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This paper reviews the concept of high-stakes assessment against a background of postmodernism, and argues that the inaccessibility of cognitive processes is only one part of the problem of reading assessment: even greater challenges are posed by a postmodern analysis, in which an ‘incredulity toward metanarratives’ leads to a series of six theoretical positions, from each of which is derived a practical imperative that might guide us in establishing postmodern principles of assessment. These six imperatives are then explored in relation to two practical contexts, one in the area of portfolio or evidence-based assessment, the other in the area of computer-based assessment of reading. In both cases, it is argued that, working from first principles, the case for using such approaches can be established. Second, it is argued that while both these approaches to assessment offer empirical and methodological challenges that have yet to be met, they also offer opportunities for valuing the individual subject and diminishing the authority of the author and the text in ways that are in harmony with a postmodern position.

Introduction

During the past 30 years, and certainly within English-speaking nations, the concept of accountability has become deeply and inexorably woven into the fabric of education (Fullan, 2000). Most teachers and other employees within education now accept, at least in principle, that within a publicly-funded system they have a responsibility to those who have been elected to run that system both to deliver the best education they can using the resources available and to accept that assessment procedures are likely to be part of the delivery mechanisms of that system. Of course they have other responsibilities too, and these include a moral imperative not to stand idly by if their employers enact policies that are damaging to their students, and there is little disagreement among educationists that, while national assessment procedures are now a key factor in the accountability system, ‘high-stakes’ assessment procedures have the potential to be very damaging to students (International Reading Association, 1999; American Evaluation Association, 2003). The phrase ‘high-stakes assessment’ is now generally used in both the USA and UK to refer to publicly reported assessment data that can have serious consequences, at either the individual level (e.g. on the basis of their test score a child is denied access to the school...
of their choice or denied an opportunity to progress to what would normally be next grade or stage) or the institutional level (e.g. a school might be threatened with funding reductions or closure because of its students’ low scores).

This paper will address some of the theoretical positions and research evidence that relate to the socio-political and methodological issues surrounding ‘high-stakes’ assessment in the literacy field, and particularly in the area of reading assessment. It will then go on to suggest a set of principles derived from an analysis of the concept of postmodernism that could inform both the theory and practice of assessment in a postmodern world.

In England there is some evidence that the tide is beginning to turn against national tests in a country that has the most tested children in Europe, with publicly-reported ‘high-stakes’ testing in English and Mathematics at age seven, in English, Mathematics and Science at the ages of eleven and fourteen and (for nearly all students) sixteen. In the spring of 2003, a survey reported that 10% of seven-year-olds had been reduced to tears and had lost sleep over the national tests, and that parents’ organisations were actively encouraging parents to withdraw their children from school at the time of the tests (BBC, 2003a). The report also quoted a survey that showed that over 10% of eleven-year-olds refused to go to school to sit the Key Stage 2 national tests.

There is also concern in England that tests damage teachers. In England in 2003 a headteacher was sent to prison for three months after pleading guilty to forging the test results of 11-year-olds. While many fellow teachers may have felt sympathy because of the social and institutional pressure that led this headteacher to commit such a crime, the chair of the school’s governing body did not take a sympathetic view, at least in public, and was on record as saying ‘I am pleased he got a custodial sentence and I hope that this will send out a clear message to schools everywhere’ (BBC, 2003b).

Concern over high-stakes assessment being associated with professional malpractice is not confined to the UK. In the USA, Jacob and Levitt (2001) developed a mathematical model for spotting unusual answer strings and test score fluctuations, and after applying it in the Chicago area reported that scores patterns in 4–5% of all classrooms in the Chicago Public Schools district indicated teacher cheating on standardised tests.

In the context of this paper, though, student anxiety and teacher cheating are not the primary issues. At least as important as these ethical issues are the other fundamental problems with high-stakes testing, namely that it may not do the job of assessing reading effectively, and that its backwash effects may actually hamper reading development.

The American Evaluation Association (AEA), whose task force on testing spent a year reviewing all the available evidence, came to the conclusion that ‘High-stakes testing leads to under-serving or mis-serving all students, especially the most needy and vulnerable, thereby violating the principle of “do no harm”’ (American Evaluation Association, 2003). The task force stated that ‘The consequences that concern us most are increased drop out rates, teacher and administrator deprofessionalization, loss of curricular integrity, increased cultural insensitivity, and disproportionate allocation of educational resources into testing programs and not into hiring qualified teachers and providing sound educational programs’.

