

Nonverbal Delivery in Speaking Assessment

Mingwei Pan

Nonverbal Delivery in Speaking Assessment

From an Argument to a Rating Scale
Formulation and Validation

 Springer

Mingwei Pan
Faculty of English Language and Culture
Guangdong University of Foreign Studies
Guangzhou, Guangdong
China

ISBN 978-981-10-0169-7 ISBN 978-981-10-0170-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-0170-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015955873

Springer Singapore Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

© Springer Science+Business Media Singapore 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer Science+Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd. is part of Springer Science+Business Media
(www.springer.com)

Preface

Language, especially its spoken form, is now universally recognised as being highly complex, multidimensional and variable according to a multitude of social, contextual and affective factors (Bachman 1990). Accordingly, the taxonomy of language ability has been long arguably partitioned into a plethora of dimensions. Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996) propose the framework of communicative language ability (CLA), whose explanatory power and inclusiveness, as compared against the other frameworks of a similar nature concerning communicative competence, can be justified as the fittest model to which speaking assessment can be referred. In particular, deriving from strategic competence, nonverbal delivery, with its interactive and interdependent role with the accompanying verbiage, should be judged as an indispensable component in speaking assessment, especially when its promoting effect on communicativeness is considered. However, notwithstanding well-documented research might be omnipresent with regard to where learners in the Chinese EFL context are poor at, how they perform their nonverbal delivery in speaking assessment seems to be comparatively underexplored (e.g. Liu and Pan 2010a, b; Pan 2011a, b). Against this, there arises a need of examining Chinese EFL learners' oral proficiency in an all-round manner, via which a rating scale incorporating nonverbal delivery is to be formulated and validated.

With the above background as a point of departure, this research project, contextualised in formative assessment, mainly aims at (1) building an empirical argument of embedding nonverbal delivery into speaking assessment; (2) developing a rating scale, with nonverbal delivery included as a dimension, for assessing candidates' communicative competence in group discussion; and (3) cross-validating the proposed rating scale with multi-trait multi-method (MTMM) as well as multimodal discourse analysis (MDA) approaches. These three aims also constitute the three phases of research (henceforth AB phase, RSF phase and RSV phase, respectively) for the present study.

The data of this project are 150 samples of group discussion by Chinese EFL learners at the tertiary level in the context of formative assessment. For

phase-specific purposes, all the samples are accordingly video-recorded, transcribed, processed and analysed. Except for the 30 samples used in the AB phase, the other 120 samples are scored by expert raters, teacher raters and/or peer raters specific to the design of the latter two research phases.

In the AB phase, this study conducts an empirical study to explore the role of nonverbal delivery in Chinese EFL candidates' performance in group discussion, particularly how candidates across a range of proficiency levels can be discriminated with regard to their nonverbal delivery. In a sense, if nonverbal delivery can statistically discriminate the candidates of predetermined proficiency levels, an argument of incorporating nonverbal delivery into speaking assessment can be accordingly advanced. The descriptive, comparative and extrapolative statistics in this phase of study find that although there seems to be a generally low profile of employing nonverbal delivery by the observed candidates in group discussion, they can be statistically discerned vis-à-vis eye contact, gesture and head movement.

Candidates of advanced proficiency are characterised by higher frequency and longer duration of eye contact. Elementary-level candidates, though featuring a high frequency of eye contact occurrences, are inclined to shift their gaze hurriedly and not able to instantiate durable eye contact with the peer discussants. In addition, rather than enhance communication effectiveness, most occurrences of their eye contact, if not all, serve regulatory or adaptive purpose. Although intermediate-level candidates are found to present eye contact with their peers, the degree to which their eye contact can serve attentive purpose would be more impaired compared with the advanced-level counterparts. Candidates' gestures can be mainly distinguished from the perspectives of frequency, diversity and communication-conduciveness. Advanced candidates would be able to perform satisfactorily in all of the above measures, whereas candidates of elementary proficiency level are found to maintain an extremely low profile of resorting to gestures in accompanying their verbal language. Although intermediate-level candidates can be judged to perform well in gesturing frequency and diversity, a number of gesture occurrences are found to serve adaptive or performative purpose, failing to be a remarkable enhancer for intended meaning conveyance. When head movement is probed into, head nod and shake are the main manifestations. It has to be noted that, given the socio- and cultural preponderance, candidates are not significantly different in presenting lower frequency of head shake than head nod, yet whether they perform certain head movements appropriately in the given social context might be referred to as a discriminating point because candidates are found to nod even though certain negative meanings are intended.

