A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WRITING UNDER TIME PRESSURE AND PORTFOLIO WRITING: A CASE STUDY OF SS II OF GOVERNMENT DAY SECONDARY SCHOOL, MALUMFASHI, KATSINA STATE

BY

ALTI, KASIM

MED/EDU/51661/2005-2006

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA. IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREE IN TESL

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
FACULTY OF EDUCATION,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA – NIGERIA.

MARCH, 2010.

DECLARATION

I declare that this study is an original work of research undertaken by myself. To the best of my knowledge, it has never been presented partially or wholly anywhere for the award of a higher degree in any form. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text.

…… ……

Alti, Kasim **Date**

MD/EDU/51661/2005-2006

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled "A Comparative Study of the Effectiveness of Writing under Time Pressure and Portfolio Writing": a case study of SS II, Government Day Secondary School, Malumfashi by Alti Kasim, meets the regulations governing the award of Master Degree (Language Arts – English) of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

……. ……

Professor I. A. Olaofe **Date**
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

……. ……

Dr. S. Mohammed **Date**
Member, Supervisory Committee

……. ……

Dr. S. Mohammed **Date**
Head of Education Department

……. ……

Prof. S. A. Nkom **Date**
Dean, Postgraduate School

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my late parents, for being parents, Late Alhaji Alti Mohammad Abdullahi and Raheenah Alti, may Allah forgive them, Amin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All thanks be to Allah the beneficient the merciful who enjoined man to read (search for knowledge), for initiating in me the inspiration and need for this study. I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Isaac Olaofe, whose advice and help have greatly assisted in making this work a success. His detailed comments, corrections and guidance on the drafts of this work were invaluable, so was his patience when I spent too much time working on the corrections.

I am grateful to Dr. Saddiq Mohammed who taught me much about socially motivated language use. I am also grateful to Dr. Ramalatu Jibir Daura who broadened my psycholinguistic knowledge. Dr. Mamman Musa's fruitful statistical and research methodology lessons shaped my statistical and methodological approach to the study. I sincerely thank him for his personal encouragement.

I am especially grateful to Dr. A. Enesi, Dr. I. O. Inekwe, Dr. Hanatu Yusuf and Dr. Baraka Abubakar who have given me the benefit of their experience and insight. Without Susan Ola's typing and proper arrangement of the papers, the work would not have been as it is. Really, I am indebted to more people than I can possibly mention. Finally, I want to express my gratitude to my wife Aishat for her patience, love and encouragement.

ABSTRACT

This study compared the effectiveness of writing under time pressure and portfolio writing of SS II students of Government Day Secondary School, Malunfashi, Katsina State. The study sample consisted of eighty-four SS II students (all boys). A quasi-experimental study was designed in which the subjects were assigned to two treatment groups "time pressure" and "portfolio" groups, after a pre-test was given to them. The pressure group were exposed to time pressure writing procedure treatment three times a week for three months while the portfolio group was exposed to portfolio writing procedure treatment three times a week for three months. The aim was to compare the effectiveness of each of the two writing procedures analytically and holistically, by comparing the three writing samples of each students, one sample from each of the three months, presented as Phases I, II and III. The findings showed that portfolio writing students performed better than the time pressure writing students. Portfolio group showed progressive writing development both analytically and holistically, whereas time pressure group showed retrogression statistically in their writing performance across the phases. It was, therefore, recommended that the portfolio writing programme should be introduced into secondary schools writing instruction and assessment to complement writing under pressure procedure. Portfolio writing procedure could be used for both teaching and learning and, as alternative assessment procedure which could help to guard against examination malpractices.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Aspects of Portfolio and Pressure Writing and Assessment	33
Table 3.1	Analytical Writing Assessment Table - - -	41
Table 3.2	Holistic Writing Assessment Table - - -	42
Table 4.1	A Summary of Pressure Group's overall Analytic and Holistic Scores - - - - - - - - -	44
Table 4.2	A Summary of overall Analytic and Holistic Scores of Portfolio Writing Group - - - - - -	45
Table 4.3	Overall Analytic and Holistic Scores of Pressure and Portfolio Student's Writing Groups for Phases I, II, and III	46
Table 4.4	A T-Test Analysis of the Pressure Group's Analysis Scores	47
Table 4.5	A T-Test Analysis of Pressure Group's Holistic Scores	47
Table 4.6	A T-Test Analysis of Portfolio Group's Analytic Scores	63
Table 4.7	A T-Test Analysis of Portfolio Group's Holistic Scores	63
Table 4.8	A Paired T-Test for Pressure and Portfolio Group's Analytic Scores - - - - - - - - -	74
Table 4.9	A Paired T-Test for Pressure and Portfolio Group's Holistic Scores - - - - - - - - -	75

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page - - - - - - - - - i

Declaration - - - - - - - - - ii

Certification - - - - - - - - - iii

Dedication - - - - - - - - - iv

Acknowledgement - - - - - - - - - v

Abstract - - - - - - - - - vi

List of Tables - - - - - - - - vii

Table of Contents - - - - - - - - viii

Definition of Terms - - - - - - - - xii

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study - - - - - - 1

1.2 Statement of the Problem - - - - - - 4

1.3 Research Questions - - - - - - - 6

1.4 Research Hypotheses - - - - - - 6

1.5 Purpose of the Study - - - - - - 7

1.6 Significance of the Study - - - - - - 7

1.7 Delimitation of the Study - - - - - - 8

1.8 Basic Assumptions - - - - - - - 9

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction - - - - - - - - 10

2.1 Portfolio Writing: Concept, Issues and Effect - - - 10

2.1.1 Contents of Portfolio - - - - - - 13

2.1.2 Purpose and Effect of Portfolio Writing and Assessment - 15

2.2 Writing under Time Pressure – Concept, Issues and Effect - 17

2.2.1 Pressure Writing and Assessment Procedure - - - 20

2.3 Portfolio Writing and Assessment Procedure - - - 21

2.4 Writing under Time Pressure and Assessment and Portfolio Writing and Assessment Compared - - - - - 23

2.4.1 Advantage of Portfolio Writing and Assessment - - - 23

2.4.2 Disadvantages of Portfolio Writing and Assessment - - 25

2.4.3 Advantages of Writing under Pressure and Assessment - - 27

2.4.4 Disadvantages of Writing under Time Pressure - - - 28

2.5 Previous Studies on Pressure and Portfolio - - - 29

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction - - - - - - - - 34

3.1 Research Design - - - - - - - 34

3.2 Population of the Study - - - - - - 34

3.3 Sample and Sampling Procedure - - - - - 35

3.4 Instruments for Data Analysis - - - - - 35

3.5 Validation of Instruments - - - - - - 36

3.6 Procedure for Data Collection - - - - - 37

3.7 Pilot Study - - - - - - - - 38

3.8 Method and Procedure for Data Analysis - - - - 39

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 Introduction - - - - - - - - 43

4.1 Pressure Writing and its Effect on Students Performance - 43

4.1.1 Pressure Writing and Students' Performance by Phases - - 43

4.1.2 Portfolio Writing and Students' Performance by Phase - - 44

4.1.3 Portfolio and Pressure Writing Students' Performance

By Phases - - - - - - - - 45

4.2 Pressure Writing and Students' Performance- - - - 47

4.3 Portfolio Writing and Students' Performance - - - 63

4.4 Time Pressure Writing and Portfolio Writing Compared - 74

4.5 Overall Findings - - - - - - - 76

4.6 Discussion of Findings - - - - - - 77

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.0 Introduction - - - - - - - - 84

5.1 Summary of the Findings - - - - - - 84

5.2 Implication - - - - - - - - 86

5.2.1 Implication for Pressure Writing Procedure - - - 86

5.2.2 Implication for Portfolio Writing Procedure - - - 86

5.2.3 Implication for Teaching Essay O' Level English Writing Students - - - - - - - 87

5.2.4 Implication for Teachers of O' Level English - - - - 88

5.2.5 Implication for Educational Administrators and Curriculum Developers - - - - - - 89

5.2.6 Implication for Examination Bodies - - - - 90

5.2.7 Implication for Employers and Parents - - - - 91

5.2.8 Portfolio Writing Implementation Procedure Grid for Schools - 91

5.2.9 Steps to Introducing Portfolio Writing in the Classroom - 93

5.3 Conclusion - - - - - - - - 94

5.4 Recommendations - - - - - - - 95

5.5 Limitations - - - - - - - - 96

5.6 Area for Further Research - - - - - - 97

References - - - - - - - - 98

Guide for Research Aides - - - - - - 110

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Analytic Score: This means scores obtainable from the separate components of piece of writing. For example, grammar, mechanics, details, etc.

Goals Cards: A checklist highlighting specific portfolio goal by indicating student's activity, portfolio evidence and assessment tool such as teacher or peer feedback.

Holistic Score: This describes and prioritizes the general effect of a piece of writing by highlighting the general purpose, idea development and focus on the audience, in the writing**.**

Show-Case Portfolio: A portfolio that recognizes, assesses and reveals students' learning progress. Students select and explain reasons for the selection of materials that demonstrate personal and academic progress of writing in the portfolio.

Peer Feedback: This is a checklist providing the writer, by his peer, information on the status of his writing skills such as sentence structure, idea development etc with a view to editing or revising the work.

Teacher Feedback: This is a teacher's response to student's writing that encourages by suggestion, ways of writing improvement using probing and questioning such as how? Why?

Time Pressured Writing: (TPW): A type of writing that is product oriented involving students' use of paper and pen to write under a concentrated time frame in order to produce, expectedly, a teacher provided writing model encourage to be mimic.

Portfolio Writing (PW): A process oriented writing seen as purposeful collection of students' writing through drafts and revisions, over a period of time that exhibits students' efforts, interests, achievements and abilities in specific areas.

SS III: Senior Secondary School Two (2).

ELT: English Language Teaching.

ESL: English as a Second language.

L2: Second Language.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Two major instructional and assessment methods of writing are pressured and portfolio writing. Writing under time pressure is seen to be the employment of paper and pencil-standardized test to assess students' performance under concentrated writing time (Lau, 2001). It is a traditional approach to teaching and assessing writing in which students are given a model and encouraged to mimic it in order to produce a similar copy under a concentrated time pressure.

Portfolio writing, on the other hand, is seen as the systematic collection of students' work measured against predetermined scoring criteria (O'malley & Valders, 1996). It is a purposeful collection of materials over a period of time that can communicate students' interest, abilities and achievement in a certain area.

Language, being an act of communication, is the art of passing message across from one person to the other. This communication can be in spoken or written form. As Abercrombie (1965) notes, language is central to communication which makes it possible for individuals to live in a society. It, therefore, makes it easy for social, business, educational and religious interactions; that is why a learner does not learn until he masters the language of instruction (Olagoke, 1979).

Writing is much more difficult to teach and learn than most people realize because it presents so much that is personal about the individual writer. It is seen

to be a personal accomplishment and a life long skill that requires, patience, practice and confidence involving action, product, thought and process.

Instruction in English as a second language has often focused on improving students' skills and ability in speaking, listening and reading while ignoring the development of the students' writing skills (Edelsky, 1982; Edesky & Smith, 1989). Haris (1985) concluded that only 2% of English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction was concerned with writing activities. Of the two 2%, 75% was related to the mechanical aspect of writing such as syntax, punctuation, and speaking. Yet for L2 learners, writing is an essential language reinforcing skill (Krashen, 1977). Together with lack of attention to writing instruction has been the neglect of research suffered by writing compared to other skill areas (Graves, 1984). Yet the need for sound writing research is greater than ever.

There are four skills in English language and any other language, that learners have to acquire. These skills are listening, speaking, reading and writing. Writing, as the last skill to be acquired, is very significant because it essentially involves the correctly developed production of what the learner has learned, his experience in a context, meaning and the possibility of sharing meaning with the reader. This is why Sawyer and Sawyer (1993) indicate that writing, which could be seen as the ability to produce correct forms of words and sentences, is a very important skill of language acquisition.

Since writers and readers form the act of communication together, finding ideas that matter and words to express them require patience and confidence. This is why most people would rather talk than write. When they are pressed to write,

they draw a blank or even feel that they have nothing new to write or they do not know how to say it in writing.

After a decade of teaching writing, this study was necessitated by the finding that most student writers share some unpleasant experience. They feel a sense of dread whenever they are confronted with a writing task. Upon all the courses, workshops, and handbooks, there is still the rarity of authentic writers at every level of education which makes it not surprising that few students complete particular level of education with good writing achievement.