Can theory assist us in the search for educationally sound assessment procedures?

Given the somewhat formidable nature of the AEA list of potentially damaging consequences related to high-stakes assessment, where should we begin a search for
principles that might underpin educationally sound reading assessment? My answer would be that we need to begin by considering not how assessment data are used, important though this is: we need first to consider the validity of the measures of content and skills that students are expected to master, because we have a major job on our hands simply assessing comprehension. The central problem has been expressed by Hellman (1992), who reminded us that it is incredibly difficult to get at our own or anyone else’s psychological processes as we or they deal with text and struggle to reach some sort of understanding:

‘Cognitive processes are … largely impenetrable to the human processor and, sad though it may seem to the cognitive scientist, it must so be’ (Hellman, 1992).

We cannot assess reading directly. This much is clear. But as I have attempted to argue elsewhere (Harrison, 1995; Harrison, Bailey and Dewar, 1998) the inaccessibility of cognitive processes is only part of the challenge we face in considering reading assessment. The rationale for offering what I have called a postmodern analysis is simple: if the government seeks to take control of assessment, then researchers have a responsibility at the very least to be in a position to advance a principled argument setting out how assessment might be managed, and that in turn implies a declaration of principles.

A postmodern view of assessment

I want to suggest that two important aspects of postmodernism, a rethinking of the nature of scientific enquiry and a rethinking of the concept of meaning in text, have very significant implications for reading assessment. ‘Postmodernism’ is not a philosophical position that we can choose whether or not to adopt. It is a term for the state of our culture. As the philosopher Jean-François Lyotard put it, postmodernism ‘has altered the game rules for science, literature and the arts’ (1984, p. xxiii). The condition of our society and culture is ‘postmodern’, and our task is therefore not so much a matter of deciding whether or not to accept a ‘postmodern’ position as to try to understand its implications, and to decide how to act on them.

In his essay The Postmodern Condition, Lyotard (1984, p. xxiv) defined postmodernism as an ‘incredulity towards metanarratives’. By ‘metanarratives’, Lyotard was referring to the grand socio-historical narratives, one of which portrays science as a dispassionate march towards objectivity, and it is such grand narratives which postmodernism calls into question. A postmodern account of science would note the many ways in which science has had to reinvent its own rules – in post-Newtonian astronomy, in transfinite mathematics and in quantum theory, for example – as a result of which many scientists have become incredulous towards superordinate concepts such as ‘truth’, ‘scientific accuracy’, ‘objectivity’ and ‘expert’. These new systems of thinking have replaced a single notion of ‘science’ with a more flexible one: the single metanarrative has been replaced by a series of locally applicable discourses, and the scientist’s role is to select from these as appropriate.

Where does all this leave us? A postmodern analysis would lead to three specific implications:

1. that we acknowledge the potential of local system solutions if global system solutions are difficult or impossible to achieve;
2. that we acknowledge the importance of the individual subject, given that the concept of ‘objectivity’ has to be recognised as problematic;
3. that we acknowledge the importance of accepting as valid a range of methodologies, given that it is no longer possible to bow to the authority of a single, grand scientific metanarrative.

Postmodernism brought about a fundamental rethinking of the nature of authority in science, but it also brought about a number of parallel seismic shifts in the field of literary theory. One useful way into postmodern literary theories is through the writing of Mikhail Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1973; Medvedev and Bakhtin, 1978). Bakhtin’s topics ranged widely, but one constant theme was a challenge to the notion of a ‘monologic’ concept of meaning. Instead of a fixed or passive notion of meaning, Bakhtin emphasised its ‘dialogic’ nature, and argued that language was a series of acts of communication, each of which takes place in a unique social, cultural and ideological context. One clear implication of this position is that ‘meaning’ is not something to be regarded as immutable. The ‘meaning’ of a word is not fixed, because ‘meaning’ is a social as well as a linguistic phenomenon, as a result of which it varies subtly within each context of production and interpretation. Bakhtin’s view of the concept of meaning as dynamic rather than static also extended to literature. He argued that not just words but whole texts were ‘dialogic’. Dostoyevsky’s novels, for example, are not ‘monologic’; they do not offer a single, unified authorial view of the world. Dostoyevsky’s novels, suggested Bakhtin, introduce and celebrate a ‘polyphonic’ range of points of view, expressed through the various characters, and between which the author does not adjudicate. Instead, the reader is faced with the difficult task of struggling to come to an active, personal and individual interpretation of meaning, and to engage in a personal search for unification.