Enlightened by the findings in the AB phase, this study draws an interim conclusion that nonverbal delivery, as reflected by eye contact, gesture and head movement, can be one of the indicators for assessing candidates' overall spoken English production and that what has been extracted to discern candidates across various proficiency levels can usefully and effectively inform how a new rating scale can be formulated consequently.

When such a rating scale is developed, two broad dimensions are perceived in the RSF phase: language competence and strategic competence. The former is

formulated by an operationalised questionnaire drawn from the related spectra of CLA model. After an exploratory factor analysis from the Chinese EFL teaching practitioners' and learners' responses to the constituents of language competence in group discussion, this study distils and organically brings forth three assessment dimensions representing language competence: Pronunciation and Intonation (D1), Grammar and Vocabulary (D2) and Discourse Management (D3). The gradable descriptors of these dimensions have been written and further fine-grained by referring to the statements in the questionnaires. Based on the review over the definitions of strategic competence and the empirical argument in the AB phase, Nonverbal Delivery (D4) is perceived as the fourth dimension on the rating scale proposed. In writing the descriptors for this dimension, what can observably and feasibly discriminate candidates regarding their nonverbal delivery in the AB phase is referred to.

A four-dimensional rating scale, therefore, is tentatively formulated, and it epitomises what would supposedly be measured in relation to communicative competence in group discussion, as guided by CLA model. Considering the fact that the expert raters' scoring reveals a high correlation between two assessment dimensions, this rating scale can be initially certified to be valid in its construct, yet it would be subject to certain modifications in wording, disambiguation and the shrinkage of bands from five to four for a higher degree of rater-friendliness.

The rating scale, afterwards, is phased into the RSV phase, where both quantitative and qualitative approaches are employed. When MTMM is deployed following Widaman's (1985) alternative model comparison method, it is found that, considering the interpretability and consistency with previous studies regarding speaking ability taxonomy, a second-order correlated trait/uncorrelated method model not only provides sound goodness-of-fit indices ($\chi^2(28) = 462.796$, $p = 0.818$; CFI = 1.000; NNFI = 1.024; SRMR = 0.015; RMSEA = 0.000; 90 % C.I. = 0.000, 0.060), but also presents divergent validity ($\Delta\chi^2(9) = 403.08$, $p < 0.001$; Δ CFI = 0.472) and discriminant validity ($\Delta\chi^2(17) = 425.68$, $p < 0.001$; Δ CFI = 0.146). The standardised parameter estimates and trait-method correlations reveal no method effect or bias concerning rating methods. Thus, this rating scale, with nonverbal delivery included as a crucial dimension, has been validated in a statistical spectrum.

The rating scale, especially its assessment dimension of Nonverbal Delivery, is further validated on a micro basis with an MDA approach, with a special reference to an integrated analytic framework drawn from Martinec's (2000a, b, 2001, 2004) taxonomy of action and Hood's (2007, 2011) works on nonverbal delivery. Three randomly selected candidates (pseudonyms: Tom, Linda and Diana) representing different proficiency levels are probed into concerning their de facto performance in nonverbal delivery. Tom, with a nonverbal delivery subscore of 1.5, is found to be rather sedentary and passive in the group discussion because only a limited number of captured nonverbal channels with ideational meanings are instantiated. A majority of his nonverbal delivery occurrences retain to be performative, or as a likely regulation to adapt himself to an assessment setting. In that sense, almost no interpersonal or textual meanings can be interpreted from his nonverbal delivery;

thus, Tom is reduced to stagnation where only the mere occurrence of nonverbal delivery employment can be captured. In stark contrast, Diana, as a representative of advanced proficiency level who is assigned a full mark in nonverbal delivery, is found to be articulate in eclectically resorting to a repertoire of nonverbal channels in accompanying her verbiage. At certain points, her nonverbal performance can also instantiate intended meanings in the absence of any synchronised verbal language. Judging from the perspective of metafunctions, she is found to be capable of realising a variety of meaning potentials via nonverbal delivery. Although she seems somewhat aggressive in group discussion, her frequent shift in instantiating different nonverbal channels with discrepant metafunctions would impress other discussants as an active and negotiable speaker as well as an attentive listener. Although Linda, whose subscore of nonverbal delivery is 3, performed quite satisfactorily in terms of formal nonverbal channels, she is found to be slightly passive and hesitant in the group discussion. In particular, when the interpersonal meaning of her gestures is looked into, she seems to be self-contained and strike a certain distancing effect on the peer discussants. The above profile of the three candidates' performance on nonverbal delivery can also be aligned with the descriptors of nonverbal delivery on the rating scale, thus lending weightier support to validate the proposed rating scale.

