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INTRODUCTION

Performance assessment of language minority students is a complex process that requires the application of theoretically defensible procedures that are carefully designed and systematically implemented. Due to the differences between language minority students in the schools and those ESL/EFL students typically studied by language testing researchers, performance assessment in the schools must involve the utilization of procedures that are more authentic, more functional, more descriptive, and more individualized than those typically recommended by second language testing researchers. This paper proposes a descriptive approach to performance assessment that is theoretically defensible and psychometrically sufficient. The characteristics necessary for successful performance assessment, the assessment process, and actual assessment techniques are discussed.

"To me it seems to be generally desirable in instructional contexts to focus tests diagnostically only against a contextual backdrop where attention is directed toward comprehending or producing meaningful sequences of elements in the language" (Oller, 1983:354).

When I first read this passage in a working manuscript of John Oller's 1983 chapter, "A consensus for the eighties?", it had a galvanizing effect on me. This suggestion of a "pragmatic" approach to assessment was the final impetus for me to shift my theoretical stance and my practices involving performance assessment of language minority students in the schools. I recognized that although I was very interested in the excellent work going on in second language testing research, my research involving language minority students in the schools required something different.

While there are a number of purposes for evaluation and assessment of language minority students in the schools (Henning, 1987), those purposes most relevant to my concerns revolved around the student and the student's ability. Using Oller's conceptual writings as guidance, my work has focused on ways to provide a rich description of the individual student's communicative performance and that student's underlying language proficiency. To accomplish these objectives, the assessment procedures designed and implemented for these students have to be more authentic, more functional, more descriptive, and more individualized than those procedures recommended in the second language testing literature. This is due to the differences between the language minority students my research targeted and the ESL/EFL students discussed by many other language testing researchers.

The Differences Between The Populations
The second language testing literature typically focuses on students who are enrolled in ESL or EFL classes. These students are tested to determine placement in second language classrooms or to determine their progress in these classes. With much of this research, the students are usually older than elementary level and/or there is an assumption that these students have normal language-learning abilities. The situation facing the typical language minority student in our public schools -- particularly at the elementary and mid-school level -- is very different.

Unlike the majority of students discussed in the second language testing research literature, the language minority students usually targeted for evaluation in the public schools are located in environments that are not conducive to language diversity. They are frequently the only students in their classrooms who are non-English speakers. Additionally, their teachers are unlikely to have knowledge of their first language or even of the process of second language acquisition. As a result, normal acquisitional phenomena may be viewed as an indication of language-learning problems (Hamayan & Damico, 1991). Within this environment there may even be prejudice toward students who are speakers of other languages (Ogbu, 1978).

Second, unlike older ESL/EFL students, the language minority students are typically compared in their routine academic and conversational performance with the mainstream students rather than other language minority students. In such cases, they naturally perform more poorly since they don't have the same proficiency in English and, because they are not being tested and compared in the ESL or EFL classroom with their peers, their performances are always suspect when they perform below the mainstream expectations (Cummins, 1984; Ortiz & Wilkinson, 1987).

Third, many of these language minority students come from what Ogbu (1978) has termed the "caste minority" group. That is, a group of individuals that may or may not have been born in this country but who are usually regarded by the mainstream and dominant population as being inferior. As a result, these individuals are perceived as being less-intelligent, less-motivated, and less-able to match the mainstream students in a range of activities. These biased perceptions give rise to lowered expectations and frequently result in a disempowerment of these students that is manifested not only in their academic performances but in the ways that they perform and are evaluated during assessment (Cummins, 1986; 1989; Mercer, 1984; Ogbu, 1978).

The fourth difference between these students only heightens the perceptions created by the first three differences: these students are usually individuals that do not have well-documented first language proficiency. Rather than having demonstrated their first language through performances that enabled them to enter into a second language learning context (e.g., an EFL class), many language minority students are kindergartners or first graders who are still acquiring their first language. Consequently, little is known about their native language proficiency. Even when these students are older, they are frequently recent immigrants that have few academic records from their home countries that could document their performances (Cloud, 1991). As a result, there is no assumption of sufficient first language proficiency or normal language-learning capacity. Rather, given the first three conditions, these students may be suspected of poor language proficiency in both their first and second languages. That is, they may be suspected of exhibiting a language-learning impairment.

The final difference is a natural consequence of this suspicion and it makes the situation for many language minority students most desperate: the purposes of assessment are frequently different. Unlike the ESL/EFL students who are assessed for placement in classes to supplement their normal language-learning proficiency with the addition of a second language, language minority students may be assessed to determine remedial placements or placement within special education programs. A harsh reality in our public schools is that many language minority students are mis-diagnosed and enrolled in special education programs or remedial tracks that reduce their academic potential as normal language-learners...
As a result of these differences, performance assessment for many language minority students requires a different focus. Not only must the usual testing purposes be accomplished (O'Malley, 1989), the evaluator must also be able to address specific questions regarding an individual's underlying language proficiency and learning potential. In the remainder of this paper, a descriptive approach with a pragmatic focus that has been effective in the performance assessment of language minority students will be detailed. Although this descriptive approach is aimed at actual evaluation and diagnosis of individual students for selection and placement purposes, it can also be utilized in program evaluation for formative and summative evaluation purposes (Navarrete, Wilde, Nelson, Martinez, & Hargett, 1990).

Descriptive Performance Assessment

To adequately evaluate language minority students in the schools, performance assessment practices must be consistent with the currently accepted theoretical construct of language proficiency (Bachman, 1990a; Oller, 1989; Oller & Damico, 1991) and they must be carefully designed to meet the numerous assessment requirements within the public school environment. The theoretical grounding will help ensure strong validity indices while the design characteristics will aid in the construction of assessment procedures that possess sufficient reliability and educational utility.

