

0248-1

Development and Implementation of Student Portfolios in Foreign Language Programs

Amado M. Padilla
Stanford University
Juan C. Aninao
Dominican College
Hyekyung Sung
Stanford University

ABSTRACT *Issues related to portfolio development and use in assessing language learning in foreign language education are discussed. Among the issues are "audiences" and "purposes" of the portfolio. With teachers involved in an evaluation project of less commonly taught languages (Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Russian) representing different educational levels (elementary and secondary), we collaborated in the design and implementation of student portfolios to examine growth in foreign language proficiency. The contents of portfolios were analyzed to determine their usability as a means of assessing foreign language learning. Analysis of the portfolios showed that many factors should be considered by teachers in deciding on contents and objectives of the portfolio. We conclude with a series of recommendations for foreign language educators interested in using portfolios to document their students' language learning progress.*

The wave of educational reforms has brought with it an increasing dissatisfaction with traditional approaches toward student assessment (i.e., standardized testing instruments). Traditional assessment has emphasized the measurement of a given body of defined and discrete knowledge as determined by a student's performance on an objective test (Herman, Aschbacher, and Winters 1992). This approach has often been limited to assessment of student outcomes at a specific point in time and has provided little information about teaching and learning processes (Thompson 1995).

Recently, educators have put increasing emphasis on a search for alternative forms of

measuring the processes inherent in actual classroom learning and teaching (Baker 1990; Herman, Aschbacher and Winters 1992; and Lewis 1992). Alternative methods of assessment are an integral part of classroom instruction and should require students to apply and integrate what they know by emphasizing complex skills (e.g., ability to analyze, generalize, and hypothesize) within a relevant, meaningful context. These approaches call for more student involvement in planning assessment, interpreting the results of assessment, and in self-assessment. One such approach that has gained popularity is the use of student portfolios. As Calfee and Perfumo (1993) observe, portfolios provide "opportunities for a revolution in assessment" in a variety of subject areas and at different levels of schooling.

The purpose of this article is to report on our effort to develop a system for using student portfolios to document growth over an extended period of time in connection with students' learning of a foreign language in a formal classroom setting. The students, who were at both the elementary and high school

Amado M. Padilla (Ph.D., University of New Mexico) is Professor of Education at Stanford University and Chair of the Language, Literacy, and Culture Program.

Juan C. Aninao (Ph.D., Stanford University) is Assistant Professor of Education at Dominican College, San Rafael, CA.

Hyekyung Sung (Ph.D., Stanford University) is Research Associate with the Foreign Language Assistance Program, Stanford University, School of Education.

0248-2

levels, were enrolled in courses in less commonly taught foreign languages, namely Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Russian in California schools. The 14 programs involved in this project included nearly 1000 students and were part of a larger research project designed to assess strategies for teaching the less commonly taught languages.¹

In order to establish a portfolio assessment system that was sensitive to both the learning environments of elementary and secondary foreign language classrooms and students, a literature search on the topic of portfolio assessment in foreign language education was first conducted. Only a few documents that were tangentially related to portfolio assessment in foreign language were identified (e.g., Singer 1993). A more global search of the literature revealed that teachers in the subject areas of language arts, social studies, math, and science (Adam and Hamm 1992; Crowley 1993; Slater 1994) were much further along in developing workable systems of student portfolio assessment than in foreign language.

Although there was scant literature on how to develop and implement student portfolios—as noted by Herman and Winters (1994), teachers in all subject areas are mostly in agreement that the potential benefits of portfolio assessment are numerous. For example, Adams and Hamm (1992) state that

“Portfolios can be used as a tool in the classroom to bring students together, to discuss ideas, and to provide evidence of understanding and the way to apply it. Through critical analysis of their work—and of their peers—students gain insight into other ways of looking at a problem.” (103)

There are certain important questions that come with the use of portfolios, such as: What should be placed in the portfolio? How often should items be added to the portfolio? Who decides what goes into the portfolio? Who should be given responsibility for its safekeeping? What should be done with the portfolio at the end of the school year? These are just a

few of the “nuts and bolts” issues that surface when deciding to implement portfolio assessment in the classroom.