This research project yields significance in the sense that it organically integrates multimodal discourse analysis, a research method scarcely explored in language assessment, with rating scale validation, thus extending the literature of applying this method to more research of a similar kind. In addition, based on the research findings, how nonverbal delivery can penetrate into EFL learning and teaching is also enlightened and suggested. In particular, this thesis illuminates how EFL textbooks should be multimodally compiled for a heavier load of meaning making and how EFL teaching can be optimised with nonverbal delivery by teaching practitioners incorporated in daily instruction.

References

- Bachman, L.F. 1990. *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L.F., and A.S. Palmer. 1996. *Language testing in practice: designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hood, S.E. 2007. *Gesture and meaning making in face-to-face teaching*. Paper presented at the Semiotic Margins Conference, University of Sydney.
- Hood, S.E. 2011. Body language in face-to-face teaching: a focus on textual and interpersonal meaning. In *Semiotic margins: meanings in multimodalities*, eds. S. Dreyfus, S. Hood, and S. Stenglin, pp. 31–52. London: Continuum.
- Liu, Q., and M. Pan. 2010a. A tentative study on non-verbal communication ability in Chinese college students' oral English. *Computer-assisted Foreign Language Education in China* (2):38–43.
- Liu, Q., and M. Pan. 2010b. Constructing a multimodal spoken English corpus of Chinese Science and Engineering Major Learners. *Modern Educational Technology* (4):69–72.

- Martinec, R. 2000a. Construction of identity in Michael Jackson's "Jam". *Social Semiotics* 10 (3):313–329.
- Martinec, R. 2000b. Types of processes in action. *Semiotica* 130(3):243–268.
- Martinec R. 2001. Interpersonal resources in action. *Semiotica* 135(1):117–145.
- Martinec, R. 2004. Gestures that co-occur with speech as a systematic resource: the realisation of experiential meanings in indexes. *Social Semiotics* 14(2):193–213.
- Pan, M. 2011a. *Reconceptualising and reexamining communicative competence: a multimodal perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Shanghai: Shanghai International Studies University.
- Pan, M. 2011b. Incorporating nonverbal delivery into spoken English assessment: a preliminary study. *English Language Assessment* 6:29–54.
- Widaman, K.F. 1985. Hierarchically tested covariance structure models for multi-trait multi-method data. *Applied Psychological Measurement* 9:1–26.

Acknowledgments

A great many people have helped in the writing of this book. In particular, I feel profoundly indebted to Professor David D. Qian from Hong Kong Polytechnic University, whose resourcefulness, insightfulness and supportiveness have removed my amateurishness in research and nurtured me towards professionalism in the academia of language assessment.

I also need to thank other scholars who so generously offered their time and voices—Professor Frederick G. Davidson from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Professor Alister Cumming from University of Toronto and Professor Zou Shen from Shanghai International Studies University—and all the others whose voices are also recorded here. Their scholarship continues to be a great source of stimulation.

I would also like to thank the Springer editorial team who have been such a pleasure to work with, in particular Ms. Rebecca Zhu and Ms. Yining Zhao.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Research Background	1
1.2	Research Objectives	3
1.3	General Research Questions	4
1.4	Research Significance	5
1.5	Book Layout	6
1.6	Summary	7
	References	7
2	Literature Review	9
2.1	Nonverbal Delivery	9
2.1.1	Eye Contact	11
2.1.2	Gesture	13
2.1.3	Head Movement	15
2.2	Communicative Competence	16
2.2.1	Hymes' Notion of <i>Communicative Competence</i>	17
2.2.2	<i>Communicative Competence</i> Model	19
2.2.3	<i>Communicative Language Ability</i> Model	21
2.2.4	<i>Communicative Language Competence</i> Model	28
2.2.5	An Integrated Review on <i>Communicative Competence</i>	31
2.3	Rating Scale and Formative Assessment	33
2.3.1	Rating Scale	34
2.3.2	Taxonomies of Rating Scales	35
2.3.3	A Critique on the Existing Rating Scales	42
2.3.4	Formative Assessment	43
2.3.5	Properties of the Present Rating Scale	47
2.4	Validity and Validation	47
2.4.1	Validity: A Componential Notion	48
2.4.2	Validity: A Unitary Notion	53
2.4.3	Argument-Based Validation and AUA	57