The Construct of Language Proficiency

Since 1961 when John B. Carroll raised concerns regarding the artificialness of the "discrete-point" testing methodology, numerous second language researchers have advocated assessment and evaluation procedures that stress the interrelatedness of language as a psychological construct. Calling for the development of "integrative" (Briere, 1973; Oller, 1972; Spolsky, 1973; Upshur, 1973), "pragmatic" (Oller, 1979; 1983), "edumetric" (Cziko, 1983; Hudson & Lynch, 1984), "communicative" (Bachman, 1990a; Canale, 1987; 1988; Olstain & Blum-Kulka, 1985; Shohamy, 1991; Van Lier, 1989; Wesche, 1987) and "informal" (Brindley, 1986; Navarrete, et al., 1990) assessment procedures, these researchers utilized the most defensible constructs of language proficiency available to them to justify their test design. Descriptive performance assessment is also based on the most defensible construct of language proficiency available.

Currently, language proficiency is viewed as a componentially complex psychological construct with a powerful synergistic quality that enables language or communicative ability to act as a coherent and integrated totality when it is manifested in performance (Bachman, 1990b; Carroll, 1983; Oller, 1983; 1989). While there are several models or frameworks that are consistent with this construct (e.g., Bachman, 1990a; Canale & Swain, 1980; Cummins, 1984; Shohamy, 1988), the hierarchical model of language proficiency proposed by Oller (1983; 1989; Oller & Damico, 1991), seems most appropriate and is utilized for the design of this descriptive approach to performance assessment.

In this hierarchical model, language proficiency is recognized as a multicomponental and generative semiotic system that functions in an integrated fashion in most communicative contexts. For practical purposes, language proficiency exist when the individual components (e.g., syntax, morphology, phonology, lexicon) function as an integrated whole. Further, in keeping with the synergistic perspective, this integrated whole is unpredicted by the behavior of the individual components when they are described separately (Fuller, 1982). This is because these separable components are more apparent than real; they are essentially terminological distinctions created in the mind of the linguist or evaluator for ease of discussion and analysis. As noted previously, language is a generative system that
exists for the transmission and coding of meaning and these components are aspects of this process. However, they are not divisible and discrete in their functioning; they function holistically. Consequently, when observable aspects of these components are isolated in artificial tasks during assessment, the tasks are not assessing language or communication but some splinter skill quite different from true language proficiency.

Another facet of this synergistic quality of the hierarchical model is that language proficiency is not viewed as an autonomous semiotic system. It is an integrated system that is intimately influenced by other semiotic and cognitive systems and by extraneous variables. Consequently, performance is highly influenced by factors like memory, perception, culture, motivation, fatigue, experience, anxiety, and learning. For effective and valid assessment, therefore, it is important that language and communicative behavior be assessed in natural contexts.

As discussed elsewhere (Damico, 1991a; Oller & Damico, 1991), reliance on Oller's hierarchical model results in a number of advantages when trying to account for data and concepts reported in the second language literature. Such discussion, however, is beyond the scope of this paper. For our current purposes, this model helps in the design of an effective descriptive performance assessment system.

**The Design Characteristics of Descriptive Assessment**

Based on the hierarchical model regarding the construct of language proficiency and on the specific purposes for performance assessment previously discussed, there are several design characteristics necessary to the development of effective procedures for descriptive performance assessment of language minority students (Damico, 1991a; Damico, Secord & Wiig, 1991). These characteristics concern the authenticity of the data collected and analyzed, the functionality of the behaviors evaluated, a sufficiently rich description of language proficiency to accomplish assessment objectives, the necessity for a focus on each individual being assessed, and the assurance of psychometric veracity (See Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Characteristics Necessary for Descriptive Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity of the Collected Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linguistic Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ecological Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effectiveness of Meaning Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fluency of Meaning Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriateness of Meaning Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Description of Language Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Descriptive Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Explanatory Analysis

Emphasis on the Individual

Assurance of Psychometric Veracity

- Reliability
- Validity
- Educational and Programmatic Utility

Authenticity

The first characteristic necessary to effective descriptive assessment relates directly to the synergistic quality of language proficiency. Since language proficiency is synergistic in terms of its internalized structure, its relationship with other semiotic and cognitive abilities, and its interaction with external variables, it is not possible to assess language and communication apart from the influence of intrinsic cognitive factors and extrinsic contextual features. Consequently, assessment must be structured to observe language during actual communicative activities within real contexts. The language and communication behaviors assessed must be authentic (Damico, 1991a; Oller, 1979; Seliger, 1982; Shohamy & Reves, 1982).

For our purposes, authenticity means that the methods used in assessment focus on data that possess linguistic realism and ecological validity (see Table 1). Linguistic realism requires that assessment procedures treat linguistic behavior as a complex and synergistic phenomenon that exists primarily for the transmission and interpretation of meaning (Crystal, 1987; Oller, 1979; 1983; 1989; Shuy, 1981). The task of assessment, therefore, is to collect data that are meaning-based and integrative rather than data that attempt to fragment language or communication into discrete points or components. Consequently, the data of interest in assessment should be actual utterances and other meaningful "chunks" of linguistic behavior that serve to transmit an idea or intention from a speaker or writer to a listener or reader (Damico, Secord, & Wiig, 1991). In this regard, there should be a focus on the analysis of discourse.

Ecological validity is another aspect of authenticity that must be accommodated during assessment. Numerous researchers have demonstrated that the behaviors manifested during isolated and artificial testing procedures are unlike the linguistic and communicative behaviors noted in real language usage situations (Carroll, 1961; Cummins, 1984; Douglas & Selinker, 1985; Shohamy, 1983). Rather than trying to isolate the assessment process from contextual influence, therefore, assessment should be accomplished in naturalistic settings where true communicative performance is occurring and is influenced by contextual factors. Such practices will enable the evaluator to discern the effects of contextual variables on the student's communicative performance and will enable assessment to remain consistent with the emphasis on relativism in behavior analysis (Kagan, 1967; Oller, 1979).

Oller's (1979) work regarding the development of pragmatic assessment procedures is consistent with this focus on authenticity. By incorporating the work of several other language testing researchers, Oller suggested that language testing adhere to three "pragmatic criteria." The first, that data be meaning-based, required that data be collected from tasks that were motivated by a desire to transmit meaning or achieve comprehensibility during meaning transmission. The second, that data be contextually-embedded, required that the data under scrutiny be produced in a contextually rich environment. The
third criterion, that data be temporally-constrained, required that tasks used to collect the data fit into the normal temporal envelope of communicative interaction. Taken together, these three pragmatic constraints act to ensure linguistic realism and ecological validity.