In the field of foreign language education, the advantages of using portfolios are obvious: provide students with opportunities to display good work, serve as a vehicle for critical self-analysis, and demonstrate mastery of a foreign language. However, an important distinction between a content area such as math or science and learning a new language is that the learner’s ability to use the language is the primary object of study, and students’ current use of the target language system and potential growth in those abilities over a period of time is what is at issue. Thus it becomes crucial that a student portfolio capture in as many ways as possible the learner’s use of the target language. Depending on the emphasis given to the development of reading skills and the ability to compose written products in the foreign language, students’ written materials will be a part of the student’s portfolio. However, in foreign language learning, oral skills typically are considered more important than reading and writing skills. Since oral language use of a target language system in both controlled and spontaneous situations cannot be captured easily through written means, the use of audiotapes and videotapes takes on increased importance.

Although considerations of what to place in the portfolio and how often to do so are important, these decisions by necessity have to be driven by two fundamental considerations: namely, the portfolio’s purposes and audiences. We will now turn our attention to how these primary considerations influence the use of student portfolios in the foreign language classroom.

Purposes of the Portfolio

There are specific purposes a student portfolio can serve in the foreign language classroom. The following list of typical purposes by no means represents an exhaustive description of all the possible functions a portfolio can fulfill. None of the purposes described here is superior to any of the others, and there

is no
sente
with
Pe
in do
in pr
tenir
curri
allov
crea
can
way
lio's
sopl
tect
hear
corr
the
A
tain
ized
the
suc
whi
neo
tear
lios
the
use
er's
A
dei
shc
the
dei
If a
po
she
stu
a s
a s
cr
an
te:
pr
ye
ex
pe

is no reason why the individual purposes presented here cannot be used in combination with one another.

Perhaps a portfolio's greatest potential lies in documenting and charting students' growth in proficiency in the four language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. If the curriculum has been designed in a way that allows students to acquire a progressively increasing base of knowledge and skills, items can be placed into the portfolio over time in a way that allows anyone looking at the portfolio's contents to see increased knowledge and sophistication with using vocabulary; to detect greater accuracy in pronunciation; to hear how the learner's oral production has become more fluent; and to see growth in using the language for written purposes.

A portfolio can be used to document certain kinds of language abilities that standardized instruments fail to measure. In addition to the results of any standardized instruments, such as the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview, which can help assess the learner's spontaneous oral production of the target language, teachers can place into the students' portfolios audiotapes and videotapes that capture the learner's use of the language, which are useful in determining the progress of a learner's communicative competence.

A portfolio can also be a place where students may place work that, they believe, shows unusual learning and/or ability. During the course of a semester or school year, students complete a wide variety of assignments. If a student feels particularly proud of a composition she has written in the target language, she can place it in her portfolio. If a group of students is assigned to write and then perform a short skit in the target language and they feel a strong sense of ownership of it because they created it themselves, it can be videotaped and included as part of the students' portfolios.

Portfolios can serve as the basis of parent-teacher conferences to review student's progress over time throughout the school year. As Crowley (1993) points out, "concrete examples can show the...parent the student's performance in more detail than would an ab-

stract number or letter grade" (544). Parents can be more assured of a child's progress with the target language system if they are able to view videotapes or listen to audiotapes of their child actually using the target language over time. Similarly, if parents have the opportunity to review compositions the child has written in the target language or to compare exercise sheets that show how the child has steadily come to master more and more of the target language's writing system, they can better understand their child's progress.

Finally, the contents of students' portfolios can provide information to teachers that can help them make decisions about curriculum. If, for example, by reviewing students' writing samples, the teacher finds that many students are writing more complex sentences than they have been taught, but their attempts have grammatical errors, the teacher may decide to reprioritize the curriculum plan to cover more advanced forms of writing that the students appear ready to learn.

Audiences of the Portfolio

The term "audience" refers to the person(s) the portfolio is intended for. In the same way that the main purpose of the student portfolio will help determine what goes into the portfolio, the teachers' decision as to the portfolio's primary audience will help guide decisions concerning the portfolio's contents, the frequency of placing items in it, etc. As previously mentioned, parents, teachers, students, or appropriate administrators (i.e. foreign language department chairpersons, school principals, school curriculum planners) can all view a student portfolio though different lenses.