2.5	Rating Scale Evaluation and Validation	62
2.5.1	Quantitative Validation Methods	63
2.5.2	Qualitative Validation Methods	65
2.6	Summary	85
	References	86
3	Research Design and Methods	109
3.1	Research Procedure	109
3.2	Data.	112
3.2.1	Dataset 1: Questionnaire Responses	112
3.2.2	Dataset 2: Samples of Group Discussion	116
3.2.3	Dataset 3: Rating Results	126
3.3	Methods and Instruments	128
3.3.1	Exploratory Factor Analysis	128
3.3.2	Multi-trait Multi-method.	129
3.4	Summary	130
	References	131
4	Building an Argument for Embedding Nonverbal Delivery into Speaking Assessment.	133
4.1	Research Objectives and Questions	133
4.2	Method.	134
4.3	Research Findings	135
4.3.1	Findings on Eye Contact	135
4.3.2	Discussion on Eye Contact.	142
4.3.3	Findings on Gesture.	143
4.3.4	Discussion on Gesture	150
4.3.5	Findings on Head Movement	152
4.3.6	Discussion on Head Movement.	156
4.4	Summary	157
	References	158
5	Rating Scale Formulation.	159
5.1	Research Objectives and Question	159
5.2	Method.	160
5.2.1	Research Procedure	161
5.2.2	Research Instrument.	162
5.3	Research Findings	165
5.4	Discussion	167
5.5	Rating Scale (1): Language Competence.	169
5.5.1	Pronunciation and Intonation.	169
5.5.2	Grammar and Vocabulary.	171
5.5.3	Discourse Management	173

- 5.6 Rating Scale (2): Strategic Competence 175
 - 5.6.1 Nonverbal Delivery: A Recapture 175
 - 5.6.2 Nonverbal Delivery: Rating Scale 176
 - 5.6.3 Nonverbal Delivery: Band Descriptors 177
- 5.7 Summary 178
- References 179
- 6 Rating Scale Prevalidation and Modification 181**
 - 6.1 Research Objectives and Questions 181
 - 6.2 Research Procedure and Methods. 182
 - 6.2.1 Research Procedure 182
 - 6.2.2 Research Methods 183
 - 6.3 Research Findings 184
 - 6.3.1 Assessment Dimension Correlation 186
 - 6.3.2 Expert Judgment 187
 - 6.4 Discussion 192
 - 6.5 Summary 196
 - References 197
- 7 Rating Scale Validation: An MTMM Approach 199**
 - 7.1 Research Objectives and Questions 199
 - 7.2 Research Procedure and Method 200
 - 7.3 Research Findings 201
 - 7.3.1 CFA MTMM Model Development 203
 - 7.3.2 Alternative CFA MTMM Model Comparisons 207
 - 7.3.3 Individual Parameters for the Final Model 210
 - 7.4 Discussion 212
 - 7.5 Summary 213
 - References 214
- 8 Rating Scale Validation: An MDA Approach 215**
 - 8.1 Research Objectives and Questions 215
 - 8.2 Research Procedure and Method 216
 - 8.3 Research Findings 219
 - 8.3.1 Eye Contact 219
 - 8.3.2 Gesture 230
 - 8.3.3 Head Movement 246
 - 8.4 Discussion 255
 - 8.5 Summary 258
 - References 259
- 9 Conclusion. 261**
 - 9.1 Summary of This Research Project 261
 - 9.2 Research Implications. 263
 - 9.2.1 Nonverbal Delivery in EFL Teaching. 264
 - 9.2.2 Nonverbal Delivery in EFL Textbooks. 265