The West African Examination Council's report (1992) on Senior Secondary School Certificate pointed out that candidates showed a lack of acquaintance with essay formats. Parents, teachers and employers of labour have all complained of near illiteracy of modern learners especially concerning the inability to write good-essays (Olayemi, 1980).

One reason that therefore necessitated this study, apart from "back to the basic" movement (Omaggio, 1986) is that the need for writing research is greater than ever. Teachers, educational administrators, employers and parents have been convinced of the importance of writing in language development and in empowering students to write clearly, not only in the college, but throughout their lives as members of a democratic society.

The growing need for change in the nature and method of teaching/learning and assessing writing in Nigeria, in which "product" is prioritized, prompted the undertaking of this study. A situation in which whatever a language learner produces in an examination period, irrespective of how he/she produces it, was

what greatly motivated the study. This was coupled with the increasing demand and challenges of modern life (of 21st century) whereby human beings need to be flexible, autonomous and self-directed.

In the area of writing assessment, the researcher worries about a situation in which many English language teachers consider assessment as an area to veer away from and leave to the experts. The fact that they have come from humanities background, English Language Teaching (ELT) professionals develop an instinctive avoidance of assessment which one assumes will demand a familiarity with basic statistical concepts that require mathematical expertise.

In this regard, there is the need to find an assessment strategy for writing that will support and enhance effective learning. The assessment of writing (as a task) could reflect on what the learners do, what they think, and what they learn. (Ellis, 1997).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This study is concerned with finding which writing instruction procedure is more effective between writing under time pressure and portfolio writing. The researcher's involvement in examining students' writing in public English language Examination exposed a situation in which students' essays written under time pressure did not seemingly accomplish the goal of competent writing.

The problem may have been due to the fear, panic and anxiety associated with writing under time pressure. The students may have been prevented from tapping their deepest resources in producing competent writing. The questions

are: without this pressure and with some autonomy and reflections, would students perform better in writing?

Another problem is connected to the issue of what is really being tested in the product of pressured writing and that of portfolio writing. This is where the comparability between time pressure writing and assessment and portfolio writing and assessment comes in. The former sees writing as a product while the latter sees it as a process. There is, therefore, the need for teachers and educational administrators to chose among very different instructional methods. The two major instructional options which teachers need to choose between are "time pressured writing and portfolio writing and assessment.

To sum up the statements above, the problems are;

1. Is writing under time pressure effective in assessing students' writing performance?
2. Is writing under time pressure undercutting the goals of teaching writing skills it is intended to achieve?
3. How effective is portfolio writing in preparing and assessing students' writing skills and in fulfilling the goal of writing as lifelong skill?
4. To what extent does portfolio writing procedure influence students attitudinal change behavior toward writing as a language skill?

1.3 Research Questions

In the light of the above broad-based questions, the following research questions were raised to compare the effectiveness of time pressured writing with portfolio writing and assessment.

1. What are the relative effects of writing under pressure on students' writing performance analytically?
2. What are the relative effects of writing under pressure on students' writing performance holistically?
3. What are the relative effects of portfolio writing on the writing performance of students analytically?
4. What are the relative effects of portfolio writing on the writing performance of students holistically?
5. Which one is more effective, writing under time pressure or portfolio writing procedure, analytically and holistically?

1.4 Research Hypotheses

1. Writing under pressure has no significant effect on students' writing performance analytically.
2. Writing under pressure has no significant effect on students' writing performance holistically.
3. Portfolio writing has no significant effect on student's writing performance analytically.

4. Portfolio writing has no significant effect on student's writing performance holistically.
5. There is no significant difference in the students' writing performance under pressured and portfolio writing analytically and holistically.

1.5 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine which writing and assessment strategy, time pressure writing or portfolio writing, is more effective using a secondary school in Katsina State. In specific terms, the purpose of the study is to examine:

1. the effectiveness of time pressure writing in assessing students' writing performance;
2. whether or not portfolio writing could have positive influence on students' writing performance; and
3. which one is more effective: time pressure or Portfolio writing

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study could be of immense significance to students, teachers of English Language, educational administrators, examination bodies and parents. Students' writing skills at secondary level could be developed through suggestions that could be made for developing writing. Effectively, it is hoped that this study would contribute to knowledge especially in teaching/learning and assessing writing, and English language in general.

It could equally be of importance to teachers of English language since it could suggest ways of choosing the most appropriate instructional option between timed and portfolio writing and assessment methods. The study could also be of importance to textbook writers on English language because it could assist in designing ways of improved writing skills, contents and performance development.

Another area of the significance is the curriculum development. It could help in providing writing diagnosis, development, support, remediation all of which influence curriculum choices.

1.7 Delimitation of the Study

The scope of this study covered a secondary school in Katsina State. The school was chosen because it comprises different students from different parts of the state and with different backgrounds. The school also gives results that are true of the situation of secondary schools in the state.

The study is thus limited to finding out the comparative effectiveness between writing under time pressure and portfolio writing among senior secondary school level students. The study is also delimited to the use of t-test independent statistics, for effect, two way analysis of variants for effect of time and treatment, percentage (%) as well as inferential statistics of Pearson Product Movement Correlation Coefficient (r). The (r) is used for categorical data which correct for both random chance (e.g., 20% on a 5-item scale) and chance due to Skewed sample; and Skewed sample may exist in the study.

1.8 Basic Assumptions

In this study, the following basic assumptions are made:

(a) Writing under time pressure has no effects on the writing performance of senior secondary school students.

(b) Portfolio writing does not influence students' writing performance in senior secondary school.

(c) Senior secondary students' writing performance is generally good and competent.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews related literature on areas that pertain to the study. The reviewed areas include: Portfolio Writing: Concept, issues and effect; writing under pressure: Concept, issues and effect; writing under time pressure and assessment strategies; Portfolio writing and assessment strategies; pressured writing and portfolio writing compared; and previous studies on pressured writing and portfolio writing. At the end of the review, a comparative analysis of the effectiveness of portfolio writing and writing under time pressure would have been presented.

2.1 Portfolio Writing: Concept, Issues and Effect

This section discusses concepts, issues and effect of portfolio writing. The section aims at reviewing literature related to portfolio writing. At the end of the sub-heading, areas important for the study are outlined.

Development in writing instruction which had typically been formalistic, product-oriented model started in the mid – 1960s (Soonpaat 2007). It emphasizes process rather than product. Jodan (1997) acknowledges that process writing evolved as a reaction to product writing approach, in that it met the need to match the writing process in one's mother tongue and other learned languages.

Nunan (1999) states how different "Process" approach is from the traditional product – oriented approach. Whereas the product approach focuses on

writing tasks in which the learner imitates, copies and transforms teacher supplied models, the process approach focuses on the steps involved in creating a piece of work. In the process approach, therefore, writing is seen to be a dynamic multi-step process that involves discovering ideas, careful planning, writing and re-writing (Dauivit, 1985).

Advocates of process approach to writing have also found that going through the multi-step process of pre-writing, writing and re-writing frees the writer from the feeling of the pressure to write a final draft at first trial (Emig, 1971). Hence, the idea behind process approach is to take the learner through many steps to produce a final product.

Oluwadiya (1989) criticized the process approach to writing for placing premium on students' potential for self correction, indicating that it is not valid because the approach should not have left matters of revision to the student writer alone. It advocates, self, peer, as well as teacher assisted revision of written text. The present research would explicate the validity or otherwise of the above critique based on the findings obtained in the field.

Process writing contains portfolio writing. Portfolio writing is defined in different fashions by scholars but with strong interconnectivity. O'malley & Valders (1992) defines Portfolio as the systematic collection of students' work measured against predetermined scoring criteria. This definition is further explicated by Gomez and Emily (2000), to include performance – based assessment such as writing samples that illustrate different genre, solution to mathematics problem, laboratory reports that demonstrate an understanding of

scientific approach or social studies research that shows the ability to use multiple sources.

Portfolios are purposeful collections of materials over a period of time that can communicate students' interest, abilities and achievements in a certain area. Bothwick (1995) emphasizes the need for the portfolio to be more of a selection of work than collection. There are "showcase portfolios" where students select their highest quality work, and "works in progress" portfolio which can include rough drafts, jottings of ideas, data collection, drawings and photos of activities (Shackleford, 1996).

Paulson and Meyer (1991) see portfolio as purposeful collection of students' work that exhibits students' efforts, progress and achievements in one or more areas. The collection must include students' participation in selecting contents, the criteria for judging merit and evidence of students self-reflection. Thus, a portfolio writing is a living, growing collection of a students' work. Each addition is carefully selected by the student for a specific reason (Judy and Debby, 1998).

The central issue about portfolio writing is, as Rea (2001) hinted, students' learning process through documenting best works. That is why over the years, there has been a growing dissatisfaction with the traditional writing approach using a single-test essay. It fails to account for the revision component of the writing process (Hold and Baker, 1990). Another issue in portfolio writing is it can become an option available to those students for whom time constraints or

personal variable have prevented them from demonstrating writing proficiency in a single-test essay (Anson 1989; Belanoff 1994; Bird 1989; Burkhalter 1988).

A criticism of portfolio writing indicates its consumption of more time. Ralph (1987), Daiker (1996), Elbow (1991), Hutchings (1993) and Kulski (1998) brought the issue of students' competition using portfolio for their personal best than compete on single-test essay. This issue was frowned by Sandra (1980) that student may copy others' work and documents. These criticisms are important to the present research as it is open to confirmation or disconfirmation at the end of the study.

Kaye (1989) rejects timed-writing as associated with panic, fear and anxiety which do not create good writer and favors portfolio which suppresses these. This study does not subscribe to it since there are situations that demand writing under time pressure.

2.1.1 Contents of Portfolio

For the content of portfolio, there is not necessarily a set of fixed components to be included. Definitions of Portfolio indicating evidence of students' best work that is collaborative and demonstrates students' writing accomplishment of materials (Edgerton et. al., 1991) have produced 49 items for inclusion in students' portfolio. This is in contrast with other descriptions of contents of portfolio. For example, at Griffith University, a students/teaching portfolio is a short collection of students works (GIHE, 1996). Similarly, Daro, (1996) takes the view that "the kind of portfolio we are proposing is not lengthy

document, but carefully selected synopsis…. a maximum length of four pages might be desirable" (P. 21).

This study is of the opinion that prototype portfolios could be developed in the context of institutional priorities. Placing portfolio contents will therefore be influenced by the purpose for which the portfolio has been assembled and will reflect the process.

The decision on the components can be made by the teachers, the students, or through an agreement between teachers and students. As general guidelines, Crockett (1998) as cited in Nunes (2004) suggested five different groups of materials that may be included in the portfolio of students:

a. Samples that are considered as classroom assignment requirements;

b. Processed samples that were previously graded by teachers;

c. Revision of students' woks that are graded and then revised, edited and re-written;

d. Reflections associated with processed samples, and these reflections give students opportunities to identify their own strength and weaknesses.

e. Projects that include work mainly designed to put into the portfolio.

Holly (1989) includes materials that have special meaning for the students in the process of learning. These may include newspaper, articles, pictures, and articles or pictures from magazines. Sommers (1979) indicated that for any material to be put in the portfolio, teachers have to communicate to students in the beginning of the course to avoid confusion and frustration. Here, Nunes (2004) warns that teachers have to be sensitive to students' interest.

2.1.2 Purpose and Effect of Portfolio Writing and Assessment

The portfolio is beneficial not only to the students but also to the teachers. As Meyer (1991) stated, it acts as a bridge between instruction and assessment. The purpose of portfolio in an English as a second language (ESL) classroom is to increase the level of students' motivation and to give them a sense of accomplishment and ownership in their own learning (Crosby, 1997).

This study cautions that it may not be an easy task to achieve when teachers are not fully supported by administrators. Routman (1991) purported that when teachers feel that using portfolio add to their work-load, they may reject it or collect students' work without actually using it meaningfully (as cited in Newman, Solemn and Lee, 1995).

Portfolio is a means to legitimize classroom experience and wed teaching and instruction inquiry. Portfolios invite readers into the students' studio. Portfolio assessment take a stance of an invitation: Can you show us your best work, so we can see what you know and what you can do – not just what you cannot do? And also an invitation to the teachers: Can you show us your students' best works – what they can do, not just what they cannot do (Belanoff, Pat, and Dixion 1991).

Portfolio integrates theory and practice, and learning and assessment. It encourages reflection on learning process and assessment, promotes professional development (Glen and Hight, 1992; Redman, 1994). This view is further strengthened by Slater, (1997); Smith, (1981); by pointing that portfolio can capture students' learning over time and provides strong foundation for student

teacher discussion and collaboration. Shackleford (1996) highlighted another purpose of portfolio which is providing students with opportunity for self development, managing and monitoring learning to achieve final draft. Borthwick (1995) feels that the ability to put together a portfolio is an important skill in itself, demonstrating organisation of ideas, structuring materials and presenting it effectively.