Implications of "Audience/Purpose" Combinations

The combination of purpose and audience is an essential element in implementing portfolio assessment since together they ensure that the assessment process is a systematic undertaking, not a haphazard process of randomly "throwing things into a folder or box." When careful consideration is given to the au-

dience and purpose of the portfolio, answers emerge to such questions as: What should be placed in the portfolio? How often should materials be placed in the portfolio? Who decides what goes into the portfolio? Who should be given responsibility for its safekeeping? What should be done with the portfolio at the end of the school year?

As an example, assume that a teacher decides that the primary purpose of the portfolio is to provide a place for the student to keep and display work she is particularly proud of, and the primary audience for the portfolio is the student herself (as opposed to the teacher). Given this configuration of purpose and audience, teachers open the possibility for students to feel a greater investment in the learning process. Teachers should consider, though, what the contents of the portfolio might look like at the end of the period of study: in cases where the majority (or all) of the control is given to the learner, there is no guarantee that at the end of the period of study the portfolio's contents will provide an outsider with evidence of a clear progression of skill development and emerging proficiency. Consider another example of a teacher who decides to make the portfolio parent-focused. Here the main purpose could be to place items that could be shown as part of a "Parent-Teacher Night" conversation about the child's progress. It would be important for a teacher to show parents not only evidence of the child's current level of proficiency but also some charting of the child's progress. Thus, one might find in this portfolio clusters of related items that the teacher has chosen. Groups of artifacts would be related to one another because they illustrate development, and the teacher could thus say to parents, "At the beginning of the school year, you can see that Elena was able to use the vocabulary to write simple sentences, but you can now see that she's using her words to write a story of connected sentences with some more sophisticated vocabulary."

Finally, suppose that the department chairperson of a foreign language program wants teachers to focus more of their effort on de-

veloping students' communicative competence as evidenced in spontaneous oral language situations. Further, the department chairperson decides that she wishes to see evidence of this across individual language programs. The audience for the student portfolios then becomes the department chairperson, and the purpose of the portfolios is to provide evidence of a faculty's implementation of a departmental goal. In keeping with this audience/purpose combination, teachers could decide that portfolios needed to have both more and a greater variety of speech samples to document growth in communicative competence. Thus portfolios would probably contain more video and audiotapes as opposed to written documents.

In sum, the task of deciding upon a combination of purpose and audience is an essential first step in implementing a system of portfolio assessment. Doing this task at the onset helps to ensure that the assessment process is carried out systematically. In the work to be described here, the purpose was to establish a portfolio system that could be used by foreign language educators at both the elementary and secondary levels. We provided technical assistance to teachers on strategies for developing student portfolios that could be used to document a student's progress in the foreign language. In working with teachers, our goal was to communicate the importance of audience/purpose as they worked through the details of establishing portfolios in their classrooms.

Method

Description of Language Programs

The programs that we worked with varied widely in how foreign language education was carried out in the classroom. The programs included two elementary total immersion programs (Chinese and Japanese), an elementary Russian culture program, an elementary Japanese foreign language program, and ten high school foreign language programs ranging from introductory to advanced classes in Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and

Russian. Sites include level where language and credentials of the teacher and credentials to teach

Procedure

To begin discussions with student teachers, we took place involved in each speaking, reading, and writing samples of reading and writing. These were appropriate for speaking and writing. We discussed audiotapes and videotapes of writing skills. We implemented a mentored ecology. It would be new to try for their purposes. We are and primary kinds of current and kinds of teaching alternatives. We also had a school

Russian. The teachers in the different school sites included: teacher aides at the elementary level who were proficient in the target language and who did the language instruction; credentialed teachers who were native speakers of the target language, but who were not credentialed as foreign language teachers; and credentialed teachers who were certified to teach a foreign language.

Procedure Used in Developing Portfolios

To begin work on portfolios we initiated discussions with teachers on the collection of student proficiency data. These discussions took place early in the school year and involved the kinds of information that teachers could collect to document student proficiency in each of the four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In the case of reading and writing, teachers agreed that samples of students' writing and tests measuring reading comprehension were easily identifiable sources for documenting proficiency in these two skills. However, identifying appropriate means for demonstrating listening and speaking proficiency was not as easy. We discussed with teachers the possibility of using audiotapes and videotapes as a means of providing evidence of listening and speaking skills. Issues such as the availability of equipment and logistics involved in the development of portfolios for large classes soon became apparent. As a way of maintaining ecological validity, we stressed to teachers that it would not be necessary for them to invent new types of artifacts (a term commonly used for items placed into a student portfolio) for purposes of a student's portfolio. Since teachers are constantly monitoring student growth and progress through both formal and informal means, we discussed with teachers the kinds of practices they use to assess students' current proficiency levels: the types of materials and activities used for that purpose, the kinds of tests and/or quizzes they utilized, etc. Teachers were encouraged to try out different alternatives in deciding upon possible portfolio artifacts. In general, conversations at each school proved to be productive, and at all sites