9.3 Limitations of This Study 266

9.4 Future Directions of Research 267

9.5 Summary 268

References 268

Appendix I: IELTS Speaking Rating Scale (Band 8 and Band 9) 269

**Appendix II: TOEFL Independent Speaking Rating Scale
(Band 3 and B and 4) 271**

Appendix III: TEEP Speaking Rating Scale 273

Appendix IV: BEC Level 1 Rating Scale 277

Appendix V: Questionnaire for Teachers (Trial Version) 283

Appendix VI: Questionnaire for Teachers (Final Version). 285

Appendix VII: Questionnaire for Learners (Trial Version) 289

Appendix VIII: Questionnaire for Learners (Final Version) 291

Appendix IX: Proposed Rating Scale (Tentative Version) 295

**Appendix X: Transcriptions of the Three Selected
Group Discussions. 299**

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACTFL	American Council of the Teaching of Foreign Languages
AERA	American Educational Research Association
AGFI	Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index
AOM	Agent-oriented modelling
APA	American Psychological Association
ASD	Average sample duration
ASLPR	Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings
AUA	Assessment Use Argument
BEC	Business English Certificate
CA	Conversation analysis
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference
CET	College English Test
CET4	College English Test Band 4
CET6	College English Test Band 6
CET-SET	College English Test Spoken English Test
CFA	Confirmatory factor analysis
CQUPT	Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications
CLA	Communicative language ability
CLC	Communicative language competence
CV	Convergent validity
DM	Discourse Management (rating scale dimension 3)
DV	Discriminant validity
EC	Eye contact
EC/c	Eye contact with the camera
EC/p	Eye contact with the peer(s)
EC/n	Eye contact with none
EC/r	Eye contact with the researcher
ECD	Evidence-centred design
ECUST	East China University of Science and Technology
EFA	Exploratory factor analysis
EFL	English as a Foreign Language

ETS	English Testing Service
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
GV	Grammar and Vocabulary (rating scale dimension 2)
HD	Hypothetic–deductive
HIT	Harbin Institute of Technology
IELTS	International English Language Testing System
MDA	Multimodal discourse analysis
AT-MDA	Activity theory multimodal discourse analysis
SF-MDA	Systemic functional multimodal discourse analysis
MDT	Mediated discourse theory
ME	Method effect
MTMM	Multi-trait multi-method
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Programme
NCME	National Council on Measurement in Education
ND	Nonverbal delivery (rating scale dimension 4)
NNFI	Non-normed fit index
NUST	Nanjing University of Science and Technology
OPI	Oral Proficiency Interview
P-rating	Peer-rating
PDT	Performance decision tree
PETS-OT	Oral Test of the Public English Test System
PI	Pronunciation and intonation (rating scale dimension 1)
RMSEA	Root mean square error of approximation
SDA	Situated discourse analysis
SEM	Structural equation modelling
SFL	Systemic functional linguistics
SNU	Shanghai Normal University
SISU	Shanghai International Studies University
SRMR	Standardised root mean square residual
T-rating	Teacher-rating
TEEP	Test of English for Educational Purposes
TEM	Test for English Majors
TEM-OT	Test for English Majors Oral Test
TEM4-OT	Test for English Majors Band 4 Oral Test
TLI	Tucker–Lewis Index
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
USST	University of Shanghai for Science and Technology
VPA	Verbal protocol analysis

List of Figures

Figure 2.1	<i>Communicative Competence</i> Model (Canale and Swain 1980; Canale 1983)	20
Figure 2.2	CLA components in communicative language use (Bachman 1990, p. 85).	22
Figure 2.3	Subcomponents of <i>language competence</i> in the CLA Model (Bachman 1990, p. 87).	23
Figure 2.4	A model of language use (Bachman 1990, p. 103).	26
Figure 2.5	Components of the CLC Model (Council of Europe 2001, pp. 108–129)	29
Figure 2.6	Notional evolution of <i>communicative competence</i>	32
Figure 2.7	A Toulmin model example (Toulmin 2003, p. 97).	58
Figure 2.8	AUA base argument (Bachman 2005, p. 9).	60
Figure 2.9	Structure of example practical argument (Bachman and Palmer 2010, p. 97)	61
Figure 2.10	Content and medium layers in agent-oriented modelling (Gu 2006a)	73
Figure 2.11	Three-stratum MDA framework: an example.	78
Figure 2.12	An integrated taxonomy of nonverbal delivery channels	80
Figure 2.13	The structure of Appraisal Theory (Martin and White 2005, p. 38)	83
Figure 3.1	Flow chart of general research design.	111
Figure 3.2	Seating arrangement and recording set-up.	119
Figure 3.3	An example of header information format.	121
Figure 3.4	An excerpt of transcribed texts	122
Figure 3.5	Transcription interface of <i>ELAN</i>	124
Figure 3.6	A snapshot of <i>ELAN</i> for gesture transcription retrieval	125
Figure 3.7	An <i>EQS</i> example of path diagram with embedded parameter estimates	130
Figure 4.1	Research design for the AB phase	135