Brown (1997) describes it as "success focused" different from other assessment types that are "mistake focused". Portfolio helps students document achievement, enhance self-esteem and develop a more positive attitude towards writing (Gillespie, Ford and Leavelf, 1996).

Florez's (1987) Analytic Writing Guide for Writing lists:

1. Topic development
2. Mechanics
3. Organization of thoughts
4. Conveying meaning
5. Sentence construction, as criteria and the standard as:

1. Distinguished
2. Proficient
3. Apprentice
4. Novice

Kentucky's (2001) Holistic Scoring Guide for writing assessment lists its criteria as:

(a) Purpose/Audience (b) Idea development/support (c) Organization (d) Sentence (e) Language (f) Correctness. The standard is (1) Distinguished (2) Proficient (3) Apprentice (4) Novice.

Both Florez's (1987) and Kentukey's (2001) analytic and holistic guides for writing assessment respectively, would be used in this study. Each would be employed for both pressure and portfolio writing to determine effect for making comparison between portfolio writing (PW) and time pressure writing (TPW).

2.2 Writing under Time Pressure - Concept, Issues and Effects

This section discusses concepts issues and effect of writing under pressure. The section aims at reviewing literature related to pressured writing. At the end of the sub-heading, areas relevant to the present study are out lined.

The concept of writing under time pressure is traditionally referred to as structured writing or drill and practice. It involves copying sentence, paragraphs or essays and correcting erroneous mistakes (Hammond, 1983). Lessons are drilled and – practice based on hierarchical skills sequences, with few extended writing opportunities (Applebee, 1984; Huddleston, 1984; Zamel, 1987). This approach later developed into a more contemporary form of structured writing. The focus on actual writing replaced drill-and-practice of sub-skill. Timed-writing in its more common, contemporary form is instruction in which;

(a) the topic and purpose of writing is controlled or assigned;

(b) students' writing is judged for syntactic and lexical accuracy as well as "ideational content";

(c) Students receive prompt error feedback and corrections on a limited number of targeted skills; and

(d) Students may be asked to make corrections in these prioritized skills (Mullen, 1980).

Lau (2001) sees writing under time pressure as employment of paper and pencil standardized tests to assess students' performance under concentrated writing time. Nancy (2007) sees product writing, which is equally associated with timed writing, as a traditional approach to teaching and assessing writing in which students are provided a model and encouraged to mimic it in order to produce a similar copy under controlled limited time.

Composition research shows that exhaustive error correction is much less effective than selective error correction (Yates, 1983). Yet Hammond (1983) contends that "students need to know how often they make mistakes so they can see the urgency of doing something about them". (P. 89).

Timed-writing typically receives micro-level feedback; individual errors in usage, mechanics, sentences structure, and/or paragraph structure are marked. It is based on overall summation on a separate analytic ratings, e.g., a 1 – 5 rating for idea development. The analytic score gives a sense of overall strength, and weaknesses in each of a few (typically 2 to 6) main area, e.g., mechanics and usage, vocabulary, idea development, paragraph cohesiveness, addressing the audience (Gomez, 1996).

Since writing under time pressure involves a single sample assay, it does not involve any collection of samples and other materials. What it contains is

therefore only a sheet of paper and pen to produce an essay within a concentrated limited time frame, there and then; guided by some writing rubrics (Linda, 1999). The instantaneous finished writing is submitted to the teacher for prompt error feed back and correction, on some targeted skills (Yates,1983).

The purpose and effects of writing under time is generally on certain writing skills development e.g. usage, mechanics, organization and format, etc. (Linda, 1999). Traditional timed-writing is centrally concerned with standards. This is why the utility, success and impact of the standards in timed writing motivated the development of content standards, performance standards and delivery standard or opportunity-to-learn standard (Mabry, 1999).

Content standards articulate the content and skill students should be taught and should learn; they tell what to assess. Performance standards describe explicitly what students should demonstrate in order to show proficiency. Delivery standards define the quality of educational opportunities and resources that must be provided to students.

Susan (1993) highlights that timed writing allows for development of certain skills in writing and development of rubrics to be used; analytic and holistic assessment of student writers. Kaye (1999) supported the effect of writing under pressure that one cannot escape writing under pressure in one's life.

The standard and criteria employed by traditional writing improves inter-rater reliability, the likelihood that different raters will award similar scores. Reliability is necessary for validity (Koretz, 1992).

Time pressure writing as it concerns itself with operationalizing standards in rubrics is regarded by this study as standardizing writing. The standardization of writing as a languages skill that is fundamentally self-expressive and individualistic, may obstructs its assessment. These rubrics may standardize teaching of writing, which could jeopardize the learning and understanding of writing.

2.2.1 Time Pressure Writing and Assessment Procedure

Writing under time pressure has its own procedures that guide its operations. These are:

(a) the topic and purpose of writing is controlled and assigned;

(b) the students are asked to write on the topic within a concentrated writing time, some times with prescribed number of words;

(c) students' writing is judged for syntactic and lexical accuracy as well as ideational content;

(d) students then receive prompt error feedback and corrections on a limited number of targeted skills; and

(e) students may be asked to make corrections in the targeted skills (Yates, 1983; Nancy, 2007)

Richard, Parker and Gomez, (1996), indicated that analytic index for measuring writing is bias toward structured or pressure writing while holistic index is bias toward process or portfolio writing. This study would wish to firm this claim as the two indices would be employed.

2.3 Portfolio Writing and Assessment Procedure

The fundamental thing in organizing portfolio writing and assessment is to introduce the idea of portfolio to students and possibly present samples of prepared portfolio as examples. Its uses in learning and assessment should also be discussed (Tieney, 1991; Winograd and Jones, 1992; and Pajukanta, 1999). At this stage also, specification of goals and contents of the portfolio could be highlighted (Nunes, 2004).

Barton and Collins (1997) indicate that there are three factors that guide the design and development of portfolio:

(i) purpose (ii) assessment criteria and (iii) evidence. The purpose determines the operational guidelines for data collection as it defines the purpose of the portfolio. The assessment criteria articulate what to be considered as success and the strategies necessary for the success. It suggests items to be selected to meet the goals. Evidence describes what the new information each item selected and reflections adds to the attainment of goal (Cole, Ryan, and Kick, 1995).

The basic procedures in portfolio writing and assessment are:

Step 1 - Students develop a "students working portfolio" which documents writing development overtime toward a goal. Documentation includes after statement of goal:

(a) Teacher collected materials – These are formal and informal assignments collected severally by the teacher, report cards, progress reports, close test, interviews, writing survey and reading attitude;

(b) Student's collected material – These are works completed by students throughout the year, writing drafts, handouts, published writing, homework, and some pieces of compiled works outside of classroom;

(c) The folder has all the management tools to help the student organize their work; some of these are Friday progress report, time management sheet and learning log entries;

(d) Goal cards – The weekly goal card is the last thing to put in the working portfolio on weekly basis. The cards are handed back to students for documentation in the working portfolio.

Step II - Another Portfolio is developed. It is called "showcase" portfolio. Any material which students regard as demonstration of their personal growth and academic achievement are put in a three-ring notes book on a weekly basis. This showcase portfolio recognizes, assesses and reveals students' learning progress. It also helps students to build more realistic goals. At this stage students have to explain why they select what they selected for the showcase portfolio. They would then receive peer feedback on the materials they chose for their showcase. The teacher selects materials considered good samples of students' work (Newman, Smolen, and Lee, 1995 and Barton and Collins, 1997). The procedure above would be used in this study for portfolio treatment exercise. The procedure is the most widely and effectively used and appears to be comprehensive in documenting students' writing.

2.4 Writing under Time Pressure and Assessment and Portfolio Writing and Assessment Compared

This sub-heading examines the advantages and disadvantages of writing under time pressure. The section aims at bringing out and reviewing literature related to strength and weaknesses of pressured writing. At the end of the sub-heading areas relevant to the study are itemized.

2.4.1 Advantages of Portfolio Writing and Assessment

Generally, the advantage of portfolio is its development of shared vision. Learners, teachers, administrators, and parents can shape a common vision of what students should know and be able to do as a result of their course work. By clearly articulating expectation and criteria upon which to assess attainment of the expectations, school systems help create a shared vision of the purpose of education based on the values of the community (Perron, 1991 and Siefert, 1993).

One advantage of portfolio writing is it can measure virtually many observable skills, processes and content-area knowledge for assessment purposes (Bruder 1993, McAlister, Nelson and Bahr, 1999 - 2000). Another strength of portfolio is that when teachers are trained to use portfolio based on agreement criteria, the focus is toward a more learner-centred model.

Portfolio writing and assessment serves a cross-section lens. Providing a basis for future planning, portfolio offers the possibility of assessing the more complex and important aspect of an area or topic. (Solomon, 1993; Thormburg, 1991, Zhenhui, 2007; Richards, 2000; Hedy McGarrel and Jeff 2007).

A major contribution of portfolio seem to be in the area of self-development. Portfolios emphasize student responsibility through selection of material and self-assessment (Arter, and Spandel, 1992; Muncie, 2000).

Portfolio provides teachers with feedback on individual students' progress and highlights areas of difficulties. The information can be used to tailor strategies to individual student's needs (Elton, and Laurillard, 1979; Keh, 1990; Hyland, 2000). It also fosters collaboration between the teacher and students in discussing goals, contents and assessment. Portfolio writing ensures empowering the student by shifting ownership of learning from the faculty to the students.

Because of its emphasis on independent writing, portfolio measures ESL student's writing ability in a wider spectrum. This ensures validity of writing performance scores (Redman, 2004; Linda and Johnson, 1977; Sondra, 1980).

This study considers portfolio's emphasis on writing performance and assessment using a list of criteria (i) purpose, (ii) organization (iii) details (iv) voice/tone (v) usage, mechanics and grammar) and standards, (extensively (ii) frequently (iii) sometimes and (iv) rare) as indicated by Vermont (1989) "Analytic Assessment Guide" for portfolio. It is a kind of assessment that highlights the componential evaluation of a piece of writing. The score therefore will not support valid inference of the students' writing performance.

Hence, more substantial aspects such as content, compelling presentation, vivid description, figurative use of language, depth of character and/or significance of theme could also be considered.

2.4.2 Disadvantages of Portfolio Writing and Assessment

The most considered disadvantage of portfolio is time consumption and a lot of load-work on the teachers. This explains another disadvantage of difficulty in its management (Song, and August, 2002; Ashwell, 2000; Hyland, 2003).

The primary validity questions for portfolio are among its disadvantages. This concerns the construct and domain the assessment is designed to tap, because the teacher needs to consider whether the "best work" is a real measure of a students' performance. Concerning reliability, the inter-rater reliability, the consistency with which raters assign marks to a particular piece of work appears to be low in portfolio assessment (Koretz, 1994; Holt, Dennis and Nancy, 1990) due to variability in groups, conditions and lack of agreement among raters.

This study would wish to confirm the claim that students' "best work" may not necessarily be a measure of actual ability. It would also wish to confirm the claim that inter-rater reliability is low.

Another disadvantage is that where emphasis is on form, portfolio may not be adequately applicable. It is not always that the form is not needed in writing especially in organization writing.

Portfolio ensures difficulty in standardized testing conditions. Some authorities may not allow the use of portfolio assessment because of the perception that standardized tests (traditional norms reference) require students to perform under similar circumstance while portfolio does not (Vedez, P. in special issues centre, 1995; Yang, 2003, Wolf and Siu, 1996; Santos, 1997; Johnson, 1996).

Some authorities recognize uniformity of conditions in test administration because test scores carry such high-stakes as opportunities for higher education, school takeovers, loss of job etc. when high-stakes are associated with test scores, standardized conditions for testing are involved which portfolio does not necessarily provide.

One hurdle to implementing portfolio assessment system is the cost of expense of the program. Persuading state legislators, school boards to agree to additional cost will be difficult (Nancy, 2007; Jasper, 1994; Borthwick, 1995).

Anderson (1993) indicates that there is the fear that students may end up copying text to be included in the showcase portfolio. Portfolio discourages writing under time and other pressures, but there are of course times when situation would demand writing under adverse conditions (Kaye, 1989).

To control the possibility of students' copying others' texts, the researcher would ensure admonishing students the need and importance of producing original texts. The subjects would be trained, through, guidelines and practice, on generating topics. Any attempt at copying others' texts would be sanctioned.