teachers were excited about the prospect of being part of an effort to explore portfolio use in foreign language education. Teachers were asked to submit a written plan explaining the kinds of artifacts they intended to use, their rationale for choosing that type of artifact, and their perceptions of how that artifact could be expected to show student ability.

Six students were chosen from each level in each program to serve as case study students for this "portfolio experiment." Teachers were asked to have these students represent a range of abilities and (if possible) to choose an equal number of male and female learners. The one condition that we insisted on was that the case study students not be native speakers of the target language. This condition was imposed because many ethnic language heritage students are frequently enrolled in the less commonly taught language programs that we worked with, and these students already have varying levels of proficiency in the language. However, our focus was on students who had no familiarity with the target language prior to enrolling in the class. We returned to the schools in the middle of the school year. These visits were planned to discuss two major items. First, we asked teachers to share the samples of student work they had collected thus far. Teachers mostly shared writing samples, tests, and quizzes. Most of the teachers said that they were still in the process of collecting samples of student work that could document proficiency in listening and speaking skills. However, some teachers did share samples of audiotapes and videotapes of students acting out skits or engaging in other activities in the target language. These visits revealed that teachers were indeed attending to the task of collecting student proficiency data.

We then discussed with the teachers what they had learned about "portfolio purpose and audience," while collecting items in student portfolios. Teachers were not in complete agreement regarding the audience of the portfolios. Some felt that the primary audience should be the students themselves, while other teachers felt that the audience should be

teachers. Still other teachers felt that portfolios were for parents. However, all teachers agreed that the purpose of the portfolio was to document students' language growth.

Since the foreign language programs varied widely, teachers were allowed to identify a purpose and audience for their own foreign language program. Teachers were instructed that this purpose and audience should guide their data collection efforts for the remainder of the year. For example, for those teachers who felt that the audience for the portfolio should be teachers and the purpose to track student progress, the process of selecting portfolio items would be geared more specifically (and thus less randomly) toward including related items through which growth could be clearly seen. As an example, one teacher of Japanese noted her tests on students' mastery of Kanji characters were not necessarily cumulative. This teacher used two tests, one which showed how the student had mastered 25 characters, the other showing how the student had mastered only the next 25. However, these tests could not be used to show growth and development because of the disjointed nature of the two tests. A similar principle applied for choosing items that document oral skills. A teacher who included in the portfolio a videotape done at the beginning of the year that showed students' mastery of certain vocabulary words and language-use functions should later include a videotape that shows the students' maintenance of those same words and functions and that at the same time demonstrates mastery of new words and linguistic functions.

It was also believed that an objective measure of oral proficiency in the target language should be part of the student's portfolio. Since there was no common objective tool for measuring oral proficiency in the four less commonly taught languages in our project, we developed a matrix that teachers could easily use to assess their students' oral language development. This instrument is called the Stanford Foreign Language Oral Skills Evaluation Matrix (FLOSEM) and was modeled after the Student Oral Language Observation Matrix

(Padilla, Sung, and Aninao 1994).

Once again, these meetings proved productive and stimulating, as reported by some of the teachers later in the year. Another important aspect emphasized during the meetings was the use of a "table of contents" as part of each portfolio. The table of contents explains when each artifact was completed, what language skill it documented, and what kind of topic and activity it was about. High school students were encouraged to complete the table of contents for their portfolios while teachers were asked to do so for elementary students. High school students were also asked to provide brief notes about why they chose certain artifacts and what they had learned from the work. We informed all the sites that we expected to receive from each program a complete portfolio on each case study student (six from each level) at the end of the year. Portfolios were received during the weeks following the end of the school year.