**Functionality**

The second characteristic necessary for effective descriptive assessment is concerned with how performance is evaluated or, put in more operational terms, what should be measured. In the second language testing literature, there have been a number of attempts to identify the various components of language proficiency and then design tools or procedures to measure these components (Bachman, 1990a; Bachman & Palmer, 1982; Canale, 1983; 1987; Harley, Cummins, Swain, & Allen, 1990; Swain, 1985). This research has been controversial and no clear consensus has emerged regarding what components to measure and how to measure them. As discussed by Oller (1979; 1989; Oller & Damico, 1991), this is probably due to the powerful integrative trait manifested by language proficiency during performance. Division into components should not occur during data collection or preliminary analysis. Such strategies strip the synergy inherent in language behavior. Rather, there should be an initial focus on language proficiency and communicative performance from a functional perspective. (Attention to more traditional linguistic componential perspectives should be reserved for the stage referred to later as "explanatory analysis").

The focus on functionality suggests that instead of testing a student's knowledge of discrete points of superficial language structure -- or even the student's ability to effectively demonstrate separate componential knowledge of strategic or grammatical competence -- in order to indicate potential language or communicative difficulty, the evaluator asks the question, "How successful is this student as a communicator"? This question of success is based on how well the student functions on three criteria: the effectiveness of meaning transmission, the fluency of meaning transmission, and the appropriateness of meaning transmission (see Table 1).

**The Effectiveness of Meaning Transmission.** This criterion relates to the primary goal of communication: the formulation, comprehension, and transmission of meaning. Since language is a semiotic system that exists to achieve an understanding of what occurs in the world and since some aspect of this understanding is formulated into communication to relate that understanding to others, how well the individual handles this message (either as a speaker or hearer) is directly relevant to that person's success. The key element, of course, is the message and achieving comprehensibility so that the message is transmitted. Using a functional focus, if the meaning is transmitted -- regardless of how that transmission is achieved -- then communication is accomplished and the individual is effective.

**The Fluency of Meaning Transmission.** From a functional performance perspective, however, success is more than just getting the meaning across. As stressed by Carroll (1961), the fluency of the interaction must also be considered since successful communicators must be able to formulate, transmit, or comprehend the message within the temporal constraints of communicative interaction. If a student's communicative attempt is delayed, then the flow of communication is affected and this will result in a devaluation of the individual's rating as a communicator. Additionally, a successful communicator can also repair an initial interaction if meaning transmission is not successful. As a speaker, can the student reformulate the message so that it is better comprehended by others? As a listener, can the student successfully ask for clarification or effectively utilize contextual cues if the initial message is incomprehensible? This ability to seek clarification is another facet of the fluency of meaning transmission.

**The Appropriateness of Meaning Transmission.** The third criterion for success as a functional communicator is to accomplish the first two objectives in a manner appropriate to the contextual
constraints in which the student is immersed at the time of the interaction. Realistically, language and communication are significantly influenced by the expectations that members of a linguistic community share regarding their communicative norms. The attitudes that individuals form and the opportunities afforded to individuals in that community are frequently dependent on those expectations. When addressing the needs of language minority students, this criterion is very important. On numerous occasions, language minority students are poorly evaluated not because of an inability to transmit meaning, but to do so in a culturally appropriate manner (Cummins, 1984; Hamayan & Damico, 1991; Iglesias, 1985).

These three criteria enable the descriptive assessment process to focus on the functional dimension of communicative ability in a manner that transcends the need to divide language proficiency into a variety of skills, modules or components at the time of assessment. Consequently, the synergistic quality of language so important within communicative settings is preserved. Additionally, this initial focus on functionality enables the evaluator to answer real and pragmatic questions about the minority language student's ability to function in the second (and the first) language context as a successful communicator. Actual techniques that can be utilized to accomplish this functional focus will be discussed below.

Descriptiveness

The third essential characteristic of descriptive assessment involves the purposes of evaluation and the types of analyses performed to achieve these purposes. As previously discussed, many language minority students are not only assessed for selection and placement in bilingual programs or for limited proficiency instruction in English. Many of these students are also assessed to determine their underlying language-learning proficiency for placement in special education or remedial programs. It is important, therefore, that descriptive assessment focus on two objectives. First, in order to meet the needs of regular bilingual education programs, governmental funding requirements, and legal regulations (O'Malley, 1989), assessment should provide a detailed description of the individual's communicative performance in English. Second, this descriptive information must then be used to comment on the student's underlying language proficiency. That is, the first objective of descriptive assessment is to determine how successful the student is as a communicator in English and then, if the student is not successful, to determine the reasons for this lack of success. To accomplish these objectives, the descriptive process must utilize a bi-level analysis paradigm that incorporates an initial descriptive analysis of communicative performance with a detailed explanatory analysis of language proficiency (Damico, 1991a) (see Table 1).

Descriptive Analysis. At this descriptive level of analysis, the evaluator typically uses actual descriptive assessment procedures to observe the student's communicative English performance in the contexts and modalities of interest and to determine whether or not the student is communicatively successful. This determination is made by asking the question presented in the previous section on functionality, "How successful a communicator is the student in the context and modality of interest”? This question is answered by one of two strategies. In the first strategy, the descriptive procedure is designed to focus directly on observable behaviors that have been found to be necessary for successful communication in the targeted context and modality. These behaviors are usually selected while designing the descriptive assessment tool through the application of criterion-based, communication-based, or curriculum-based procedures (Cziko, 1983; Hudson & Lynch, 1984; Marston & Magnusson, 1987; Nelson, 1989; Tucker, 1985).

The second strategy used to answer the functionality question at the descriptive level of analysis focuses on potential problematic behaviors. In this strategy, descriptive procedures are designed to detect behaviors that are believed to be valid indices of communicative difficulty. Specific behaviors are identified as indicating when a student is experiencing problems during the communicative interaction.
and these behaviors are targeted for coding during assessment (Damico, Oller & Storey, 1983; Goodman & Goodman, 1977; Mattes, 1985).