Another disadvantage of portfolio is that the more narrowly defined the parameters of portfolio contents, the less real the selection will be (Murphy, Sandra and Smith 1991). Ferris, (1997) canvassed the distinct analytical nature of writing from other language skills which portfolio does not recognize.

This study agrees with Ferris (1997) view of relevance of analytical elements in any writing. Analytical elements constitute a character of writing and

is a factor in ensuring holistic effect. Thus, the use of analytic index for both pressure and portfolio writing in the present study would confirm this claim.

2.4.3 Advantages of Writing under Pressure and Assessment

One advantage of writing under pressure is its being easy to use with large classes. Another one is, it is easier to grade because emphasis is on the form. Time pressured writing is useful in approach where the form is considered more important (Nancy, 2007; Moss, Beek, Ebbs, Matson Murchmore Steele, Taylor and Herter, 1996).

Another strength is that, authorities recognize it the more due to the perception that standardized tests require students to perform under similar circumstance (Rosyline, 1995). Pressure writing would therefore train students to write under adverse conditions. It will further discourage students from copying somebody else's work (Gomez, 2003). It is also a strength of time pressured writing that it is cheap to implement and fund by authorities.

Another importance of time pressure writing is, it addresses the issue of reliability which is necessary for ensuring validity of test scores in writing (Korpretz, 1994). The administration of pressure writing is easy and does not consume much time (Song, and August, 2002; Meril, 1984, Oluikpe, 1979).

This study does not share the idea of standardizing writing especially for ensuring reliability at the expense of validity argued above. Research studies (Mabry, 1999; Nancy, 1998; Wolf, Reardon, 1996) indicate that it is inappropriate to standardize writing using writing rubrics, because students and teachers may

only comply with pre-specified criteria and common standards. This works against creative self-expression, which is the essence of writing. Writing seems too personal and varied an endeavor to be subjected to scoring by rubrics that set the boundaries of creative expression. This research would use analytic (which is biased toward pressure writing), and holistic (which is bias toward portfolio writing) indices (Gomez 1996; Sharples, 1985; Tann, 1991; Brumfit, 1982; Harrison, 1973, McGregor, 1971) to provide balance between the assessment demands of portfolio writing and those of pressured writing to get the expected out come.

2.4.4 Disadvantages of Writing Under time Pressure

Although writing under time pressure has advantages, it also have disadvantages. One disadvantage is that it can only assess students in certain skill areas. Another disadvantage is it is teacher – centred and not modeled toward learner-centred approach. Time Pressure writing does not teach how to write independently as the writing is controlled by predetermined rubrics. (Graves, 1981; Staton, 1982; Tchudi, 1986; White, 1988; Harmer, 1991;).

As a weakness, time pressure writing and assessment does not consist self-evaluation. It also does not consider individual difference in its writing, management and assessment. Its constrictness in approach limits creativity (Allen, 1976; Zamel, 1982; William, 1989).

Another disadvantage of time pressure writing is its focus on products alone rather than on the process. In time pressure writing, the teacher is the only

audience and does not consider different individuals and situations. As because of time pressure, anxiety and fear, timed writing discourages students from developing passion for writing (Samway, 1993).

Writing under time pressure attaches importance to teacher corrected papers but does not recognize peer feedback as important. It equally does not recognize ideal development of ideas but organization only (Hendrickson, 1980).

Central to the criticism of writing under time pressure and assessment is its analytic evaluation which highlights separate components. That the generated single score is not satisfactorily holistic. This study does not share this view because to get the total effect of a piece of writing, discrete interim level may have to be highlighted and possibly synthesized to obtain a holistic score.

2.5 Previous Studies on Writing under Time Pressure and Portfolio Writing and Assessment

A lot of studies were undertaken by different researchers on portfolio writing and writing under time pressure. This study will focus on studies conducted to compare writing under time with portfolio writing and assessment.

Thomas, Storm, Sheingold, Hller, Paulukonis, Nunes and Wing (1995) indicate that standards – based approach to portfolio writing and assessment can provide trustworthy information about students' performance. This is relevant to this study as its status would be found out at the end of the study. Another study was conducted by Genesee and Upshur (1996) who concluded that the positive contributions that portfolios make to teaching and learning of writing are more

than that of traditional writing. At the end of the present study the status of this view would be observed.

Moya and O'Malley (1994) provide a rationale for using portfolio as against traditional standardized writing assessment model. The present study would confirm or disconfirm this rational at the and of the study.

A study by Belanoff (1991) on traditional writing and portfolio writing concluded that while portfolio increases validity it diminishes reliability. Traditional writing on the other hand increases reliability. This is in contrast with Lemahieu and Gitomer (1995); Klein and McCaffrey (1994); Herman and Whittaker (1993); Olsen (1996); New standard (1997); and Delveccio (1992)'s finding that portfolio assessment can have sufficient reliability for assessing students performance.

In similar studies by Graves, (1931); Staton, (1982); Tchudi, (1986); William (1989); and Zamel, 1989, they caution against assigned topics and error correction warning that students would become bored, intimidated and would be unable to apply writing skills to real world situations. Samway (1993) suggests that error correction results in gains for the short run which diminish over time. This will be useful to the present study as the effect of assigning topics will be observed at the end of the study, if any, in achieving effective writing by the students.

Kohonen (1992); Kolu (1999); Little (1999); Pajukunta (1999); Kaikokonen (2000) and Nunes (2004), conducted a study that shows the value of students' reflection in integrating assessment, teaching/learning with the

curriculum. Their study will provide basis for confirming or disconfirming the claim that student reflection integrates assessment, teaching/learning with the curriculum in the present research.

Studies on timed writing specifically on assigning topics, by Murray (1978); Graves (1981); Staton (1982); Ferris (2003 & 2004) and Leki (1990), indicate that writers do not often know what they are going to write on, or even possibly what they have written. Two studies on teachers' personal responses without corrective feedback (Glynn, Jerram & Tuck, 1986; Seriven & Glynn, 1983) concluded students wrote more in response than with corrective feedback.

In his study of writing under time pressure, Hammond (1983) contends that students need to know how often they make mistakes so that they can see the urgency of doing something about them. Spandel & Stiggins, (1990) assert that analytic rating, which is biased toward time pressure writing, has the advantage of making students less likely to become lost in individual error corrections. They can as well note improvement in the scores from one writing sample to the next.

The claims above would be confirmed or disconfirm by the present study through making observations in areas like teacher response, assigning topics to students and analytic ratings.

Hillocks' (1986) research on process writing and Muchinsky's (1985) study on language learning (writing) indicate that process writing demonstrated only a minimal effect on the quality of writing. In a different study, Wieke, (1981); Smith, Goodman, and Meredi, (1976); Linda, Edwards and Selina (1998)

found significant difference in favour of portfolio writing. The present study would wish to confirm this claim at the end of the findings.

A summary of the Aspects of Time Pressure Essay Writing and Portfolio Assessment Gained from the Review of Related Literature is presented in the table below.

Table 2.1: Aspects of Portfolio and Time Pressure Writing and Assessment

Aspects of Time Pressure Writing and Assessment	**Aspects of Portfolio Writing and Assessment**
Concept of Time Pressure Writing	**Concept of Portfolio Writing and Assessment**
(a) It is about end product (b) Paper and pencil test (c) Assigns topic (d) Emphasis on Errors (e) Focuses on writing under time and instructions	(a) Systematic collection of students work (b) Emphasis students' learning process (c) Collaborative decision between teacher and student on goal content and scoring criteria (d) Emphasizes holistic assessment
Procedures to be followed in Time Pressure Writing	**Procedure to be followed in Pressured Writing**
(a) Topic is assigned. (b) Students write under time and instructions. (c) The writing is judged for syntactic and lexical accuracy as well as ideational content. (d) Students receive prompt error feedback. (e) Students are asked to make correction in targeted areas.	(1) Development of Students' Portfolio with: (a) Teacher collected materials (b) Students collected materials (c) Goal cards (d) Management tools (2) Development of Show-case Portfolio
Procedure to follow in marking Time Pressure Writing	**Procedure to follow in marking Portfolio Writing**
Marking Indices	**Marking Indices**
Analytic and holistic	**Analytic and holistic**
Strength of Time Pressure Writing Assessment	**Strength of Portfolio Writing Assessment**
(1) It is easy to use with large class. (2) It is easier to grade. (3) Trains students to write under critical conditions. (4) It addresses the issue of reliability.	(1) Emphasizes strength (2) Emphasizes process (3) Connects learning, assessment and instruction. (4) Recognizes individual differences (5) Learner-centred (6) Stresses idea development
Weakness of Time Pressure Writing and Assessment	**Weakness of Portfolio Writing**
(1) It can only assess certain writing skills. (2) It is teacher-centred. (3) It does not encourage self-evaluation. (4) It does not consider individual differences. (5) It focuses on product alone. (6) It discourages students from developing passion for writing. (7) It attaches importance to teacher corrected papers but not peer feedback.	(1) It is time consuming. (2) It is difficult to manage. (3) Low inter-rater reliability agreement (4) It is expensive to implement. (5) Students may copy other work. (6) It has no standardized content. (7) It does not teach writing under adverse situation.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents research methodology used in the study. The chapter comprises the following: research design, population for the study, sample and sampling procedure, instruments for the study, validation of the instruments, pilot study, method and procedure for data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

A quasi-experiment was used in this study. It was considered appropriate because the study involved quasi-experimentation of groups and data in a natural setting and homogenous population.

3.2 Population of the Study

The population for this study consisted of three arms of Senior Second School Two (SSS II) Students of Government Secondary School Malumfashi, Katsina State, Nigeria. This school was chosen because it enrolls students from all over the State with varied socio-economic backgrounds. This ensures fair representation of students' backgrounds.

The school had four (4) English Language Teachers at the SSS level of the school and one hundred and sixty-eight (168) SSS students in the school.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Procedure

All three arms of SSS II of the school were used due to their small number and to ensure fair representation. From the one hundred and sixty-eight students (168), 84 were sampled because half size was found appropriate for sampling according to Ferguson (1965). The 84 sampled students were then given a pre-test to ensure homogeneity. A post-test was then undertaken by the subjects to see whether the experimental treatment was effective.

3.4 Instruments for Data Analysis

Research instrument for this study was students written essays. The time pressure writing group engaged in writing strictly under time pressure procedure while the portfolio writing group engaged in writing under portfolio writing procedures (Yates, 1983; Murray, 1978 and Zamel, 1987, and that of Newman, Smolen and Lee, 1985; Barton and Colin, 1997). The writing exercise was done on Mondays and Wednesdays each week for three months. The last essay written in each month for each student from the time pressure group was taken as a sample. As for the portfolio group, each student selected his best one essay, with its draft, at the end of each month. This means that at end of the three months, each student from both groups produced three writing samples each representing the first, second and third writing months. These three samples for each student in both groups were evaluated by scores, using Vermont's (1989) Analytic Assessment Guide for Writing and Kentucky's (2001) Holistic Guide for Writing Assessment. Altogether, the topics covered during the three months writing

exercise for both groups represented WAEC content areas, and based on descriptive, narrative, expository, persuasive and letter writing.

3.5 Validation of Instruments

After the three-day training on how to rate the students' writing analytically and holistically, inter-rater reliability was calculated and found to be 0.625 for time pressure writing rating and 0.65 for portfolio writing. Both time pressure writing and portfolio writing inter-rater reliability were therefore significant.

As for content validity of the instrument, all the twelve topics used represented the West African Examination Council's essay contents (descriptive, expository, narrative, persuasive ad letter writing). The face validity was satisfactory since English language teachers were consulted for scrutinizing the topics and they testified clarity.

3.6 Procedure for Data Collection

The following procedures were followed in collecting data for the study.

1. The 84 sampled group was first given a pre-test to ensue homogeneity in their ability level based on which comparative writing growth between the groups was made after treatments.
2. The number of subjects (84) was grouped into two classes with equal number thus: Time pressure writing (TPW) class and portfolio writing (PW) class- TPW 42: PW 42.

3. The two research assistants, who were given the training, undertook the treatment of the group respectively.

4. For the students in TPW group, students engaged in time pressure writing procedure on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays every week. Topics were assigned by the teacher, and students intensively wrote assess in forty-five (45) minutes of concentrated writing time. Writing products were subjected to error corrections by the teacher who focused on those errors regarded as important such as grammatical mistake, mechanical and organization. Students were directed to focus on avoiding those errors in their next writing sample. Dialogue was not established between teacher and students. Again, writing as a social process was not allowed since discussion and grouping among the student was strictly prohibited during the writing period.