Analysis and Results

After the portfolios were received, native speakers of each language examined the contents of the portfolios. The objective of the portfolio review was to determine whether the portfolios were useful in documenting language growth over the course of the school year. The portfolios contained student writing samples, quizzes, audio and videotapes, and special group projects of a written nature (e.g., family stories, history of a country, etc.). The portfolio examiners in each language recorded the contents of each student portfolio and made comments regarding overall organization/structure of the portfolio and each artifact's usefulness in terms of charting growth in the target language. In addition, the native language reviewers compared the student portfolios with the teacher's initial portfolio plan.

To coordinate the portfolio review, the examiners of each language also frequently met as a team throughout the process of studying the contents of each portfolio. The purpose of these meetings was to compare notes and discuss the usefulness of the various artifacts

found in the four proved to the stren portfolio observat tors' cor various r complet hindere guage de

As an though a tapes in widely i dents' j taught li videotap ples tha the lan cases, th that hac from w whethe languag tion of t or vide racy of but not

Anot cluded the de been p semest had to or the c or find to do i judgin the sc portfol or vid done c late in studer guage foreig The p the ac

found in the portfolios for assessing growth in the four language skills. These discussions proved to be useful because they highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of the student portfolios. For example, a frequently noted observation in most of the portfolio evaluators' comments was missing dates of when various materials (e.g., written samples) were completed by the students. Absence of dates hindered our analysis of documenting language development across the school year.

As another example, we found that even though all teachers included audio and videotapes in the portfolios, these artifacts varied widely in their usefulness for assessing students' proficiency in the less commonly taught language. In some cases, the audio or videotapes were of spontaneous speech samples that showed the student's ability to use the language communicatively. In other cases, the audio or videotapes were dialogues that had been memorized by the students and from which it was difficult to determine whether the students in fact had mastered the language beyond the simple rote memorization of the script. In these instances, the audio or videotapes were useful in assessing accuracy of pronunciation in the target language, but not communicative competence.

Another problem was that teachers often included only a single audio or videotape for the designated student that had generally been prepared sometime during the second semester. The reason given for this generally had to do with student reluctance to be taped or the difficulty of locating suitable equipment or finding time within the instructional period to do the taping. Thus there was no way of judging growth in oral competency through the school year for some students. In those portfolios where there were at least two audio or videotapes and where the first had been done early in the school year and the second late in the year, it was possible to assess the student's growing oral skill in the target language. This was especially true in introductory foreign language classes (e.g., Japanese I). The portfolios also revealed that teachers at the advanced levels of foreign language in-

struction (e.g., Chinese IV) used a more thematic approach to their instruction. This made analyzing the portfolios not only more interesting because of the contents but also more difficult to determine specific communicative growth across the academic year.

Another concern with respect to the review of the audio and video portions of the portfolios was that oftentimes two or more of the case study students collaborated in preparing and presenting a skit or puppet show. Then when the production was taped, it was not always possible to identify each speaker or what the individual's contribution was to the material. Although these productions were entertaining and obviously very enjoyable for the students, they posed problems from an evaluation perspective. Thus, it was not always possible to adequately assess spontaneous communicative competence from these group presentations.

The written samples in the portfolios also provided important information regarding the growth in the target language; however, many teachers provided too few written samples to adequately judge writing skill development across the academic year. Portfolios that contained numerous and dated writing samples proved very useful in assessing growth in writing ability in the target language. Some teachers included in the portfolio various drafts of students' writing assignments. These were especially valuable since they showed the developmental stages of writing in the foreign language in response to their teacher's comments regarding their attempts to complete the written assignment. As part of the process of examining the contents of each portfolio, the reviewer prepared written commentaries on the contents that would be shared later with the teacher. These commentaries were first presented to the evaluation team during our meetings as we discussed the usefulness of the contents of all portfolios for documenting language growth in the target languages. The comments were useful in aiding team members to formulate guidelines for foreign language portfolio assessment. In addition, the teachers found the commentaries useful in

planning for the following year's student portfolios. For example, in the case of one student portfolio, the native language reviewer commented:

We can see each student's growth in Japanese, when we compare audio-4 with video tapes-2/3. Student's Japanese has developed in terms of syntactic complexity, functional complexity, utterance length, number of utterances, etc. However, since all of them were memorized and rehearsed dialogues, they don't necessarily reflect each student's proficiency in Japanese...Growth in pronunciation and intonation is hard to assess with these limited speech samples.