Regardless of the strategy used, this descriptive level of analysis provides a determination of the student's success as a communicator in the targeted English contexts. It is at this level that the primary assessment objectives discussed by Henning (1987) and O'Malley (1989) for limited English proficient (LEP) student identification, placement, and program evaluation are accomplished. By using the actual descriptive analysis procedures, data are provided to document the student's strengths and weaknesses in English, the student's overall success as an English language user, and even the student's progress over time (when pre/post analyses are conducted). Many of the descriptive analysis procedures provide objective scores to rank individual students for placement or reclassification purposes or, if such scores are not available, scoring adaptations like those suggested by Navarrete et al. (1990) may be applied.

It should be noted that during this descriptive level of analysis, communicative performance should be analyzed in different contexts and in different modalities to ensure a rich and wide-ranging coverage of the minority student's success in various language usage manifestations. As discussed by Cummins (1984), there are various dimensions of language proficiency that interact to produce performance distinctions in bilingual (and monolingual) language users (e.g., the CALP and BICS distinction). Similar recommendations for the assessment of language performance in different modalities and contexts have been advocated by others (Canale, 1983; Damico, 1991a; Luria, 1981; Oller, 1979). A discussion of several descriptive analysis procedures is provided below.

If there are no difficulties noted after a descriptive analysis is performed or if there are no attempts to refer the language minority student for further (special education or remedial) testing, then the student is considered for appropriate placement in a bilingual program, a program for English instruction, or in the mainstream classroom. These placements are dependent on how successful the student is as an English language user in the contexts and modalities of interest. This decision meets the general student assessment purposes discussed by Henning (1987) and O'Malley (1989). If there are difficulties indicated at this level of analysis and if there are concerns regarding the student's language-learning proficiency, then the second level of analysis is necessary.

**Explanatory Analysis.** This analysis seeks to determine the causal factors for the communicative difficulties noted in the descriptive analysis. At this analytic level, the examiner notes the absence of the indices for success (the first strategy above) or the presence of the problematic behaviors (the second strategy above) and seeks to determine why these behaviors occurred.

The explanatory level of analysis typically does not involve additional data collection or assessment procedures. Rather, this level involves a deeper interpretation of the data collected at the descriptive level. The evaluator attempts to explain what aspects of the context, the student's social/cultural experience, or the individual's cognitive abilities or linguistic proficiency can account for the described difficulties. At this level, the evaluator attempts to determine the adequacy of the student's underlying language proficiency or comment on the effectiveness of the student's deeper semiotic capacities (see Oller & Damico, 1991). To accomplish this analysis, a number of strategies can be utilized (Damico, 1991a; Goodman & Goodman, 1977). One effective way to structure this analysis for language minority students is with a set of questions that may be systematically applied to explanatory analysis. A modification of Damico's list (1991a) will be discussed below.

The descriptiveness characteristic enables this performance assessment approach to accomplish the various purposes of assessment while maintaining a functional perspective with authentic language and communicative data. In order to fully adhere to each of these three design characteristics, however, the fourth characteristic of descriptive performance assessment is required. That is, the assessment must be
individualized.

**Individualized Assessment**

Descriptive performance assessment requires individualized assessment. Unlike a number of the discrete point language tests and even some of the more integrative testing procedures, the descriptive process emphasizes individualized observation and analysis. This characteristic is particularly important when determining the need for an explanatory analysis. While the description of the student's communicative performance from an authentic and functional perspective is difficult enough, the analysis of the student's underlying language proficiency based on results of the descriptive analysis procedures is virtually impossible unless conducted on one student at a time. In order to richly describe the complex phenomenon of language proficiency for the purposes previously discussed, time and effort are required. Given the importance of the placement decisions, however, such individualization should not seem excessive. Quality language education of language minority students should require nothing less.

**Psychometric Veracity**

The final essential characteristic of descriptive performance assessment is psychometric veracity. Similar to a general definition of construct validity (Cronbach, 1971; Messick, 1980), this characteristic reflects the interaction of the other four characteristics once they are carefully implemented. This concept embraces the idea that the tests and procedures used during assessment must be genuine and effective measures of language proficiency and communicative performance. Consequently, veracity requires strong psychometric qualities of reliability, validity, and educational or programmatic utility. In order to exhibit veracity, the assessment procedures must focus on authentic data and must target specific behaviors to use as indices of language proficiency and communicative performance. The evaluator must know what behaviors indicate successful or unsuccessful communication and these behaviors must be able to reflect on the student's underlying language proficiency. The identification of the indices during test development involves several steps (see Table 2).

| Table 2 |
| The Steps Required for Determination of Valid Behavioral Indices |

**Step 1.** Select the targeted contexts and modalities.

**Step 2.** Identify functional behaviors required for meaning transmission.

- Strategy One: Identify behaviors that are indices of successful communicative performance.
- Strategy Two: Identify behaviors that are indices of communicative difficulty.

**Step 3.** Determine the Reliability of the selected behaviors.

- Temporal reliability
- Interexaminer reliability

**Step 4.** Determine the Validity of the selected behaviors.

**Step 5.** Determine the Educational and Programmatic Utility of the selected behaviors and the assessment procedure.
First, the test designer or the evaluator must determine the actual contexts and communicative modalities that will be targeted by the descriptive procedure. This is essential since the data targeted and the student's manifestations of language and communicative ability will differ across contexts and modalities. For example, the language needed to be successful during a writing lesson in the classroom is different from the language needed for a conversation at a friend's home after school. The proficiency required and the communicative behaviors manifested are quite different (Cummins, 1984). To identify valid indices, therefore, the context and modality of interest must be selected.

Once the target manifestations are selected, then behaviors that have a functional role in the transmission of meaning in that manifestation should be identified. This identification is the second step and the two strategies that may be used to accomplish it have been previously discussed. The third step involves the psychometric concept of reliability. Reliability is necessary to ensure that the specific behaviors used as indices for language proficiency are consistent and stable enough in their occurrence (temporally reliable) to be considered as true indices of a stable underlying language proficiency. Additionally, these behaviors must also be easy to observe and code by individuals trained to use the procedures. If different evaluators cannot easily code these behaviors and agree on their occurrences (interexaminer reliability), then the potential of these behaviors as effective indices is greatly diminished. If these behaviors are demonstrably reliable over time and across examiners, however, then the next step can be taken with these behaviors.