Students in portfolio group (PW), on the other hand, engaged in regular writing activities on the same days and time as those in TPW group. Here, they selected topics and could write for as long as they wanted. The writing was not subjected to error corrections, but the teacher responded to each student's writing with written comments such as, are these the only reasons for so so….? Why so so? They were required to respond to the comments in writing, thus creating dialogues between themselves and the teacher. Students in PW group were also encouraged to help one another, share drafts and plan their essays in small groups.

5. Friday was used for comments and dialogues between the teacher and students.
6. Out of the twelve writing samples of each student writing, generated by the weekly sample for three months, three writing samples representing the first, second and third months respectively.

3.7 Pilot Study

To have a trial test of time pressured writing and portfolio writing test instruments, a pilot study was conducted in a neighbouring town, Funtua, Katsina State. The study used sixteen (16) students of Government Secondary School Funtua for three days. The school enrolls students from all over Katsina State indiscriminately, which allowed for fair representation of socio-economic and educational backgrounds. The sample was used to gauge difficulties that might arise using limited number of subject and whether the quality of the test items would be restricted by its size in producing different results. Six week duration was to give way to possible " changes in result" in a longer study.

The study compared Time Pressure writing with the portfolio writing and assessment. The study examined two types of writing quality in weekly writing samples from 6 students (3TPW and 3PW treatment groups), randomly divided in two. The t-test independent statistics was used to calculate effect over time and to compare groups.

From the two types of scores derived from students writing (analytic and holistic ratings), students showed significant improvement both in analytic and

holistic ratings, and only by TPW students. The pilot study was intended to validate the instrument.

3.8 Method and Procedure for Data Analysis

This study employed t-test independent (Fleiss, 1987) to test the first, second and third hypotheses.

Here is an example of two students' (PTW & PW) real life writing script developed for comparative effectives (from the pilot study). The time pressure script was assessed using analytic and holistic rating indices. In the same manner, the portfolio script too was assessed using both analytic and holistic indices. The TPW and PW samples together with the rating scales are presented in appendix I. The scores obtained from the students' writing samples, indicated that time pressure writing students showed better improvement both in analytic and holistic ratings, than the portfolio students.

Table 3.1 indicates analytic guide for writing assessment.

Table 3.1: Analytical Assessment Table

Mark		Assessment Criteria	TPW Student's Score obtained	PW Student's Score obtained
		Purpose The degree to which the writer's response		
2	A	Establishes and maintains a clear purpose	1.5	1
2	B	Demonstrates an awareness of audience and task	2	1
1	C	Exhibits clarity of ideas	1	.5
		Organization The degree to which the writer's response illustrates		
3	A	Unity	2	1.5
2	B	Coherence	1	1.5
5		**Details** The degree to which details are appropriate for the writer's purpose and support main points of the writer's responses	3	2
5		**Voice/Tone** The degree to which the writer's response reflects personal investment and expression	3	1.5
		Using/Mechanics/Grammar The degree to which the writer's response exhibits correct		
2	A	Usage (e.g., tense formation agreement, word choice)	1	1
1	B	Mechanics (e.g., spelling, capitalization, punctuation)	1	.5
1	C	Grammar	.5	.5
1	D	Sentence Structure	.5	.5
The total Score is 25, each criterion comprising 5 marks			16.5	11.5

The table represents the analytic marking result of a pressured student and a portfolio student. The pressure student scored 16.5 over 25, while the portfolio student scored 11.5 over 25.

Table 3.2 indicates holistic guide for writing assessment.

Table 3.2: Holistic Assessment Table

	Criteria	TPW Student's Score Obtained	PW Student's Score obtained	Marks
		TPW	PW	
1.	Purpose/Audience	4	2	5
2.	Idea Development	3	4	5
3.	Sentence	3	3	5
4.	Language	3	3	5
	Total	13	12	20
	The total score is 20, each criterion comprising 5 marks			

The table represents the holistic marking result of a pressure student and a portfolio student. The pressure student scored 13 over 20, while the portfolio student scored 11 over 20.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 Introduction

The data for this study are presented, analyzed and interpreted in this chapter. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to portray the pattern of distributions of scores for analysis. This is based on the null hypotheses stated (1.5) that the presentation of data was made. The standard contingency tables are used to show means, percentages, the standard deviations and t-test. The level of significance adopted for all tests of hypotheses in the study is a = 0.05. Qualitative data were analyzed in order to prove the results of the quantitative data.

4.1 Time Pressure Writing and its Effect on Students Performance

This section highlights data collected in respect of the pressure writing and its effect on students' writing performance. This is presented in phases to show the levels and variations in students' performance.

4.1.1 Pressured writing and Students' Performance by Phases

Table 4.1 presents the overall analytic and holistic scores of pressure writing students' group. By analytic scores, we mean scores obtainable based on writing components and holistic indicates scores obtainable from the general effect of the writing.

Table 4.1

A Summary of Pressured Group's Overall Analytic and Holistic Scores.

Overall Students' Scores	*Phase I*		*Phase II*		*Phase III*	
	Avrg Score	%	Avrg Score	%	Avrg Score	%
Analytic scores	*50.69*	*49.15*	*49.86*	*48.53*	*48.93*	*48.58*
Holistic Scores	52.48	50.88	52.88	51.47	51.79	51.42
Total	103.14	100	102.74	100	100.72	100

Table 4.1 indicates that the pressure group started well in their analytic performance at the first phase but deteriorated a little in the second and third phases (for example in phase I 50.49: 49.15%, phase II 49.86: 8.93% and phase III 48.93: 48.58%). This contrasts with the group's holistic performance which indicates higher achievement though with a slight decline, from 52.48 (50.88%), to 52.88 (51.42%), and then 51.79 (51.42%) in the first second and third phases respectively.

4.1.2 Portfolio Writing and Students' Performance by Phase

Table 4.2 presents the overall analytic and holistic scores of the portfolio writing students' group.

Table 4.2

A Summary of Overall Analytic and Holistic Scores of Portfolio Writing Group

Overall Students' Scores	*Phase I*		*Phase II*		*Phase III*	
	Avrg Score.	%	Avrg Score	%	Avrg Score	%
Analytic scores	*43.60*	*48.95*	*71.67*	*53.31*	*74.88*	*52.16*
Holistic Scores	45.47	51.05	63.38	46.93	68.38	47.84
Total	89.07	100	135.05	100	142.93	100

The portfolio writing group, as indicated in Table 4.2, started not too impressively with 43.60 (48.95%) average analytic score in Phase 1. However, the trend was overtaken with general progression in Phase II with 71.67 (53.31%) average analytic score and Phase III, 74.88 (52.16%).

The overall total analytic and holistic average scores for pressure group in Phases II (102.74 33.51%: Table 4.1) and III (100.72 32.85%) contrast negatively with the portfolio group's Phase II (135.05 36.80%: Table 4.2) and Phase III 142.93 (38.94%) scores. It is only in phase 1 that pressure group performed higher than the portfolio.

4.1.3 Portfolio and Pressure Writing Students' Performance by Phases

Table 4.3 presents the overall analytic and holistic scores of pressure and portfolio writing students' groups combined.

Table 4.3

Overall analytic and holistic scores of pressure and portfolio writing students' groups for Phase I, II and III.

Overall Students' Scores	*Phase I*		*Phase II*		*Phase III*	
	Avrg Score.	%	Avrg Score	%	Avrg Scor	%
Analytic scores						
Pressure	*50.69*	*26.37*	*49.86*	*20.97*	*48.93*	*20.08*
Portfolio	43.60	22.68	71.67	30.14	74.55	30.60
Holistic Scores						
Pressure	52.48	27.30	52.88	22.24	51.79	21.26
Portfolio	45.47	23.65	63.38	26.65	68.38	28.06
Total	192.24	100	237.79	100	243.65	100

In Table 4.3, portfolio group ranked highest in Phase II (71.67: 30.14%) and Phase III (74.55: 30.60%) analytically. It was only in Phase One that portfolio did not rank highest in the analytic rating (Phase I, 43.60: 22.68%, Phase II, 71.67: 30.14% and Phase III, 74.55: 30.60%) analytically Table 4.3. As for the holistic rating, portfolio group ranked highest in Phase II (63.38: 26.65%) and Phase III (68.38:28.06%). Again, it was only in Phase One that the group did not rank highest. The result showed that pressured group only appeared highest in Phase One in analytic rating (50.69: 26.37%) and Phase One in holistic rating (52.48: 27.30%), but retrogressed in the other phases. This means that as the treatment was being prolonged, the portfolio group progressed while the pressure group's performance dropped.

4.2 Time Pressure Writing and Students' Performance

The Null Hypothesis One States:

Writing under pressure has no significant effect on students' writing performance analytically and holistically.

The data were subjected to t-test and the result presented in Table 4.4 below for both the analytic and holistic ratings of the pressure group's writing in phases.

Table 4.4. A t-test analysis of the pressure group's analytic score.

Table 4.4

a. A t-test Analysis of the Pressure Group's Analytic Score

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE	T-cal	Df	t-critical	P
Pressure Analytical Score	42	48.93	1.94	.63137	1.906	124	1.658	000

The pressure group's analytic score showed that writing under pressure had significant effect on students' writing performance because the t-cal was greater than the t-critical, that is 1.906 >1.1658 at p = 0.0001. This means that the hypothesis that state that writing under pressure had no significant effect on students' analytic writing performance was disconfirmed.

Table 4.5

b. A t-test Analysis of the Pressured Group's Holistic Score

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE	T-cal	Df	t-critical	P
Pressure Holistic Score	42	51.79	2.21	1.63129	1.311	127	1.658	.256

For the pressure group's holistic score, the t-cal of 1.311 was less than the t-critical value of 1.658 at P = 0.256. This means that writing under pressure had no significant effect on students' holistic writing performance. The hypothesis

stating that writing under time pressure had no significant effect on students holistic writing performance was confirmed.

A student of a high written performance level from the pressure writing group was found to have committed a number of errors (5) at Phase I. The error increased to (10) at Phase II and (20) at Phase III. Some of these errors in terms of types and gravity are illustrated with the example I below:

> *It is not good for a person to smoke in a place where people gather to gether having refreshment or doing their various physical activities; when you smoke in public they are various illness and diseases that the people around that place may inhail, for example the disease of the lungs which this smoking cause, it damages persons lungs and what next will happen, you will tell me that at the end it result to death of one person.*

At Phase I, following are the errors observed in the extract above, at the lexical, grammatical., mechanical and organization levels.

(a) "….*where people gather together having…*"

"get together" would have been better expression.

(b) "…*when you smoke in public they are various…*", instead of "there are various…"

At the grammatical level, below are the errors observed.

(a) "….*the disease of the lungs which smoking cause…*"

Instead of … which smoking causes.

(b) "….*at the end it result to death…*" instead of "it results…"

At the mechanical level, punctuation errors were noted in:

(a) "…*their various physical activities, when you smoke…*"

There should have been a full-stop after "activities".

At Phase II extract 2 is used to prove the incremental profile of errors committed by the same student in terms of types, gravity and frequency. The number of errors rose from 5 in Phase I to 10 in Phase II.

> *They are various and different type of cell phones in Nigeria the one I want to talk about is the Nokia product. Cell phones are device that are use in communication. Nokia is one of the populest type of cell phone in the whole world. It is very hard and many people prefer using this type of phone.*
> *Nokia has several types which are use in communication and it is the hardest of all types of c ellphone. This cell phones differs and you can get anyone you like if you have access to it. for example they are . This cell phones differs and you like if you have access to it. For example they are this types of Nokia that serves like a computer.*

At the lexical level, the following errors emerged.

(a) They are various and different types of cell phones in Nigeria.

"…There" are various…." "there" is the correct lexical form.

(b) Nokia is one the populist type of…". "Recognized" would have been better lexical alternate.

(c) "…it is the hardest of all…". "Strongest" could replace hardest in this context.

Grammatically, errors were noticed in the following:

(a) Cell phones are device that are use in communication.

It should be: cell phones are devices that are used in…"

(b) This cell phones differs and…". This should be:

These cell phones differ and…

(c) For example they are this types of Nokia that serves.

"…there are these types of Nokia that serve as…" is the correct form.

(d) There are different type of cell phone…, "there are different types…"

At the mechanical level, problem in punctuation appeared in

(a) "….different types of cell phones in Nigeria the one I want to…"

A full-stop should have been placed after "Nigeria".

At discourse organization level, the following problems were observed in the wiring.

(a) Problem with cohesion was observe between the first and second sentence. The two ideas are different.

(b) Idea packaging is poor as the second paragraph discusses types of Nokia phone, its uses, its physical quality, quality status among phones, availability, difference and general computer function.