Other perspectives from literary theory contribute to the demise of the author as arbiter of meaning. As Eagleton (1983, p. 74) has pointed out, in recent years there has been a marked shift of attention in literary theory away from the author (the focus of nineteenth-century criticism) and the text (the focus of structuralist criticism in the early and middle years of the twentieth century), towards the most underprivileged of the trio, the reader. Iser (1978) argued that the process of reading is a dynamic one, to which readers bring personal experiences and social and cognitive schemata, in which predictions, assumptions and inferences are constantly made, developed, challenged and negated. Iser’s theory goes further than Bakhtin’s, in suggesting that the text is unfinished without the reader’s contribution to making meaning: it is the reader who, in partnership with the author, fills the ‘hermeneutic gap’ in the text, bringing to it his or her own experience and understanding, and resolving the conflicts and indeterminacies that the author leaves unresolved.

Perhaps the most extreme challenge to any notion of stability in meaning and interpretation – a notion which is essential if we are to retain any hope that it is possible to assess response to reading with any validity – is that posed by the literary theories of Jacques Derrida. Derrida’s *Of Grammatology* (1976) proposed a theory of ‘deconstruction’ of texts which was so radical that it seemed to imply not only the ‘death of the author’ as determiner of meaning, but to threaten the death of meaning itself. According to Derrida, the reader’s role is not to discover meaning, but to produce it: to dismantle (*déconstruire*) the text and rebuild it another way. Derrida uses the metaphor of *bricoleur* to describe the reader’s role. The reader is a handyman or do-it-yourself enthusiast, for whom the words of a text, the signifiers, are no more than tools to be used in
deconstructing, not constructing, the text. Deciding on a text’s meaning under these circumstances is not possible – the reader can do no more than look for traces of meaning, and contemplate the text’s geological strata during the unending fall into the abyss of possible deferred meanings.

I would argue that the positions from literary theory outlined above are postmodern in their overthrowing of traditional notions of authority in text and meaning, and mirror those of postmodern positions in science. As was the case with postmodernism in science, I want to suggest that three broad implications follow from this analysis.

1. The first (derived from the argument that the extraction of meaning is a dynamic, locally contextualised, rather than a static, one-to-one lexeme-sememe mapping process) is that we acknowledge that we need to recognise a polysemic or multi-valent concept of meaning in text;
2. the second (following Iser’s and Bakhtin’s arguments concerning the importance of the individual in constructing meaning) is that we acknowledge a privileging of the role of the reader;
3. the third, related to the first two, is that we acknowledge a diminution of the authority of the author, and a corresponding diminution of the authority of the text (the implied model here is of a triangular relationship between author, text and reader, as opposed to the more traditional hierarchical or linear model).

The implication of these positions is that we need to move towards a set of assessment practices that are responsive to the conditions of indeterminacy and provisionality that must now contextualise our understanding of reading assessment, and responsive to the role of the reader, whom we now cast as the agent rather than the object of assessment. I have suggested the term ‘responsive assessment’ for such a set of practices (Harrison, Bailey and Dewar, 1998). In constructing a model of responsive assessment, I shall take the six theoretical imperatives and from them derive six practical imperatives, which go some way towards describing some of the ways in which responsive assessment might be put into action.

1. First, in responsive assessment, the emphasis is switched from global to local, from the government level to the classroom level and thus from serving national policy to serving curriculum practices. At this point assessment can begin to fulfil two essential purposes which national programmes usually ignore – assessment evidence can be of direct value to the teacher, and it can be of direct value to the student.
2. Second, in emphasising the individual subject, responsive assessment calls for increased emphasis on teacher assessment, self-assessment and peer assessment. I would suggest that if a government were to move in principle towards responsive assessment it would be enormously important to develop a wide body of information, not only on teacher assessment, but on self- and peer-assessment, and to put in place mechanisms for sharing the information.
3. Third, in rejecting a single metanarrative, responsive assessment of reading should not only draw upon a range of methodologies, but should be negotiated with the participants. Students should be involved in deciding what evidence of their response to reading is to be recorded, and that range of evidence should be broadened to include, for example, playscripts, logs, scrapbooks, narratives, maps, graphs, taped or videoed conversations, photographs, role-playing, interviews and displays.
4. **Fourth, a rethinking of the concept of meaning implies the need for deeper consideration of how readers are invited to respond to texts: in this respect it is important to consider the authenticity of the tasks that form the basis of reading assessment.** If what we call ‘meaning’ is the product of reader–text interaction, and not simply a set of nodes in semantic space, it becomes essential to consider how such interactions are generated, and to both explore the assumptions that underpin current models of comprehension assessment and to problematise the concept of ‘authentic’ modes of assessment.