A determination of the validity of these behaviors as indices is the next step. Simply put, how well do these reliable behaviors actually reflect on the language minority student's underlying language proficiency? If a descriptive procedure using these behaviors enables an examiner to make accurate predictions about an individual's language-based performance over time and outside of the assessment situation, then validity is demonstrated and the descriptive procedure is useful (Bachman, 1990a; Cronbach, 1971; Oller, 1979). Without some indication of a procedure's validity and an index's role in that validity, however, the effectiveness of the procedure is reduced.

The last step in establishing psychometric veracity involves determining the educational or programmatic utility of the procedures. Regardless of how reliable and valid a procedure (and its indices) might be, it must be relatively easy to learn and apply in the educational setting or instructional program and it must reflect the instructional goals and objectives of the setting or program. If a procedure requires an inordinate amount of time or equipment to implement or if the data obtained is inconsequential to the setting or program, then it is unlikely that the procedure will be embraced by any evaluator constrained for time. Descriptive performance assessment procedures must reflect the realities and limitations of the school systems that employ the evaluators.

These five characteristics of descriptive performance assessment act to ensure that the processes and procedures used to evaluate language minority students are effective. To implement performance assessment, however, it is not enough to merely describe the characteristics of the descriptive approach. A description of the actual process of assessment and some of the procedures useful for performance assessment is also necessary.

The Descriptive Assessment Process

As previously discussed, an evaluator using the descriptive approach conducts the assessment process differently from other assessment approaches. Remaining consistent with the authenticity characteristic, communication is assessed as it functions holistically in its various manifestations and within naturalistic contexts. The process for a complete assessment involves four sequential stages. First, the evaluator conducts a descriptive analysis. Based on the findings of this analysis, the second stage involves making the first set of diagnostic decisions. If assessment is still warranted after this stage, the
next stage of assessment involves the utilization of an explanatory analysis. Finally, based on the results of this deeper level of analysis, the second set of diagnostic decisions is made. Figure 1 provides a flowchart description of this descriptive assessment process.

**Figure 1**  
A Flowchart Description of the Descriptive Performance Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Analysis</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>Diagnostic Decision 1</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>Explanatory Analysis</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>Diagnostic Decision 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select:</td>
<td>Determine:</td>
<td>Select:</td>
<td>Determine:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Modalities</td>
<td>--Strengths</td>
<td>--Purpose</td>
<td>--Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Contexts</td>
<td>--Weaknesses</td>
<td>--Extrinsic</td>
<td>--Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Procedures</td>
<td>--Needs</td>
<td>--Intrinsic</td>
<td>--Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Implement</td>
<td>--Implement</td>
<td>--Implement</td>
<td>--Implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When conducting a **descriptive analysis**, the evaluator asks the question, "In the present domain of interest, how successful is this student as a communicator?" To conduct this stage of the process, the evaluator determines the modalities of language use and the observational contexts that should be assessed. The evaluator then chooses communicative assessment procedures that will allow the description of communication as its functions in whatever modalities and contexts are appropriate to the objectives of the program or setting. These tend to vary according to the individual programs. For example, Damico (1991a) has specified three manifestations of language use that are important to his assessment objectives. In other situations, however, only one manifestation of language use might be important. Regardless of whether several modalities (e.g., writing, speaking, reading) or several contexts (e.g., conversation with friends, job interview, classroom discussion group, lesson recitation) are evaluated, assessment procedures that describe authentic communication from a functional perspective are required for evaluation. These assessment procedures should typically focus on all aspects of communicative effectiveness (language and speech) together and allow for a determination of communicative success based on the three criteria of effectiveness, fluency, and appropriateness of meaning transmission.

Once the stage of descriptive analysis is completed, the evaluator makes the **first** set of **diagnostic decisions**. At this time, the evaluator uses the data collected during the previous stage to determine whether or not there are any communicative difficulties in the targeted language manifestations. If no difficulties are noted, then the assessment process is completed and the evaluator can describe the individual's strengths as evidence of communicative success and strong language proficiency. If difficulties are noted in one or more of the language manifestations, however, then the evaluator has several tasks.

First, from a functional perspective, the evaluator describes the student's individual strengths and weaknesses. This information will assist in identification and placement into supportive educational programs. Next, the evaluator determines the actual needs of the student at this stage of the assessment process. If there is evidence of strong first language ability or if there is no desire to refer the student on for further (special education) assessment, then the actual placement decisions (e.g., bilingual classroom, ESL instruction) can be made for this student and the evaluation is completed. However, if there is no
evidence of normal first language ability, if there are indications of potential language-learning difficulties at the deeper level of language proficiency or semiotic capacity, or if others in the educational settings request further evaluation, then the next stage of the descriptive assessment process occurs.

This stage of the descriptive process involves the second level of analysis described under the bi-level analysis paradigm mentioned previously -- explanatory analysis. At this stage of assessment, the evaluator examines the difficulties noted during the descriptive analysis stage and attempts to determine why the individual had these particular difficulties in the manifestations under scrutiny. Initially, extraneous variables are examined as potential explanations for these problematic behaviors (e.g., second language acquisition phenomena, contextual complexity, listener reactions, significant cultural differences). If no extraneous explanatory factors are noted, then a more systematic analysis of the actual linguistic data is initiated. Based on this analysis, the evaluator determines the underlying causes of the problematic behaviors identified during the descriptive analysis stage and can determine if a true intrinsic language-learning disorder exists.