In Phase III, 20 errors surfaced as against 10 errors recorded in Phase II. Extract 3 below is used to illustrate the error types gravity and frequency.

> *First of all you will have to find a pot and set it on fire. After that, put your oil the amount you want live it until it get hot then put your chop tomatoes, onions and pepper inside and allow it to fry. After frying it put the quantity of water you will need and allow it to boils all together in the pot. When the water has been boiled wash your rice the quantity you want very well, stain it and put it in that boiling hot water that is in he pot. Add your spices just after putting that water that is before putting your, rice into the food. Allow it until it has been cooked. Put it down from the fir, put it in flask and it is ready now to be serve to every one. It will taste delicious provided you have follow this basic rules I have write in preparing.*

At the lexical level, errors were found in:

(a) First of all you will have to find a pot and…" instead of "get a pot to…"

(b) "…and then put your chop onion.." instead of put the sliced onions.

(c) "…rice… stain it and…. It should be drain it, not stain.

(d) "…before putting your rice into the food. Into the pot and not food.

(e) For …quantity of water you want….. Volume of water you want… is more acceptable.

At the grammatical level, errors continue to develop as shown below:

(a) ….until it get hot… "gets hot" is the correct version.

(b) …allow it to fry… It should be "allow it to get fried".

(c) When the water has been boiled… It should be "when the water is boiled.

(d) …after putting that water that is before putting your rice…

It should be taken as … in the water before the rice.."

(e) Put it down from the fire, put it in the flask…

It could be taken as "bring the pot down, and put the food in the flask".

(f) …it is now ready to be serve. It should be "ready to be served.

(g) …provided you have follow this basic…, instead of "have followed".

(h) …I have write. It is "I have written".

(i) …until it has been cooked. It should be "until it is cooked".

The mechanical aspect of the writing was faulty in:

(a) After frying it put the… There should be a comma after "it".

(b) ….the amount you want live it until… There should be a comma after "want" or an "and".

(c) Leave was wrongly spelt as live in (b) above.

(d) When the water has been boiled wash… A comma is needed after "boiled".

Discourse organization was found to be weak in:

(a) Idea packaging. The three ideas jumbled in the paragraph could have been broken into three paragraph or two.

(b) Poor utilization of listing word. “First of all” was not allowed by “secondly”, “thirdly” etc.

A student of a moderate written performance level was found to have committed less number of errors (7) at Phase I. The errors are illustrated in terms of types and gravity using example 1 below:

> *Smoking is a act of wasting money because the cigarette does not help the smokers nor does it help them to develop their body but destroys the heart. Most smokers just want to see them blowing smoke in the air they see it as a way that they can impress people.*
> *Some said, that cigrete is ment for those that live in snow places like greek, Russia etc that it will make their heart worm but in my own opinion it destroys the heart, most people ask why do they produce it and worn that “smokers-die young” by the federal ministry of health, they answered this question by saying it cools the mind, and the heart, when he/she smoke they will cool their mind and relax.*

At Phase I, lexical section was a problem to the writer for example, in paragraph one above:

(1) Smoking is a act of wasting money…

Instead of “smoking is an act of wasting money”.

(2) Most smokers just want to see them blowing smoke…

Instead of using reflexive pronoun “most smokers just want to see themselves”.

(3) …. They see it as a way that the can impress people.

Instead of “they see it as a way of impressing people.

At the grammatical level, the organization of the sentence was poor. In the first paragraph, this deficiency is illustrated using the sentence:

(4) Most smokers just want to see them blowing smoke in the air they see it as a way that they can impress people.

Lack of a full-stop after “air” makes the meaning not easily accessible.

Punctuation problems disturbed the grammar of the writing as indicated above, spelling mistakes such as:

(5) “Cigarrates” instead of c*igarette* was found at the first phase.

(6) Capitalization error was found in “*greece*”, instead of “Greece”.

(7) Discourse organization was not satisfactory at phase one. Idea packaging was poor. Paragraph one did not introduce the idea of public smoking and the position of the writer about it. instead, it started with a judgmental statement. The second paragraph did not discuss the reason for he position of the writer toward the topic.

> *Phone was described by the English man was a “GLOBAL SYSTEM FOR MOBILE COMMUNICATION”. But by the nigerian man it describes it as a general street madness. He described it by this because on the streets you will see people answering calls and shouting, he says that they make sound pollution. And you will see many people driving and answering on the main road and they cause locomotion or accident.*
> *But for me I prefer the English man definition because its only a system for communication not a street madness.*

In Phase II, the same student indicated further deterioration in his lexical, grammatical, mechanical and discourse use. This was reflected in the higher number of errors committed as opposed to lower number of errors in phase I.

(1) "Nigerian" as a common noun, is capitalized in its first letter, and not "nigerian".

(2) But the Nigerian man it describes it as…

"It" is not supposed to be there at all. It is not a correct pronoun for a human being where a pronoun for a human being is required.

(3) *"… they cause locomotion or accident".*

"Locomotion " is a wrong word. "Commotion" would have been better.

(4) "Its" only a system for communication not…", instead of it is only a system…

At the mechanical perspective of the writing, punctuation seemed to be the major problem.

After it boils… its okay. A comma is needed after "boils".

(5) It "selfs" money instead of "it saves money"

(6) *….they make sound pollution". "cause" sound pollution* is better used.

At the grammatical level, the student did not show any improvement in his grammar in Phase II of the writing

(7) Deterioration in the length of the sentence retarded the grammatical process of achieving meaning. For example:

Cell phone is mobile, portable and unique it be carried to anywhere without obstruction it help people.

(8) ….*communication not a street madness.* "a" is not needed in the expression.

Mechanical errors were found in almost every sentence of the paragraph. For example,

(9) *Cell phone is mobile, portable and unique it be carried to anywhere without obstruction it help people.* A full-stop after "unique" would have divided the sentence into two meaningful parts.

(10) Discourse organization became worse at Phase II. The writer confused the idea of describing cell phone with the danger posed by the misuse of cell phone in the first paragraph.

(11) The second paragraph continued with the definition issue instead of discussing physical features of a cell phone and subsequent functions of it.

In Phase III, the errors committed by the same student rose to 18 as against 11 errors in Phase II and 7 in Phase I. The increment in error types and gravity is illustrated using extract 3 below:

> *When preparing jelof rice if it is with chicken or fish with vegetable the following ingredients must be available: Rice, chicken or fish, oil, onions, vegetables, peppe, salt, tomota sauce, water, and spices*
> *Firstly, when I will prepare this jelof rice, I will pour oil on the pot then put on the stove, when the oil is hot then I will bring my fish or mat and put inside, when it has start to fry then I would put my tomattoe sauce after 1 minute the will pour water that will be enough to cook the quantity of rie I want to cook. After it boils that is After5 minutes I will bring my already washed rice and put inside, when it is nearly dane then I will put my spices and salt and stair it very well then taste if every its okay.*

> *After 2 minutes when it is done then I would put it done and then food is served.*

At the lexical level, below are the errors noticed in extract 3 of the student's writing.

(1) *"I will pour oil on the pot"* instead of *"in the pot"*.

(2) *… then taste if every its okay,* instead of

"…everything is okay".

(3) *I would put it done*, instead of *I will put it down.*

With regards to grammar, the following errors were observed:

(4) *…when I will prepare this jellof rice.* The expression could be taken as:

when preparing jellof rice….

(5) *….when it is nearly done. "nearly cooked"* would have been better.

At the mechanical level perspective of the writing, punctuation seemed to be the major problem. Ideas and expressions were not separated. For example:

> "*After it boils that is after 5 minutes I will bring my already washed rice and put inside when it is nearly done then I will put my spices and salt and stair it very well then taste it every its okay"*

(6) *…when it has start to fry…"* instead of *when it has started to get fried or when it starts getting fried.*

(7) *I would put if down,* instead of *I will put it down*

(8) The underlined then indicated over repetition of the word.

(9) *After it boils that is after 5 minutes.* The underlined phrase indicates wordiness. It is not necessary.

Punctuation problems continued in Phase III. For example

(10) A comma after “5 minutes” or “boils” is missing.

(11) A full-stop after “put inside” is needed.

Spelling mistake was found in

(12) Stain for stir.

At the discourse level, the writing was characterized with shortcomings in:

(13) Introducing the idea of Jellof Rice; it all started with “ingredients” straight-forwardly.

(14) The body of the essay was unstructured, it was compacted.

(15) The conclusion was made up of only a sentence of two lines.

(16) There was no coherence in the writing. For example, “firstly, when I…” but there was no “secondly”, as expected.

(17) The whole write-up became short as compared to Phases I and II.

(18) Idea development eventually became poorer.

In all three phases, the facts emerging from the qualitative data seemed to buttress the findings of the statistical or quantitative data which stated that writing under pressure has no significant effect on students’ writing performance.

Retrogression in writing performance was observed in scripts of the pressure group students at the low written performance level. A total of seven (7) errors was found in the written essay of the student at Phase I. This increased to eleven (11) error types and frequency in Phase II, and seventeen (17) errors in Phase III. The incremental profile of the errors is illustrated with the analysis of the three extracts culled from the scripts (paragraphs) at the three different phases.

> *"To smoke in public places is a very bad habit for each and everyone of us. First and foremost smoking is a very bad habit. It spoit our reputation. and every essential personalities".*
> *To smoke in public places is not good because it pollute the environment. It make people look down on you as an irresponsible person, someone with no future ambition.*

At the lexical level, the student exhibited misunderstanding of compound words as single words that are not separated. Places of initial letter capitalization were equally misunderstood by the student. For example:

(a) *"… is a very bad habit for every one…",* instead of everyone

(b) *"it spoit our reputation". "and every Essentiat"* instead of "It spoil our reputation. And every essential…"

(c) *"It make people …"* (paragraph 2) instead of "It makes people…"

At the grammatical level, problem with subject verbs agreement was observed as in:

(d) *it spoit our …* instead of It spoils…"

(e) "It spoils our reputation and…" There shouldn't be full-stop between "reputation" and "and" since the "and" links the two related idea of the sentence to make it one.

At the level of discourse organization, idea development and idea packaging were found to be poor as indicated below, respectively.

(a) The idea of smoking as bad habit in the first sentence should have been developed by subsequent sentence in the paragraph. The writer repeated it instead.

(b) The student could not defend his reason of the "smoking polluting the environment". Instead, he abandoned that idea and followed the sentence with a different one "peoples looking down on smoker".

(c) There was no articulatory coherence between the two paragraphs.

To prove that the errors increased substantially at Phase II, the following extract 2 is used.

> *It is very beautiful phone and rectangle in shape and also a big phone which each and every one of us will like to have.*
> *The cell phone actually is mainly use for making calls, texting meassages, receiang calls and so on. not only that the phone is a camera phone.*
> *The screen of the phone is a very large and the button for operating is very small which if you are not carefull will mistakely destory it. the phone has a pen calibrator which is also use for operating if only you can't operate with the button and also calibrator in which you use in watching television programmes on the phone and also listen the fm radio if you wish o and also listen to music which you have recorded in the memory card of he phone through the phone.*

At the lexical level, the following are errors observed:

(a) "… it is a beautiful phone and rectangle in shape…"

It should have been rectangular since it is an adjectival comparison.

(b) The screen of the phone is a very large….

"a" is not needed.

At the grammatical level, sentence segmentation became the basic problem of the writing. The whole paragraph one is one sentence joined by repetitive "and" (three times).

(c) The sentence *"the phone has …."* Is not correct because it was not broken into meaningful parts. It should have been arranged into sentences containing individual ideas like:

(i) The phone having calibrator used for operating it.

(ii) The idea of antenna and its function in the phone.

(d) *"The phone has a pen calibrator which is also <u>use</u> for …"*, "use" should be "used" past participle because of the preceding verb to be "is".

(e) *"… can derive antenna from the phone … in which you use in whatching…"* The repetition of "in" makes the meaning of the sentence unclear.

(f) "… and also listen the radio if…."

"to" is missing after "listen".

At the mechanical level, the student exhibited further deterioration in his use of punctuation as shown in the paragraph above "Watching" was wrongly spelt as "whatching".

(g) "not only that the phone is a camera phone".

A comma should have been placed after "that" and "n" in "not" should be capitalized (N) since it is the beginning of the sentence.

At the discourse level, shortcomings were noticed in these areas:

(h) The paragraphs are poorly structured. Paragraph one and two are too small. Paragraph three needed to have been broken into two.

(i) Ideas were not well packaged as indicated in paragraph three.

(j) Ideas were not developed as related parts of the proposition.

