

**Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives, Volume 1(1),
2003**

Chris L. S. Coryn

Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives is a relatively new journal devoted to the interdisciplinary study of measurement in the human sciences and is intended to represent a broad range of disciplines and perspectives including psychometrics, ethnography, social theory, psychology, economics, education, linguistics, sociology, policy studies, history, and law. Each issue is devoted to a single, provocative focus article followed by commentaries and a rejoinder article. Further information can be found at <http://bearcenter.berkeley.edu/measurement/>. Presently eight issues are available covering objectivity and trust, standards-based testing, and certification testing, for example. The inaugural issue—Volume 1(1), 2003—was sent to us by the editors (Mark Wilson at the University of California, Berkeley; Paul De Boeck at K. U. Leuven, Belgium; and Pamela Moss at the University of Michigan) to encourage becoming involved in for example, debating a “focus paper” or participating in a commentary.

The focus article of the inaugural issue is *On the Structure of Educational Assessments* by Robert J. Mislevy, Linda S. Steinberg, and Russell G. Almond. This article describes a framework for assessment that makes explicit the interrelations among substantive arguments, assessment designs, and operational processes. This framework, called “evidence-centered” assessment design (ECD)

“...entails the development, construction, and arrangement of specialized information elements, or assessment design objects, into specifications that embody the substantive arguments that underlies an assessment” (p. 4).

The authors illustrate their ideas with examples from language testing and the article is presented parallel to the stages of the ECD design process: (1) domain analysis, (2) domain modeling, (3) conceptual assessment framework, and (4) operational assessment—the “four-process delivery system.”

In the first stage of ECD design, domain analysis, information about the domain is used to organize beliefs, theories, research, subject-matter expertise, instructional materials, and exemplars. In the second stage, domain modeling, the information gathered in stage 1 is organized into three paradigms; proficiency, evidence, and tasks. The third task, developing a conceptual assessment framework (CAF), specifies the technical details necessary for implementing the assessment; specifications, operational requirements, statistical models, and rubrics, for example. The final stage, the four-process delivery system, consists of four principal components: (1) activity selection, (2) presentation, (3) evidence identification—task-level scoring, and (4) evidence accumulation—test-level scoring.

Mislevy, Steinberg, and Almond’s intricate approach emphasizes measurement models which incorporate the relationship between “assessment purposes, substantive experience and theory, statistical models and task authoring schemas, and the elements and processes of operational models” (p. 56).

Eight commentaries follow the focus article which range from the limitations of Bayesian models in assessment (Earl Hunt) to critiques and comments from a

psychometric perspective (Cees A. W. Glas) and finally to a framework for shifting from principle to practice (Richard K. Wagner). The issue concludes with Mislevy, Steinberg, and Almond's rejoinder in which the authors address the themes of critique presented in the commentaries; constructivist and situative learning perspectives, model generalizability, user and statistical models, and implementation.