Finally, at the last stage of the process, the second set of diagnostic decisions are made. Based on the results of the explanatory analysis and the opportunities available to the student, appropriate placement recommendations are made. If the explanatory analysis demonstrates difficulties due to extraneous variables and not due to the student's underlying language proficiency or deeper semiotic capacity, then the recommendations will be for various types of support systems or programs that will benefit the student's acquisition of English and academic material within regular educational formats. A number of authors have discussed various pedagogical strategies along these lines (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987; Cochran, 1989; Crandall, Spanos, Christian, Simich-Dudgeon, & Willetts, 1988; Fradd, 1987; Hamayan & Perlman, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). If the difficulties appear to be due to more intrinsic cognitive, linguistic, or semiotic factors, then appropriate placement and remediation in special education may be warranted (Cummins, 1984; Damico & Nye, 1990; Willig & Ortiz, 1991).

In summary, the assessment process utilizes authentic and functional procedures to analyze an individual's communication in a descriptive and pragmatic fashion through the application of a four stage process centering around a bi-level analysis paradigm. This process is consistent with the hierarchical and synergistic model of language proficiency proposed by Oller and may be used to fulfill the purposes of assessment for language minority students.

The Descriptive Analysis Procedures

To remain consistent with the descriptive assessment approach, the assessment tools and procedures utilized to describe language and communication (i.e., procedures implemented during the descriptive analysis stage), must be able to analyze language use in authentic situations from a functional perspective. Over the past 15 years, a number of procedures and tools have been developed that fit these requirements. In general, these procedures can be conveniently organized according to their different data collection formats and the primary behavioral manifestations that these procedures target. In keeping with Cummins (1984), Canale (1984), and Damico (1991a), these tools and procedures will be organized into four major data collection formats (probes, behavioral sampling, rating scales and protocols, and direct and on-line observation) and two general language usage manifestations (conversational and academic). While these divisions are too general to provide a rigorous classification system, they will permit sufficient organization for this discussion.

Probe Procedures
The probe format is the most widely used of the four data collection strategies. It has been used in the design of norm-referenced tests and many integrative and descriptive procedures. There are numerous variations within this category. For example, there are picture elicitation probes, question and answer probes, elicited imitation probes, interactive computer probes, direct translation probes, and role-playing activities to name a few. Probes are structured tasks or activities that elicit a specific language behavior from the individual being assessed. With probes, the evaluator may anticipate the type of response that will be elicited from the student. This is because the task performed, whether discrete-point, integrative, or pragmatic, is carefully designed to elicit a specific behavior.

For conversational purposes, there are a number of probe activities that have been suggested. Brinton and Fujiki (1991), for example, have structured an assessment activity used to probe a student's ability to revise utterances, maintain topics, and ask relevant questions during conversation. Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985) have suggested several elicitation techniques that focus on language usage, while Deyes (1984) and Jonz (1987) have adapted cloze procedures for more discourse or conversational assessment. In working with adolescents, Brown, Anderson, Shillicock & Yule (1984) have suggested a number of task-based activities that tap the student's ability to use transactional language during interactions.

Academically, probes activities are widely used. The current trend toward criterion-referenced assessment in second language testing (Cloud, 1991; Cziko, 1983; Hudson & Lynch, 1984) and some applications of curriculum-based assessment (Marston & Magnusson, 1987; Tucker, 1985) are dependent on probe activities. Simon (1989) has developed a comprehensive analysis of classroom communicative abilities needed to transition from elementary to secondary school that employs several probe strategies in addition to other formats. Her work has been found to be quite successful in commenting on the success of language minority students to function in the mainstream classroom environment. When reviewed, all achievement tests and many locally-constructed measures of the academic performance of language minority students are discovered to be designed as probes (Brindley, 1986; Cloud, 1991; O'Malley, 1989) and for academic purposes, this format is very effective.

A final academic probe procedure that warrants discussion is the cloze test. As discussed by Oller (1979), and others (Hamayan, Kwait, & Perlman, 1985; Jonz, 1987) cloze procedures accurately reflect on the student's underlying language proficiency and are usually highly correlated with academic performance in English (Oller & Perkins, 1978; 1980). For example, Laesch and van Kleck (1987) demonstrated significant correlations between their cloze procedure and the California Test of Basic Skills. The cloze procedure was effective in measuring the language needed in academic tasks and it discriminated between subjects with varying degrees of proficiency.

**Behavioral Sampling**

The second assessment format involves behavioral sampling procedures. Within this popular strategy, the student being assessed completes some required task and this performance is audio-recorded (or video-recorded) and transcribed or the performance is collected in some other way. After data collection, the behavioral sample is analyzed. This format has been extensively applied over the past 25 years and there are numerous procedures available for both conversational assessment and for evaluation of many academic activities.

Conversationally, a number of functional language sampling procedures are available. Loban (1976) emphasizes dimensions of clarity of expression, fluency, command of lexical expression, and comprehension. Blank and Franklin (1980) have developed an appropriateness scale to analyze spontaneous language samples and Adams and Bishop (1990) focus on exchange structures, clarity, and cohesion. The recent work of both Van Lier (1989) and Wesche (1990) show potential as functional descriptive assessment procedures for language minority students. Emphasizing the role of
organizational structure, predictability, and speaker/listener rights, these researchers are attempting to focus on discourse skills that are most relevant to second language users in their second languages.

One language sample procedure that is effective in determining conversational success is Clinical Discourse Analysis (Damico, 1985a). This procedure employs a set of 17 problematic behaviors and the theoretical framework of H.P. Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) to provide a descriptive evaluation that focuses specifically on the effectiveness, fluency, and appropriateness criteria mentioned previously. Listed below are the 17 targeted behaviors as classified within the Gricean framework:

Quantity Category

- Failure to provide significant information to the listener
- Using nonspecific vocabulary
- Informational redundancy
- Need for repetition

Quality Category

- Message inaccuracy

Relation Category

- Poor topic maintenance
- Inappropriate response
- Failure to ask relevant questions
- Situational inappropriateness
- Inappropriate speech style

Manner Category

- Linguistic non-fluency
- Revision behaviors
- Delays before responding
- Failure to structure discourse
- Turn-taking difficulty
- Gaze inefficiency
- Inappropriate intonational contour

Research has indicated that these behaviors are effective in identifying students with communicative difficulty (Damico, 1985b; 1991a; Damico & Oller, 1980; Damico, Oller, & Storey; 1984).