Figure 4.2	Intensification between verbal language and eye contact	141
Figure 4.3	Compensation of eye contact for the verbal language	141
Figure 4.4	Meaning-generative gesture concordance lines (<i>HAND</i> as search item)	146
Figure 4.5	Non-meaning-generative gesture concordances (1)	146
Figure 4.6	Non-meaning-generative gesture concordances (2)	148
Figure 4.7	Intensification between verbal language and gesture	149
Figure 4.8	Divergence between verbal language and gesture	149
Figure 4.9	Concordance lines of synchronisation between head nod and verbal language	154
Figure 4.10	Divergence between verbal language and head movement	154
Figure 4.11	Concordance lines of synchronisation between head shake and verbal language	155
Figure 5.1	Research design for RSF-I	161
Figure 5.2	Rating scale (Part I): <i>Pronunciation</i> and <i>Intonation</i>	170
Figure 5.3	Rating scale (Part II): <i>Grammar</i> and <i>Vocabulary</i>	171
Figure 5.4	Rating scale (Part III): <i>Discourse Management</i>	173
Figure 5.5	Rating scale (Part IV): <i>Nonverbal Delivery</i>	177
Figure 6.1	The layout of the revised rating scale	196
Figure 7.1	The baseline CFA MTMM model (Model 1). <i>PI</i> pronunciation and intonation, <i>GV</i> grammar and vocabulary, <i>DM</i> discourse management, <i>ND</i> nonverbal delivery, <i>T-rating</i> teacher-rating, <i>P-rating</i> peer-rating	203
Figure 7.2	No trait/uncorrelated method MTMM model (Model 2)	204
Figure 7.3	Single trait/uncorrelated method MTMM model (Model 3)	205
Figure 7.4	Uncorrelated trait/uncorrelated method MTMM model (Model 4)	206
Figure 7.5	Correlated trait/correlated method MTMM model (Model 5)	207
Figure 7.6	A Second-order factor model (Model 6)	208
Figure 8.1	Directionalities of eye contact	220
Figure 8.2	Distribution of eye contact types	221
Figure 8.3	Presenting eye contact: material	222
Figure 8.4	Presenting eye contact: mental	223
Figure 8.5	Eye contact of representing functions	224
Figure 8.6	Indexical eye contact	225
Figure 8.7	Engagement of eye contact in interpersonal meaning: expansion and contraction	226
Figure 8.8	Interpersonal meaning in eye contact: graduation	227

Figure 8.9	Engagement of eye contact in interpersonal meaning: graduation.	227
Figure 8.10	Textual meaning in eye contact: contact targets	228
Figure 8.11	Directionality of gestures	230
Figure 8.12	Description of hands	231
Figure 8.13	Use of hands.	231
Figure 8.14	Hands level.	232
Figure 8.15	Distribution of gesture types	233
Figure 8.16	Gestural presenting action: material process (Tom).	234
Figure 8.17	Gestural presenting action: behavioural process (Linda).	234
Figure 8.18	Gestural presenting action: mental process (Diana).	236
Figure 8.19	Examples of representing gestures	236
Figure 8.20	Distribution of representing gestures: entities.	237
Figure 8.21	Indexical gestures: importance.	238
Figure 8.22	Indexical gestures: receptivity	238
Figure 8.23	Indexical gestures: relation	239
Figure 8.24	Indexical gestures: defensiveness	239
Figure 8.25	Interpersonal meaning in gestures: attitude	240
Figure 8.26	Attitude of gestures in interpersonal meaning: negative	241
Figure 8.27	Engagement of gestures in interpersonal meaning: expansion and contraction.	242
Figure 8.28	Engagement of gestures in interpersonal meaning: possibility.	242
Figure 8.29	Interpersonal meaning in gestures: graduation	243
Figure 8.30	Graduation in interpersonal meaning	243
Figure 8.31	Textual meaning in gestures: pointing directionalities	244
Figure 8.32	Textual meaning in gestures: pointing specificity.	245
Figure 8.33	Distribution of formal head movements	246
Figure 8.34	Distribution of head movement types	247
Figure 8.35	Ideational meaning in head movement: mental.	248
Figure 8.36	Representing head movement: nodding.	249
Figure 8.37	Indexical head movement: importance	250
Figure 8.38	Indexical head movement: receptivity.	250
Figure 8.39	Interpersonal meaning in head movement: negative attitude.	251
Figure 8.40	Graduation in interpersonal meaning: head movements	252
Figure 8.41	Amplitude of head movement	254
Figure 9.1	An example of seating arrangement in a multimodal class.	265