In Phase III the students' writing errors became worst as revealed in the analysis of extract 3 below:

> *To start with frist af all you perboil your rice, after that you wash the rice and keep it in a sieving pan. In doing that put your frying pan or pot in us in perboiling your rice on fire, put the quantity of oil you want and allow it on the fire for few seconds and pour your onions which you will fry and then the tomatoes will now be poured and then after add the essential ingredient to make the food for palatable and delicious, which is your nutmeg, curry chicken seasoning, pepper, magi, after this turn the stew and taste if it is to your taste you continue turning the stew when ok. Before every every your meat or fish have been boiled so you pour the water into the pot of stew. If not enough add a little and allow to boil. then pour your rice and allow it for 3 – 5 minutes, and bring it down, it is now ready to consume.*

The extract above indicated accumulated errors that resulted in an unilleligible text product. The paragraphs should have been broken into sentences with ideas like:

(a) Parboiling the rice first;

(b) Washing it and the reason for that;

(c) Frying the ingredients;

(d) Adding the seasoning; and discussing the timing for all this.

Spelling mistakes were found in:

(a) "*frist*" for "first"

(b) "*Perboil*" instead of parboil

Poor wording was also observed in:

(a) In doing that instead of having done that

(b) "*… allow it on the fire for few seconds and poured and …*"

(c) Poured is grammatically wrong, it should be pour since the action was not denoting past.

Punctuation errors were many in the extract.

(d) A comma was needed after "*To start with, …*".

(e) Another comma was missing after *"In doing that"*,

(f) A full-stop should have been placed after "*…allow it on fire for few seconds…."*

(g) Another full-stop should have been used after "*…for palatable and delicious"*.

At the discourse level, the student exhibited a retarded discourse organization observed in the extract.

(h) No idea linkage between sentence was found.

(i) Referent and antecedents were not observed.

(j) "To start with, first of all" was seen, but "secondly" did not follow any where in the text.

Successive retardation that emerged from the qualitative data from Phase I to Phase III of the students' writing further support the statistical or quantitative data which stated that writing under pressure has no significant effect on students' writing performance.

4.3 Portfolio Writing and Students' Performance

Null hypothesis Two States:

Portfolio writing has no significant effect on students' writing performance analytically and holistically.

To test the null hypothesis, the t-test was used. The summary of the computation is contained in Tables 4.6 and 4.7.

Table 4.6

a. A t-test Analysis of the Portfolio Group's Analytic Score.

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE	T-cal	t-critical	P
Pressure Analytical Score	42	74.55	2.34	1.5089	1.906	1.658	.000

The portfolio group's analytic score shows that writing under pressure had significant effect on students' writing performance because the t-cal was greater than the t-critical, that is 1.906 >1.1658 at p = 0.0001. This means that the hypothesis that writing under pressure has no significant effect on students' analytic writing performance was disconfirmed.

Table 4.7

b. A t-test Analysis of the Portfolio Group's Holistic Score

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE	T-cal	t-critical	P
Pressure Holistic Score	42	65.38	1.56	.8976	13.31	1.658	.000

For the portfolio group's holistic score, the t-cal of 13.31 was greater than the t-critical value of 1.658 at P = 0.0001. This means that portfolio writing had significant effect on students' holistic writing performance. The hypothesis stating that portfolio writing had no significant effect on students' holistic writing performance was disconfirmed.

The significant effect of portfolio writing on students' performance was further buttressed using extracts of high level performance portfolio writing students to show positive progress in the development of the writer's lexical, mechanical, grammatical and discourse repertoire. For example, in Phase I, 12 errors were found in the written essay of the high performance student. This number of errors decreased in quantity and quality to 5 in Phase II. A further decrease was noticed in Phase III as the number of the errors became three (3). The following extracts, from the essays of the same students are used to illustrate this decreasing profile of the quality and quantity of the student's errors across the phases.

In Phase I, at the lexical, the student's lexical knowledge and manipulation was limited. For example the writer wrote:

> *In addition the smoke brings damage to some of our internal environment for example, the heart, the liver and the kidney and most of them know and they will not regulate it.*
> *Although the can't see there internal environment but they use to here about it infections by the doctors.*
> *There mouth use to be black, there hands even their legs too and it doesn't shake them_they continue except when god (almighty) help them – and they too help their selves, they will stop.*

(1) The word "brings" is an inappropriate one and could be replaced by "cause" to make ".. the smoke causes…"

(2) "internal environment could be substituted with better lexical alternate orgnans to make, "… some of our internal organs

(3) The underlined "and" above is better replaced with but since the context is for contrast, to make "… most them know but they will not…"

(4) "…*it infections by doctors*", instead of its infection as a possessive pronoun. "by" should be replaced by "from" since we say "hear from" so so person.

(5) "… *and they too help their selves*". Firstly, the two words are written as one word theirselves where applicable. Secondly, themselves is more appropriate in this context.

At the grammatical level, "but" is not needed in "…*see their internal environment but they…"* instead, a comma should replace it.

(6) "… they continue except when god (Almighty) help them and they too help…. they will stop". The construction is wrong. It should be: they will not stop.

(7) The underlined help should be helps. It is a problem with subject-verb agreement. The mechanical errors of the student are evidence in:

(8) "In addition the smoke brings…" A comma is needed after "addition thus, "in addition, the smoke…"

(9) "*There mouth use to be black, there hands even their legs too, and it doesn't ….*"

There suppose to be a full-stop after "too" since what follows is a new idea.

(10) "Their" was wrongly spelt as there

"*smoking*" was wrongly spelt as smooking.

At the discourse level, the student indicated inability to package ideas properly.

(11) The first paragraph was too brief and did not discuss public smoking but smoking in general.

(12) Ideas are not developed using inter-sentence connection.

At Phase II extract no 2 from the student's essay reveals decrease in the number of errors committed.

> *Jallof rice is a type of meal that is made of rice. It is easy to prepare and does not need costly ingredient, importantly, it does not take too much time. jallof rice is common food but it has a lot of vitamins, protein and other thing important to our body.*
> *When you want to prepare jallof rice you have to get ingredient s that include things like rice, oil, meat, vegetables, salt, peper, tomatoes and magi. Make sure that each ingredients is good so that it will not cause poor taste to the food. Whatever is needed wash, make use you wash it very well before you start to use.*
> *After everything is available, cut the onion into slices, peper, and the vegetables. Put the pot on fire and then put some oil for some time. When it is hot then you put the ingredients and fry. It is now time to pour some water and allow to boil with the meat.*

In Phase II, the following errors were noticed in the student's script.

(a) "*… a lot of vitamins, proteins and other thing important to our body*".

The underlined thing should be things.

(b) "Things" is a weak word "nutrients" can replace.

(c) "*make sure that each ingredients is good…*"

The underlined do not agree in number, subject and verb. It should be "each ingredient is good …"

(d) "*… cut the onion into slice, pepper and the vegetables*".

The correct arrangement should be "cut the onion, pepper and the vegetables into slices".

(e) Pepper is wrongly spelt as peper.

At Phase III, the number of errors committed by the same student further reduced to the minimal level as buttressed by the extract number 3 below:

> *In addition, the person infected with AIDS becomes very sad with his life. This is true because exept if God helps him he will dies quickly. People will hate him at home, friend and the community. If he is married man the wife can leave him and the children will not respect him.*
> *The causes of AIDS are three. The first one is through sex with the infected person. The person who is not infected can contact the disease if he has sex with the infected person when somebody not infected is ill and need the blood. The last one is by using razor blade, or sping that the infected person used.*

Problem with lexical selection and grammar featured in in: "a" and "b" below

(a) "*In addition, the person… becomes very sad with his life*". With is better replaced with "in" to make "in his life".

(b) "*… he will dies quickly". Instead of "he will die quickly*"

(c) Somebody ….need … It should be …needs.

Successive decrease in the number of errors across the three phases of the student essay corroborates the statistical findings that portfolio writing has significant effect on students writing performance.

Progress in writing performance was further observed in the scripts of the students of a middle written performance level. At Phase I, 13 errors were found in the essay of the student. This decreased to 4 error types and frequency in Phase II, and 2 in Phase III. The reductive trend of the errors is illustrated with the analysis of the three extracts culled from the scripts of the three different phases.

> *Moreover, there so many ways of doing the smoking, but to mention just a few. It is for sure that self free serration is the total way of survival, also, in extent the parents doesn't matter o take care of there children, that is why some some the children were intrested in smoking.*
> *In conclusion, we have so many ways we can distroy the smoking, because it destroys and spoils our children, of now adays, therefore, discurraging and even erradicating smokers, is the only solution to our health problems.*

Phase I of the student's writing exhibited errors relating to lexicon, grammar, mechanic and discourse. Lexical inappropriateness was observed in:

(a) "… *is the total way of survival, also, in extent,* the parents…."

The word extent is a wrong word choice that could be replaced by essence, to make "in essence".

(b) "*in conclusion … we can destroy the smoking beca*use…"

"*Eradicate*" smoking is better lexical alternate.

(c) "… *even eradicating smokers, is…*"

"…*eradicating smoking…*" is more appropriate.

At the grammatical level, the following errors were noticed:

(a) …there are so many of ways of doing the smoking, but to mention just a few

The underlined phrase does not make sense unless coupled with some expression that will complete the meaning.

(b) So "… *some some the children…*" 'of" is missing before "the" children.

(c) … in extent the parents doesn't matter to take care of …" "doesn't" doesn't agree with its subject "parents". It should be don't, "matter to" is not even needed.

At the mechanical level of the writing, problems with punctuation and spelling were observed.

(a) "*… is the total way of survival, also, in extent parents...*"

A full-stop is needed after survival so that the new idea can commence.

(b) "self – preservation" was wrongly spelt as "self – free servation"

(c) "their" was wrongly spelt as "there"

(d) "erradicating" should be "eradicating" whereas discouraging was wrongly spelt as "discurraging".

(e) "some" was repeated twice in "some some children".

At discourse level, it was found that:

(a) Idea development was missing. The first sentence was not developed.

(b) Likewise the second and the first sentence of the second paragraph.

(c) Cohesion was not found among sentences; as no relationship seem to exist between sentences.

(d) There was no outline of the topic.

Phase II of the same student's writing proves a decrease in error type and frequency as revealed in the following extract.

"*… Road accident is caused by many factors...*"

> *One of the factor that cause accident is careless of the drivers. This careless can be seen in the driver's lack of serionsness in maintaining their vehicles such as the tyres, trafficators and brakes. When this types of*

> *important parts of a car have problem, they can cause accident. For example, if a car's brakes refuse to work, the car can not be stopped and accident can hapen.*

At the lexical level, the word, "careless" in (a) below is wrong and should be "carelessness".

(a) One of the factor that cause road accident is careless.

At the grammatical level, "factor" in (b) below should be factors since "one of" signifies "only one out of more than one"

(b) "one of he factor that cause…"

(c) When this types of …" "this" should be "these" the plural of "this" since "types" is plural.

Mechanically, spelling mistake occurred in

(d) "… and accident can hapen". It should be spelt as "happen".

In Phase III, the errors committed by the same student decreased, to 2 instead of 5 in Phase II. This is buttressed by the following excerpt.

> *My best friend is a girl. Her name is Amina and she lives in Bakori town. Amina, who is Hausa by tribe is tall, fair in complexion and have a smiling face. She is ten years -. She lives with her parents and sisters as a happy family.*

Grammatically, one error surfaced in:

(a) "*Amina, who is … have a smiling face*". "has" should replace have.

(b) She is ten years. It should be completed with "old" to give, ten years old.

The statistical findings indicating portfolio writing having significant effect on students' writing appeared to have been further supported by the facts resulting from the qualitative data in all the three phases analyzed above.

From the scripts of a lower level performance student in the portfolio group, the 13 errors found in Phase I decreased to 4 in Phase II , and 2 were discovered in Phase III.

In Phase I, the following extract illustrates error types, their gravity and frequency.

> *Smoking in a public places of an entire people is not good, because it is full of so many armful things to the people and it is one of the dangerous infection that was brought by the tabacco company.*
> *Also it is not important to the people, it only distroy their body. And some of the people are been infected, expecialy the seek people and some other people in the country were been infected by smoking of ciggeret.*
> *It was dicorered by the scientiee that smoking is a very bad things that distroyed part of the body expecially the lung and you can also known smoker by lips, face and other part of the body.*

At the lexical level, the following problems were observed in the script.

(a) "… *it is full "armful"* …". The Correct word is harmful.

(b) "*And some of the people are been infected…*". The corrected word is being.

At the grammatical level, errors were found in

(a) "*Smoking in a public places of an entire* …". It should be a public place or public places.

(b) "… *and you can also known smokers by* …". It should be "you can also know smokers by ….".

