos*. Niterói: Intertexto, 2009. 192 p.
- GRICE, H. P. *Logic and Conversion*. In: P. COLE; MORGAN, J. (Eds) *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech Acts*. New York, Academic Press. P. 41-58 (1975).
- JÚDICE, Norimar. Gêneros textuais no planejamento e na elaboração de módulos para o ensino de Português do Brasil a estrangeiros. In. JÚDICE, Norimar; DELL'ISOLA, Regina Lúcia Peret. *Português-Língua Estrangeira: novos diálogos*. Niterói: Intertexto, 2009. 192p.
- LEROY, Henrique Rodrigues. *Ensino de língua portuguesa para estrangeiros em contextos de imersão e de não-imersão: percepções interculturais dos aprendizes e do professor*. Dissertação de Mestrado defendida no Programa de Pós-Graduação em Estudos Linguísticos – CEFET-MG. Belo Horizonte, 2010.
- LINELL, Per. The Power of dialogue dynamics. In Markovà, Ivana; Foppa, Klaus (Eds). *The Dynamics of Dialogue*. Nearvester & Sheatshear. P. 147-177, 1990. 238p
- LINELL, Per. *Approaching Dialogue*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998. 331p.
- MARCUSCHI, L. A. Assimetria, Poder e Adequação na Interação Verbal. In: *INVESTIGAÇÕES*, Recife, 5:80-93. 1995
- MCNAMARA, Tim. *Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 140 p.
- MCNAMARA, Tim. *Measuring Second Language Performance*, Longman, London, 1996.

MCNAMARA, Tim F. Interaction in second language performance assessment: whose performance. *Applied Linguistics* 18. 446-466. 1997.