Later in the same commentary and referring to reading, the evaluator states:

Translation is used regularly as a means for checking comprehension. Although sentences for translation became more complex, reflecting the target sentence structures in each lesson, they didn't become longer as the teacher had planned. It might have been more valuable if the student had read a written passage (a paragraph, not a sentence) and then had this included in the test.

As for writing, the evaluator says:

Translation (sentence level) is used to demonstrate writing proficiency in Japanese. More spontaneous written samples would be necessary to chart growth in Japanese writing. (Essays are used at the higher level in Japanese. Perhaps this can start earlier.)

In sum, these comments illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of a particular portfolio. The material in the portfolio allows the reviewer to determine both the level of proficiency attained by the student in the foreign language classroom and the strategies used by an exemplary teacher of Japanese to

assess her students' acquisition of the language. The commentary also offers feedback to the teacher for improving the assessment process that will be useful for the multiple audiences for which the portfolio is prepared; that is, the teacher, the student, and the student's parents.

Conclusions and Recommendations

A critical analysis of the contents of portfolios indicated several important conclusions when portfolios were used as part of an assessment procedure for documenting language development in foreign language programs from kindergarten through 12th grade. First, it was possible to document growth in a foreign language in one academic year in most portfolios when appropriate items were placed in the portfolio throughout the school year. Second, a portfolio was most useful as an alternative method of assessment when a teacher had a plan that took into account purpose and audience. Third, the contents of a portfolio differed by the grade level of the student (e.g., third grade) and by the level of difficulty (e.g., third-year high school Japanese) of instruction in foreign language. Finally, an objective measure of oral proficiency in a foreign language should be part of the student portfolio. The Stanford FLOSEM was developed and used for this purpose.

A set of guidelines for implementing portfolios in foreign language classrooms was compiled and offered to our participating teachers. Teachers reported that these guidelines were very useful. The guidelines that follow are intended to enhance the usability of portfolios by students, parents, and language teachers. How the guidelines offered below are implemented will depend on the grade and/or level of foreign language instruction. The guidelines are as follows:

• The teacher and/or student should prepare a brief annotation for each item placed in a language portfolio. These annotations need not be elaborate or lengthy, but they should describe the activity that resulted in production of the artifact.

• It is e
be dated
• Teacl
purpose
documen
guage. T
materials
dents' tar
of the s
should b
target lar
• If po
gies for i
tening co
This may
ing comp
were us
about st
standing
• Info
also sho
This ma
dents' re
class. In
in the up
ally be l
guage.
• It is
to obtai
samples
could b
tapes.
• Effe
actively
valuabl
importa
ative wi
are as i
• The
student
through
ial shot
a mont
of lang
can be
In a
guidel
videot
oral p

• It is essential that all entries in a portfolio be dated and numbered chronologically.

• Teachers need to keep in mind that the purpose of the student language portfolio is to document student growth in the target language. Thus the portfolio needs to contain materials that first establish a baseline of students' target language ability at the beginning of the school year. All entries thereafter should be directed at showing growth in the target language.

• If possible, teachers must seek out strategies for including information on students' listening comprehension in the target language. This may include audio or videotapes, listening comprehension tests, or other artifacts that were used in class to obtain information about students' ability to listen with understanding in the target language.

• Information on reading comprehension also should be a part of a student's portfolio. This may include audio or videotapes of students' retelling a story after it has been read in class. In more advanced language classes (or in the upper grades) such retelling should ideally be longer and, of course, in the target language.

• It is always important to find opportunities to obtain spontaneous target language speech samples. Again, this may be something that could be documented by audio or videotapes.

• Efforts at using the target language creatively in writing stories or narratives are invaluable artifacts for portfolios; however, it is important to also focus on the process of creative writing, and any drafts of writing samples are as important as the final written product.

• The artifacts that are used to make up the student's portfolio need to be well distributed throughout the academic year. Ideally, material should be added to the portfolio at least on a monthly basis. In this way, documentation of language growth across the academic year can be collected.

In addition, we developed another set of guidelines especially for using audio and videotapes as a means of charting students' oral proficiency development. Guidelines

were prepared in order to assist teachers to maximize the use of audio and videotapes in their language classrooms. In using the guidelines, it is important to keep in mind the grade and/or level of the students because the guidelines do not necessarily apply in the same way to elementary school language programs and to introductory language classes in high school.