There are a number of effective academically-related behavior sampling procedures available for performance assessment. For example, there are many excellent narrative analyses that can be used for assessment purposes. Applebee (1978) provides a narrative organizational analysis based on developmental stages involving the production of coherent text that can be adapted for assessment while Westby (1991; Westby, Van Dongen & Maggart, 1989), Garnett (1986), Hedberg and Stoel-Gammon (1986), and Roth (1986) have demonstrated the effectiveness of several complex story grammar and narrative analyses for evaluative purposes. While it is realized that narrative development and organization are highly culturally-dependent (Heath, 1986), these behavioral analyses provide important data regarding English task expectations.
Curriculum-based assessment from a subject-based perspective (Deno, 1985; Marston & Magnusson, 1987; Tucker, 1985) and reading miscue analysis (Goodman & Goodman, 1977) frequently involve behavioral sampling in order to accomplish the actual goals of the assessment. Recently, both types of procedures have been advocated as promising informal assessments in bilingual education (Navarrete et al., 1990). Two other promising approaches along these lines are Nelson's "Curriculum-based language assessment" (1989; 1991) and Creaghead's "Classroom Script Analysis" (1991). Both of these procedures use behavior analysis to determine whether or not the student has the communicative strategies (Nelson) or the interactive scripts (Creaghead) essential to effective functioning in a classroom setting.

Finally, when targeting academically-related assessment, Portfolio Assessment must be considered. This behavioral sampling procedure is currently receiving much attention in education. Arising for evaluation purposes from the literacy and language arts fields (Flood & Lapp, 1989; Jongsma, 1989; Mathews, 1990; Valencia, 1990; Wolf, 1989), this procedure is somewhat different from many behavioral sampling procedures in that a primary "evaluation" of the artifacts placed in the student's portfolio involves generalized comparisons rather than detailed analyses. Still, this procedure is very effective in documenting the student's current performance level and his/her progress over time. If portfolio assessment is used with care and if specific evaluative procedures and processes are meshed with the current concept, then this procedure should be very effective in the academic evaluation of language minority students (Moya & O'Malley, 1990).

Rating Scales and Protocols

The third format for data collection involves rating scales and protocols. This format enables the examiner to observe the student as a communicator in the context of interest and then rate or describe that student according to a set of reliable and valid indices of communication. After the observation, the examiner completes a rating scale or protocol when the student being assessed is no longer present. Two frequent variations of this format are checklists and interview questions. Typically, procedures within this format have some sort of evaluation (e.g., numerical scale, age range, semantic differential, forced judgment of appropriate/inappropriate) for each behavior on the scale or protocol.

For conversational purposes, a number of rating scales have been developed. Damico and Oller (1985) created a functional language screening instrument, Spotting Language Problems, that is an effective rating for screening school-age individuals for communication difficulties, while Mattes (1985; Mattes & Omark, 1984) and Cheng (1987) have designed several protocols involving both verbal and nonverbal behaviors which are helpful in the descriptive assessment of Spanish and Asian LEP students. A widely known descriptive protocol, the Pragmatic Protocol (Prutting and Kirchner, 1983; 1987), focuses on a large number of language usage behaviors and requires that the evaluator rate the student's ability to use these behaviors appropriately or inappropriately. Of course, a number of the well-established evaluation procedures in ESL and EFL make use of rating scales as a basis for their evaluations (e.g., ACTFL and FSI oral interview) and more are being developed. While modifications may make these procedures more relevant, many of these procedures are currently not appropriate to the needs of the students targeted in this paper.

Academically, there are rating scales, protocols, checklists, and interview questionnaires that focus on the functional needs of the student in the classroom. For example, Ortiz (1988) has offered a questionnaire consisting of 25 questions that revolve around the evaluation of the student's educational context while Cloud (1991) has provided several questionnaires to describe home background from an academic perspective, classroom environment, and previous educational experience. In terms of checklists, O'Malley (1989) provides an "Interpersonal and Academic Skills Checklist" that focuses on 30 skills important for cognitive academic language proficiency and a "Literacy Development
“Checklist” to guide the evaluator in functional assessment of language minority students. In related applied linguistic fields, Nelson (1985), Creaghead and Tattershall (1985), and Larson and McKinley (1987) have also provided checklists that may be beneficial while the work of Archer and Edward (1982) and Bassett, Whittington and Staton–Spicer (1978) can be adapted for assessment within this format. Although this work was not developed originally for language minority students, these tools have been successful for our assessment purposes.

**Direct and On-line Observation**

The final division of assessment procedures employs direct and on-line observation. Although effective applications of this data collection approach are still relatively rare in language assessment, the approach holds promise. This format involves the direct observation of a student's communicative interaction and the real-time and immediate coding of the communicative behaviors observed. Consequently, these procedures are able to provide detailed and objective data on the speaker’s performance rather than just a final judgment of sufficient/insufficient or appropriate/inappropriate communicative performance.

Two observational systems will be detailed. Both are applicable for conversational and academic evaluation. The first, Social Interactive Coding System (SICS), was designed by Rice, Sell, and Hadley (1990) to describe the speaker’s verbal interactive status in conjunction with the setting, the conversational partner, and the activities in which the speaker is engaged. This tool requires a 20-minute observational period during which the evaluator observes and codes free play for 5 minutes and then takes a 5 minute break to fill in any codes which might have been missed. This "5 minutes on, 5 minutes off" format is followed for four consecutive cycles until the 20 minutes of direct observation is accomplished. This procedure was designed for use in a bilingual preschool setting but can be modified for other age groups.

The second direct observational procedure is Systematic Observation of Communicative Interaction (SOCI) (Damico, 1985b; 1991b). This tool was designed to employ a balanced set of low inference and high inference items to achieve a reliable coding of illocutionary acts, verbal and nonverbal problematic behaviors, and a determination of the appropriateness of the student's communicative interaction. Once trained to identify and code the behaviors, the evaluator observes the student for 12 minutes and codes the interactions observed each 10 seconds. This yields 72 coded cells of data per observation. The evaluator observes the student from four to seven times and this allows for sufficient data to make representative descriptions of behavior. This tool has very high reliability and validity indices (Damico, 1985b).