5. **Fifth, if we wish to give greater prominence to the role of the reader, it is important to take greater account of a reader’s response.** There are many possibilities here for innovation in assessment. For example, interviews offer a basis for exploration of response which is potentially fruitful, for a number of reasons: interviews can be open-ended and dynamic; recorded data can be stored, retained and played back later for comparison and discussion; recording offers the potential for a teacherless context for collecting evidence, over which a student or group of students can have some authority and sense of ownership.

6. **Sixth, responsive assessment of reading should acknowledge a diminution of the authority of the author and of the text.** Tasks that involve the reader in active reflection on texts, with the active hypothesis formation, dialogue and engagement that are possible in collaborative small group work, offer great potential for achieving this final goal, which positions the reader in a central and powerful role as an active and purposeful user of texts and creator of meaning.

These then are the practical imperatives derived from a postmodern perspective upon which responsive assessment in reading can be built. Clearly there are a great many ways in which one might seek to relate them to current assessment practices, but by way of illustration in this paper I shall restrict myself to two. The two I have chosen are far from arbitrary, however. In dealing, albeit briefly, with portfolio- or evidence-based assessment on the one hand, and intelligent on-line reading assessment on the other, I hope to illustrate that the six imperatives, which might appear at first sight as being somewhat abstract, are in fact both useful and relevant in making decisions related to assessment in practice, and can lead us towards a more authentic, worthwhile and humane set of approaches than those currently adopted in most English-speaking countries.

**Implications of a postmodern analysis**

*The importance of portfolio- or evidence-based assessment*

Portfolio-based assessment came and went (see, for example, Harrison and Salinger, 1998 for a series of accounts of its strengths, and Pearson and Hamm, forthcoming, for an account of how performance assessment foundered on the rocks of validity, particularly in relation to the verification of individuals’ work). But if our own analysis tells us that it is the approach we should be using in order to bring alignment between the ethical and theoretical imperatives on the one hand and the practicalities of reading development on the other, then we should perhaps ask why portfolio-based approaches lost their way, and what we might do to bring them back. What I would wish to argue is that a portfolio- or evidence-based assessment approach fulfils all six of the imperatives listed above: it is directly valuable to both teacher and student, it emphasises the individual, it makes use of
a variety of evidence sources, it provides a site for authentic reading tasks, it gives the reader a sense of ownership and finally permits the reader to be an advocate for their own performance; taking a stronger authority position as a maker of meaning.

From the 1980s up to the mid-1990s, in the UK, in the USA and Canada, and also in Australia and New Zealand, various forms of diagnostic and portfolio-based approaches to assessment were developed, and broadly speaking, found a great deal of support from teachers. Let us not put too much Vaseline on the backward-pointing lens of time, though: diagnostic and portfolio-based assessment required a great deal of teacher effort and organisation, and were most useful only when they were tied into a larger administrative framework that made intelligent use of the diagnostic data that had been so painstakingly gathered.

But portfolio-based assessment, and its related approaches of classroom-based assessment foundered on the rocks of state and national accountability. As Valencia and Wixon (2000) report in their review of policy research in the assessment field, the problems came when these approaches were grafted on to statewide and national assessment initiatives. First, many teachers were both ethically opposed to mapping developmental assessments on to standardised scoring frameworks. Second, teachers were in many cases not experienced in such procedures, and inter-rater correlations in the range 0.46–0.63 were obtained on some statewide assessments, which were too low to permit their being reported as reliable estimates of students’ achievement. These factors, together with a coolness towards teacher-based judgements on the part of conservative administrators and politicians, led to the discontinuation of most large-scale portfolio projects.