• Prior to the actual taping, students should be told that it is important that they speak loudly, but still within a normal range, so that they can be clearly heard on the audio or videotape by whoever listens or views the tape.

• Students need to introduce themselves by name, and a spokesperson for the group being audio or videotaped needs to describe the activity to be taped and who participated in the writing of the activity, if it is a skit, puppet show, or other dialogue.

• In videotaping groups of students, groups should not consist of more than six students, all of whom have introduced themselves. The optimal group size for a videotape is three to four students. In an audiotape the optimal number of speakers is two—generally the teacher and the student or two students.

• The time that students should spend in the presentation of their skit/dialogue/oral presentation depends on the level of the students' proficiency (e.g., Japanese I vs. Japanese IV) and the number of participants. Generally, students in more advanced language classes should present dialogues that are longer and more elaborate than those expected of introductory language classes.

• Each participant in a group videotape should have a minimum of five or six turns (i.e., lines) of dialogue to demonstrate mastery of the target language. The skills in particular that are important in a videotape are pronunciation, fluency, and expression in the target language.

• Videotaped material of actual classroom settings is also invaluable. This is especially true when students are engaged in classroom dialogue types of activities that demonstrate their mastery of the target language.

• Also essential in videotaping is that students have the opportunity to engage in spontaneous target language use. Experience has shown that many students become fearful when being videotaped; thus we recommend that teachers foster confidence in students by beginning with a skit or dialogue that students have prepared. Once this is completed, teacher-directed, spontaneous speech can be recorded. The topic for spontaneous speech may be selected before the actual taping, and

students may have the opportunity to think and practice for spontaneous dialogue around the selected topic; however, the speech in this spontaneous dialogue segment should be unpracticed and should be directed by the teacher.

Whenever possible, the video equipment should rest on a tripod during the taping sessions. This technique provides better quality videotape.

NOTE

¹This project was funded by the California Department of Education to evaluate Model Projects in Less Commonly Taught Foreign Languages in California Public Schools. We thank Dr. Duarte Silva, Executive Director, California Foreign Language Project, Stanford University, for his assistance.

REFERENCES

Adams, D. M., and M. E. Hamm. 1992. "Portfolio Assessment and Social Studies: Collecting, Selecting, and Reflecting on What is Significant." *Social Education* 56:103-105.

Baker, E. L. 1990. *What Probably Works in Alternative Assessment*. Los Angeles: UCLA Graduate School of Education; National Center for Research and Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.

Calfee, R. C., and P. Perfumo. 1993. "Student Portfolios: Opportunities for a Revolution in Assessment." *Journal of Reading* 36:532-537.

Crowley, M. L. 1993. "Student Mathematics Portfolio: More Than a Display Case." *The Mathematics Teacher* 86:544-547.

Herman, J. L., P. R. Aschbacher, and L. Winters. 1992. *A Practical Guide to Alternative Assessment*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Herman, J. L., and L. Winters. 1994. "Portfolio Research: A Slim Collection." *Educational Leadership* 52,2:48-55.

Lewis, A. C. 1992. "No Shortcuts for Alternative Assessment." *Research and Development Review* 7,4:2-3.

Padilla, A. M., H. Sung, and J. Aninao. 1994. Stanford Foreign Language Oral Skills Evaluation Matrix (FLOSEM). Unpublished Manuscript, Stanford University, School of Education.

Singer, S., ed. 1993. *Portfolio Assessment in Foreign Language*. Evansville, IN: Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation.

Slater, T. 1994. "Portfolios in Learning and Assessment in Physics." *The Physics Teacher* 32:370-373.

Thompson, L., ed. 1995. *K-8 Foreign Language Assessment: A Bibliography*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

In

ABSTR
 only rec
 the role
 tures ar
 guage,
 the mer
 languag
 guage s
 gesture.

To be :
 not onl
 commu
 compa
 a varie
 avoida
 of spe
 verse a
 of one
 consec
 learn a
 compa
 recent
 these
 ture, v
 spokel
 semin.
 1970,
 tures a
 vey the

Wo
 tha
 anc

Theresa
 Profess
 Detroit,