**The Explanatory Analysis Procedure**

As previously discussed, explanatory analysis involves a deeper analysis of the data collected during the descriptive analysis stage to find how/why the student exhibits the communicative difficulties documented. To answer this question, the evaluator must determine whether the problematic behaviors are due to factors extrinsic to the student or due to intrinsic difficulties at the student's deeper level of language proficiency or semiotic capacity. The true language-learning disabled student will have intrinsic explanatory factors.

While there are several ways to conduct explanatory analysis, this paper will briefly discuss the procedure reported by Damico (1991a). According to this procedure, analysis proceeds with the evaluator asking a series of questions that enable a systematic review of those variables that might have contributed to the communicative difficulties in English. Since detailed discussion is reported elsewhere (Damico, 1991a), only the questions will be provided.
In analyzing the communicative difficulties revealed during descriptive analysis, the evaluator should apply two general sets of questions. First, regarding **extrinsic explanatory factors**:

1. Are there any overt variables that immediately explain the communicative difficulties in English? Among the potential considerations:
   - Are the documented problematic behaviors occurring at a frequency level that would be considered within normal limits or in random variation?
   - Were there any procedural mistakes in the descriptive analysis phase which accounts for the problematic behaviors?
   - Is there an indication of extreme test anxiety during the observational assessment in one context but not in subsequent ones?
   - Is there significant performance inconsistency between different contexts within the targeted manifestation?
   - Is there significant performance inconsistency between different input or output modalities?

2. Is there evidence that the problematic behaviors noted in the second language can be explained according to normal second language acquisition or dialectal phenomena?

3. Is there any evidence that the problematic behaviors noted in the second language can be explained according to cross-cultural interference or related cultural phenomena?

4. Are the communicative difficulties due to a documented lack of proficiency only in the second language but not in the first?
   - Is there documented evidence of normal first language proficiency?
   - Has the student received sufficient exposure to the second language to predict better current performance?
   - Does the student exhibit the same types of problematic behaviors in the first language as in the second?

5. Is there any evidence that the problematic behaviors noted in the second language can be explained according to any bias effect that was in operation before, during, or after the assessment?
   - Is the student in a subtractive bilingual environment?
   - Is the student a member of a disempowered community?
   - Are negative or lowered expectations for this student held by the student, the student’s family, or the educational staff?
   - Were specific indications of bias evident in the referral, administrative, scoring, or interpretative phases of the evaluation?

If there are no extrinsic explanations for the data obtained during the descriptive analysis phase of the assessment process, then there must be a greater suspicion that the targeted student does have an intrinsic impairment. If this is the case, then the student should exhibit some underlying linguistic systematicity in both languages that can account for the majority of the behaviors noted in the descriptive analysis stage. If the communicative difficulty cannot be accounted for by asking the first five questions, then the final question aimed at **intrinsic explanatory factors** should be conducted.

6. Is there any underlying linguistic systematicity to the problematic behaviors which were noted during the descriptive analysis phase? This can be determined by completion of the following steps:
• Ensure that no overt factors account for the problematic behaviors (first five questions),
• Isolate the turns or utterances which contain the problematic behaviors,
• Perform a systematic linguistic analysis on these data points looking for consistency in the appearance of problematic behaviors.

This last step means taking the utterances or productions that contained the problematic difficulties and performing a co-occurring structure analysis (Muma, 1978; Damico, 1991a). This will determine if the appearance of the problematic behaviors systematically co-occurs with an increase in linguistic complexity. There are several systematic analyses which have been found to be very effective when conducting this type of analysis of the problematic behaviors. For example, to systematically analyze from a grammatical perspective, the work of Crystal (1979; 1982) and his syntactic, phonological, and prosodic profiles are very effective as is the work of Miller and Chapman (1983). For effective semantic analyses, Crystal's PRISM (1982), Blank, Rose, and Berlin's (1978) four levels of perceptual-language distancing, and Kamhi and Johnston's propositional complexity analysis (1991) are all practical. Other effective analysis systems that take different perspectives have been described by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Brown and Yule (1983).

If the evaluator follows the sequence of the questions for explanatory analysis, many of the students will not need a detailed co-occurring linguistic analysis. Their problematic behaviors will be explained by extrinsic variables. If this descriptive approach is implemented, language minority students will stand less chance of being mis-identified as language impaired when they only exhibit language or cultural differences and the second set of diagnostic decisions can be appropriately determined.

Conclusion

Performance assessment of language minority students must actually target and evaluate true linguistic performance. For several reasons, this is not an easy task. First, we are still too far from a sufficient understanding of language as a semiotic and behavioral phenomenon and from a sufficient understanding of measurement theory and practice to design the ideal assessment processes and procedures. Second, linguistic and communicative assessment is a complicated process that requires effort and expertise on the part of both the test designers and the test users. Good language assessment requires the services of well-trained applied linguists and behavior analysts. Third, our assessment efforts are directed to the group of students in the schools that can least afford poor application and implementation. For many of these students, tests serve as gates and evaluators as gatekeepers to prevent them from achieving their learning potential.

Given our obligations toward language minority students, however, we must attempt to do the best that we can at the present time. We must use our expertise in a proactive manner to design assessment procedures that allow us to meet the needs of our language minority students at the same time we meet the needs of our school systems and programs. These students deserve no less. Given our current knowledge base, it is possible to conduct performance assessment in an effective and efficient manner. To do so, there must be a focus on theoretically defensible procedures and processes that generate authentic and pragmatic results. By adopting a descriptive approach to assessment that utilizes a hierarchical and synergistic construct of language proficiency, this paper has provided some reasonable suggestions and options. While some aspects of this specific process and the discussed procedures may not fit the needs of many evaluators, descriptive performance assessment as an approach allows a focus on authentic behaviors from a functional perspective with enough descriptive power to supply answers to the assessment questions of interest in the schools. By implementing a descriptive performance assessment approach, we can serve as agents of our school systems and as advocates for the language minority students that we serve and care about. As professionals, we deserve no less.