These problems were not necessarily indicative of a fundamental structural weakness in a classroom-based approach to assessment, however. In England, a highly respected and efficient system of classroom-based assessment in English language and literature at age 16, based on a portfolio of work collected over two years for the externally-validated GCSE examination, was regarded as reliable and valid by universities, parents and employers. It was terminated following a year of unprecedented high achievement scores that were interpreted by Prime Minister John Major’s government as unreliable, but the high scores were validated two years later when the same cohort of students broke all records in their achievement in the more traditional ‘Advanced Level’ examinations.

As Salinger (1998) pointed out, portfolio-based assessments can be made to be reliable when the teachers using them have been trained in the new procedures, and those procedures integrated into district-wide moderation and calibration arrangements. Salinger reported agreement coefficients in the range 0.85–0.90 for teachers’ ratings of early literacy portfolios, after teachers in seven elementary schools had spent many months collaborating with researchers from Educational Testing Service in designing a six-level literacy development scale, and working through six drafts in their determination to make the scale a valid and comprehensive reflection of children’s achievement.

Ironically, the first government-funded approaches to national tests in English for 14-year-olds in England and Wales piloted classroom-based assessment procedures that extended over three or five weeks on a sample of 9000 children (Vincent and Harrison, 1998). The pilot involved extensive collaboration with teachers, and had flexible sets of assessment materials, including written, spoken, individual and small-group tasks, often with authentic communicative purposes (e.g. producing a community newspaper). Ninety
percent of teachers said they preferred this approach to a ‘short written examination’, but in the event, before the evaluation report was even submitted to government, the Secretary of State for Education curtailed the pilot, dismissing it as ‘elaborate nonsense’, and brought in a new regime of external tests.

If we are successful in moving back towards classroom-based assessment, and I think there are some signs of this beginning to happen, then the assessment should strive for alignment between curriculum and assessment, and between diagnosis and the development of the individual. The Diagnostic Procedures project in Scotland was an attempt ‘to place responsive assessment at the centre of a national assessment system which has as twin central aims support for every pupil and self-referencing by each school against a set of defined levels of attainment’ (Hayward and Spenser, 1998, p. 137), and ultimately I hope that this visionary project will prove to have been a template from which other nations will have been able to learn.

**Computer-based assessment and the need for intelligent adaptive on-line assessment**

Currently, commercial companies, states and governments are rushing headlong into computer-based assessment of reading, and no wonder. Computers, and especially computers connected to the Internet, offer the promise of instant data on reading achievement, based on centrally standardised and uniformly administered tests. Computers also offer the promise of instant sales of test instruments, with no printing or distribution costs. To make on-line assessment more sensitive to the individual, an increasing number of states are declaring that their tests are ‘adaptive’: the computer tailors the items to the achievement level of the child taking the test, thereby, it is argued, increasing validity and reliability, while reducing stress, anxiety and a possible sense of failure.

Well, that is the theory, and that is the marketing line. ‘Idaho to adopt “adaptive” on-line state testing’ ran the headline in *Education Week* (Olson, 2002), over a story that saw the Chair of the State Board of Education saying, ‘We wanted an assessment system that would provide data first and foremost to improve instruction, which in turn, would improve accountability’. But precisely what data was to be made available? The answer is multiple-choice test results, and it is by no means clear just what ‘data to improve instruction’ would be available from these scores. And in what ways are the tests ‘adaptive’? Well, broadly speaking, the computer pulls items from a bank of items, and if you get one wrong, asks you an easier one, and if you get one correct, asks you a harder one. The bonus for the testee and test developer is shorter tests and fewer items (though drawn from a large item bank); the bonus for the state is on-line access to statewide data on reading or maths achievement that is updated hourly.

But if we consider for a moment what is happening here, the gains for the individual student from instant feedback are slight – the test that is on-line is no different from the old pencil-and-paper multiple-choice test that has been taken for decades. It provides no developmental profile, no reading diagnosis and offers no recommendations for future pedagogy.