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Taxonomies of rating scales	35
Table 2.2	Facets of validity (Messick 1988, p. 42)	56
Table 2.3	Ideational meaning of nonverbal delivery channels	82
Table 2.4	Interpersonal meaning of nonverbal delivery	84
Table 2.5	Textual meaning of nonverbal delivery	85
Table 3.1	Distribution of the data sources	114
Table 3.2	Demographic distribution of the questionnaire respondents	115
Table 3.3	Topics for group discussions	118
Table 3.4	Sample distribution across proficiency groups.	120
Table 4.1	Descriptive statistics of eye contact frequency (directionalities)	136
Table 4.2	One-way ANOVA of eye contact frequency across groups.	137
Table 4.3	Descriptive statistics of EC/p cumulative duration.	137
Table 4.4	One-way ANOVA of EC/p cumulative duration across the groups	137
Table 4.5	Descriptive statistics of EC/r cumulative duration	138
Table 4.6	One-way ANOVA of EC/r cumulative duration across the groups	138
Table 4.7	Descriptive statistics of EC/c cumulative duration.	138
Table 4.8	One-way ANOVA of EC/c cumulative duration across the groups	138
Table 4.9	Integration of eye contact versus ASD ratios	139
Table 4.10	Context words in EC/p verbal modality interface	140
Table 4.11	Descriptive statistics of gesture frequency	143
Table 4.12	One-way ANOVA of gesture frequency.	144
Table 4.13	Descriptive statistics of gesture cumulative duration	144
Table 4.14	One-way ANOVA of gesture cumulative duration.	145

Table 4.15	Comparison of gesture-related verbs (1)	146
Table 4.16	Comparison of gesture-related verbs (2)	147
Table 4.17	Phraseologies of gesture-synchronised verbal utterances	148
Table 4.18	Descriptive statistics of head movement frequency	152
Table 4.19	One-way ANOVA of head movement frequency	152
Table 4.20	Descriptive statistics of head movement cumulative duration	153
Table 4.21	One-way ANOVA of head movement duration	153
Table 4.22	Phraseologies of head-movement-synchronised verbal language	155
Table 5.1	Operationalised statements of <i>organisational competence</i>	162
Table 5.2	Operationalised statements of <i>pragmatic competence</i>	163
Table 5.3	KMO and Bartlett's test results	165
Table 5.4	Communalities of items after extraction	165
Table 5.5	Component matrix of factor analysis	166
Table 5.6	Correlation matrix of the extracted components	167
Table 5.7	Band descriptors for <i>Pronunciation and Intonation</i>	170
Table 5.8	Band descriptors for <i>Grammar and Vocabulary</i>	172
Table 5.9	Band descriptors for <i>Discourse Management</i>	174
Table 5.10	Band descriptors for <i>Nonverbal Delivery</i>	177
Table 6.1	Questions for expert consultation	184
Table 6.2	Inter-rater reliability of expert rater scoring	185
Table 6.3	Descriptive statistics of the expert rating results	187
Table 6.4	Correlation of subscores in expert rating	187
Table 6.5	The revised rating scale	194
Table 7.1	Univariate and multivariate statistics for normal distribution	202
Table 7.2	Fit indices for the baseline model (Model 1)	204
Table 7.3	Fit indices for Model 2	204
Table 7.4	Fit indices for Model 3	205
Table 7.5	Fit indices for Model 4	206
Table 7.6	Fit indices for Model 5	207
Table 7.7	Summary of goodness-of-fit statistics	208
Table 7.8	Differential goodness-of-fit indices for MTMM model comparisons	208
Table 7.9	Trait and method loadings (standardised parameter estimates)	211
Table 7.10	Trait and method correlations	211
Table 8.1	The selected candidates' information (1)	216
Table 8.2	The selected candidates' information (2)	217
Table 8.3	Measures of formal nonverbal delivery	218

Table 8.4	Eye contact duration (s)	220
Table 8.5	Eye contact with peers: duration (s)	229
Table 8.6	Wavelength of head movement (frequency per second)	253