Is this the best that the massive increases in computing power – advances so great that what was 15 years ago a whole university’s computing power is now compressed into a single laptop – can offer? If the answer is yes, and if ‘adaptive’ on-line tests are no more than multiple-choice tests but with harder and easier items stripped away, then I confess to being disappointed.
Let us just consider for a moment how good readers behave, when carrying out a research task: good readers:

1. set themselves purposeful reading and writing goals (O’Hara, 1996);
2. decide where they need to look for multiple reading resources (McGinley, 1992);
3. navigate effectively towards those resources (Wright and Lickorish, 1994);
4. adjudicate thoughtfully between possible sources of information; rejecting, selecting, prioritising (Pressley, El-Dinary, Gaskins, Schuder, Bergman, Almasi and Brown, 1992);
5. decide which parts of the chosen sources will be useful; rejecting, selecting, prioritising (Pearson and Camperell, 1994);
6. decide how to use the sources: to edit, order, transform, critique (Duffy and Roehler, 1989; Stallard, 1974; Kintsch and van Dijk, 1978);
7. produce a text that takes account of its audience (Hayes and Flower, 1980);
8. evaluate the adequacy of their performance, revising and looping back to earlier stages of the process as appropriate (Rudner and Boston, 1994).

The first point to make is that these behaviours have a close mapping on to our six practical imperatives, in that evidence of a student’s performance on these tasks would be valuable for both student and teacher (Imperative 1), it could readily accommodate self-assessment (Imperative 2), based on a range of tasks (Imperative 3), using a highly authentic environment (Imperative 4), which includes a strong sense of a dynamic, adaptive response to critical reading (Imperative 5) in a context that clearly privileges the authority and autonomy of the reader (Imperative 6). Such an approach would therefore offer in principle a comprehensive basis for the responsive assessment of reading.

The second issue is more challenging: out of the list above, how many of those tasks could potentially be carried out by a reader working on a computer, and would it be possible, therefore, for computers to assess automatically such authentic reading behaviour? The answer is – yes, in principle, but it would be incredibly challenging, for not only would it be dauntingly difficult to attempt to write an intelligent adaptive programme that would capture and evaluate some of the behaviours listed above; in reality, as Spiro and his co-workers (1994) have reminded us, actual on-line behaviours are even more complex than is indicated in the list. For a good reader, goal-setting is provisional and the task being executed is therefore provisional; resource selection is provisional; and evaluation is carried out incredibly rapidly, on the basis of partial information (fluent readers can evaluate and reject potential websites at the rate faster than one per second, under certain conditions); lastly, a good reader assembles information from diverse sources, integrates it with what is already known, mapping it into a new, context-sensitive situation-specific adaptive schema, rather than calling up a pre-compiled schema.

But if we are interested in pushing forward the use of the computer into the area I would prefer to term ‘intelligent on-line reading assessment’ (IORA), then let us encourage test developers to work with cognitive scientists and artificial intelligence specialists and to begin to take reading assessment into this new and exciting domain.

The work of Tom Landauer (2002) and Walter Kintsch (1998) on Latent Semantic Analysis at the University of Colorado indicates one avenue of research that could be part of IORA: LSA generates a computer-generated score indicating the match between a reader’s summary of a text and the source text, and that score is more reliable than one produced by many teacher raters.
We are possibly a decade away from having anything approaching reading assessment of the sort I am envisioning here, but I want to suggest that if we put on-line multiple-choice tests at one end of the continuum, and IORA at the other, then we can at least use the two as reference points, and measure the progress in intelligent on-line assessment against a challenging and more worthwhile target than that offered by ‘adaptive’ instruments that do little more than put multiple-choice reading tests on to the Internet.

**Conclusions**

In this paper I have attempted to develop a single argument. This has been based on a review of some of the ethical, statistical and cognitive challenges facing reading assessment, which I suggest point to the need for a fundamental re-evaluation of the theoretical underpinnings upon which we construct the edifice of reading assessment. This re-evaluation uses the conceptual framing of postmodernism to derive three theoretical imperatives from the philosophy of science and three from literary theory that together lead to six practical principles upon which, I argue, reading assessment should be based. I have then used these to review briefly why portfolio-based assessment on the one hand and intelligent on-line adaptive assessment on the other might be helpful triangulation points on any future map of reading assessment. The argument has been compressed, and some parts of it have been much more fully developed elsewhere (Harrison, 1995; Harrison, Bailey and Dewar, 1998), but I hope that enough structure and detail have been presented to make a compelling case for responsive reading assessment, and to give at least a sense of where the map would lead us, and lead us in ways that enhance, rather than diminish the development of readers’ skills, understanding and motivation.
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