(c) "…*smoking is a very bad things that* …". It should be "… smoking is a very bad thing that destroys…"

At the mechanical level, spelling and punctuation mistakes were noticed in:

(a) Distroy instead of destroy

(b) Expecially instead of especially

(c) Scientics for scientists

(d) Ciggeret for cigarette

(e) Smoking in a public places … because it is full of … thing and …

A full-stop should be placed after "thing".

The discourse organization of the student was found to be faulty in the following areas:

(a) Idea development-paragraph I was made up of a single sentence having two separate undeveloped ideas.

(b) Each of the three paragraphs was too short to be a paragraph.

(c) The ideas of each paragraph were not properly packaged.

At Phase II, the student's errors became less in number as indicated by the extract below.

> *According to the dictionary plantain porriadge is a type of soft thick food made with a very large banana, but less sweet, that is cooked by boiling oats in milk or water, eaten hot as a vegetable especially for breakfast. I was introduced to it by one of my classmates when I met them at home. The ingredients used in making plantain porriadge is: medium onion, enough pepper, 3 maggi, curry powder, cray-fish, salt, dry fish, palm oil and thyme. They are commonly found in the market, but not to expensive.*

At the lexical level, less problem was encountered by the student in appropriate word selection.

(1) I was introduced to it be one of my classmates when I met them at home one day.

The underlined culled be substituted with "visited him" to make "when I visited him"

Grammatical error was found in:

(2) The ingredients used in making plantain porridge is … "is" is wrongly used. It should be "are" since the subject "ingredients" is plural.

Spelling error was detected in:

(3) They are commonly found … but no to expensive "to" is supposed to be "too" to make too expensive.

At the discourse level in this phase, basic problem was found to be with paragraphing.

(4) "The ingredients used in making…."

This sentence should have been taken as a new paragraph since the new idea of "required ingredients, types and quantity" was to be discussed.

Phase III showed further writing progress by the same student as the number of errors recorded in Phases I and II became minimal.

> *In conclusion, preparing jallof rice is easy and interesting. It is a type of food we can advise people to be cooking in their houses. This is because it is cheap to make and gives a lot of important things to our body.*

Stronger and more appropriate lexical alternates should have been used in:

(a) … a lot of important things to our body. "Nutrients" is more specific in this context than "things".

(b) It is a type of food we can advise people to be cooking in their houses. This can better be expressed as to make stable in their houses.

The observed successive decrease in the number of errors types and gravity, revealed by the qualitative data across the three phases supports the findings of the quantitative data that portfolio writing has significant effect on students' written English performance.

4.4 Time Pressure Writing and Portfolio Writing Compared

Null Hypothesis Three States:

There is no significant difference in the students' writing performance under pressured and portfolio writing analytically and holistically.

To test the null hypothesis, paired sample t-test was used. The summary of the computation is contained in Tables 4.8 and 4.9.

Table 4.8

A paired sample t-test of Time Pressure and Portfolio Groups' Analytic Scores

Table 4.8

A paired t-test Analysis of the Pressured and Portfolio Groups' Analytic score.

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE	T-cal	Df	t-critical	P
Pressure Analytical Score	42	48.93	1.94	.63137	1.906	124	1.658	000
Portfolio Analytic Score	42	74.55	2.34	1.5089	1.906	123	1.658	.000

The analytic means score for the time pressure group is less than that of portfolio groups' (48.93 < 74.55 respectively). This means that the hypothesis that

there is no significant difference in the students' analytic writing performance under pressure and portfolio writing s disconfirmed.

Table 4.9: A pair t-test for time pressure and portfolio group's holistic score

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE	T-cal	Df	t-critical	P
Pressure Holistic Score	42	51.79	2.21	1.63129	1.311	127	1.658	.256
Portfolio Holistic Score	42	65.38	1.56	.8976	13.31	126	1.658	.000

The holistic mean score for the time pressure group was less than that of portfolio groups' (51.79 < 65.38 respectively). This means that the hypothesis that states that there was no significant difference in the students' holistic writing performance under pressure was confirmed but under portfolio writing it was disconfirmed.

From the qualitative data analysis of quantitative data of the findings relating to null hypothesis one and two, successive rise in the number of time pressure students' errors across the three phase showed retrogression in their written English performance analytically. Difference was observed as this retrogression was compared with the successive decline in the number of portfolio students' errors across three phases which showed positive progression in their written English performance analytically and holistically. This, difference, virtually, retained the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the students' writing performance under pressure and portfolio writing, holistically under pressure writing(T-cal 1.311 < T-critical 1.658). However, the hypothesis was disconfirmed analytically, under pressure and both analytically and

holistically under portfolio writing (T-cal 1.906 > T-critical 1.1658, 1.906 > 1.1658 and 13.31 > 1.1658 respectively).

4.3 Overall Findings

In regard to the comparative study of the effectiveness of portfolio writing and writing under time pressure of the SS II of Government Day Secondary School Malunfashi, the following findings obtained:

(1a) Time pressure writing had significant inhibitive effect on students' writing performance. From the analytic score derived from student writing in phases, pressured students did not show significant development in their writing performance (Phase I, 50.69:49.15%, Phase II 49.86:48.53%, Phase III, 48.93:48.58%).

(1b) Writing under pressure had no significant effect on students' holistic writing performance (52.48 – 52.88 – 51.79).

(2a) Portfolio writing had significant facilitative effect on students' writing performance. Results from analytic rating showed significant writing development by the portfolio group across the three phases (Phase I, 43.60, Phase II, 71.67, Phase III, 74.55) Table 4.4 and 4.5.

(2b) Portfolio writing had significant effect on students holistic writing performance. Across the three phases of the writing, portfolio students' group showed significant writing development in their holistic performance (45.47, 65.38 and 68.38) Tables 4.2 and 4.3.

(3) Portfolio writing showed significant effect on the written English performance of students. This was observed in portfolio group's progressive performance shown in the mean score of the students' writing analytically and holistically (Phase I, 43.60, Phase II, 71.67, Phase III, 74.55 and 45.47, 65.38 and 68.38 respectively). Time pressure writing showed no significant effect on students written English performance and holistically across the three phases. (Phase I, 50.70, Phase II, 49.86, Phase III, 48.93 and 52.48, Phase II 52.88, Phase III, 57.79 respectively).

4.4 Discussion of the Findings

First finding (1a) states that time pressure writing has significant inhibitive effect on students' writing performance. From the analytic score derived from student writing in phases, time pressure students did not show significant development in their writing performance (Phase I, 50.69:49.15%, Phase II 49.86:48.53%, Phase III, 48.93:48.58%) Tables 4.2 and 4.3.

The result of the finding was possibly due to the pressure under which the group (pressured) did the writing involving time and imposed topic that did not give them the benefit of dialogue, peer marking and feedback. Teacher correction too, might have affected the pressured group's written performance. When the correction or comment is evaluative, for example, giving students pedagogical directive, such as, "cancel this" "poor", and underlining without clarification of the error committed, students become confused and this affects their writing negatively; holistically and analytically.

Spandel and Stiggin's (1990) assertion that analytic rating which is biased toward time pressure writing, has the advantage of making students note improvements in the scores from one writing to the next, is not in harmony with the present study's findings. Time pressure writing students' group did not seem to have noted improvement across the three phases. This led to deterioration in analytic performance in Phase II and Phase III of the writing.

It was revealed that portfolio writing treatment is not only effective at the holistic level but also at the componential level. The finding supports portfolio in the analytic rating index. It was assumed that analytic rating would enhance performance of the time pressure group but this was not the case in the present study.

The next finding states that writing under pressure has no significant effect on students' holistic writing performance (Phase I 52.48, Phase II 52.88 and Phase III 51.79). However, retrogression was observed in the time pressure group's holistic score across the three phases (Phase I 52.88, Phase II 52.48, Phase III 51.79). The group compared negatively with the portfolio group which showed holistic (Phase I 45.57, Phase II 65.38, Phase III 68.38) Tables 4.4 and 4.5. This finding resulted from variation of treatment given to the two groups (time pressure and portfolio). The portfolio group had the freedom of writing under no pressure, discussing among their peers and associates on the topic, and dialogue with teacher. Peer marking and feedback also contributed to their writing development and made them surpassed the pressured students' group. The time pressure group performed better than the portfolio at Phase I, holistically but fell lower than

portfolio group in Phase II and III respectively because of the negative effect of time pressure, teacher correction, lack of freedom to chose a topic and have peer dialogue, which did not give them the benefit of independent writing.

This negated and disconfirmed Spandel and Stiggin's (1990) assertion that analytic rating, which is biased toward time pressure writing, has the advantage of making students less likely to become lost in individual error corrections. The present study found that time pressure student were confused by the individual error corrections made by the teacher which led to their deterioration in holistic performance in phase II and III of the writing. Portfolio writing treatment seemed not only effective at the holistic level but also at componential or analytic level as the writing appeared clearly unconfused.

The finding on the contrary supports portfolio in the analytic rating index. The assumption that analytic rating would enhance performance of the time pressure group, proved otherwise and favoured the performance of portfolio group.

The second finding (2a) states that portfolio writing has significant facilitative effect on students' writing performance. Results from analytic rating showed significant writing development by the portfolio group across the three phases (Phase I, 43.60, Phase II, 71.67, Phase III, 74.55) Tables 4.2 and 4.3.

This result of the finding was based on two reasons. First, the level of autonomy enjoyed by the portfolio students' group facilitated their ability to have control over their writing. This means that the teacher's role in this type of writing was to guide the students, in which case, the portfolio students

independently directed their writing through self-reflection. Self-reflection gave students the opportunity to determine their writing strengths and weaknesses which in turn made them to continue to make adjustment (through revision) in their writings. The result confirms Kohonen (1992); Kolu (1999); Little and Pajukunta's (1998) study that found value of students' reflection in integrating assessment, teaching/learning with the curriculum. Daike (1996); Ralph (1987); Elbow (1991); Hutchings (1993); and Kulski's (1998) claim of students copying under portfolio writing was therefore disconfirmed in this study.

The finding differs from Gomez's (1996) result which showed that time pressure writing students' performed better than the free writing students. Gomez's (1996) finding differs from the present study's in the sense that all the rating indices showed superior writing growth of time pressure writing students against the free writing (portfolio) students while the present study's finding shows portfolio writing students performing better than the time pressure in both rating indices (analytic and holistic).

Hillocks' (1986) assertion that process writing demonstrated only a minimal effect on the quality of writing, proved otherwise in the present study. This is indicated by the maximum effect of portfolio on students writing since significant writing development over a period of three months in phases, was observed in Phases I, II and III.

This revealed the positive impact of portfolio treatment on students' writing not only holistically but also analytically. It shows that portfolio writing students achieve more than the time pressure writing students. A weakness of the

finding is the time frame. A prolong study of this type may be needed to determine the viability of this finding.

The expectation that time pressure students would gain more than portfolio student, analytically, was shattered. On the contrary, even the analytic rating did not favour the time pressure group but the portfolio. This negates the claim of Hammond (1983) that students need to be aware of their mistakes and ways of rectifying them through analytic corrections by the teacher. This is because constant teacher correction and feedback may discourage revision and confuse rather than encouraging them. One of the basic reasons for negative impact of teacher feedback is its being evaluative. Pedagogical directive and comment such as "cancel this", underlining problem areas without clarification, mostly end up confusing and discouraging students further from writing. Formative feedback, which is used by probing questions on students' writing (such as how? Why?) proved more useful in motivating students' revision; because it encourages them to explore their own ideas and develop them.

Finding number (2b) states that, Portfolio writing has significant effect on students holistic writing performance. Across the three phases of the writing, portfolio students' group showed significant writing development in their holistic performance (45.47, 65.38 and 68.38) Tables 4.2 and 4.3.

This was due to the autonomous behaviour of the writing method. Fear, panic and imposition of topic did not obtain in this method of writing. The student wrote in confidence, obtained peer feedback and the opportunity to dialogue with the teacher and revise their work. This promoted students' ability

to develop and organize ideas, and achieve desired effect on the reader. The time pressure group did not have these opportunities and this necessitated their shortcoming in achieving holistic effect on the reader.

In his findings, Gomez (2003) indicated that writing trend of the structured group, holistically, progressed higher than that of the free writing group in organization and idea development, whereas in the present study, portfolio group surpassed pressure group holistically, 68.38 and 52.88 respectively. This adds relevance to portfolio writing in matters regarding evaluation of total impressionistic effect of writing. The finding indicates that holistic rating promotes construct validity of writing and may be best measured using portfolio writing.

The third finding states that portfolio writing showed significant effect on the written English performance of students. This is observed in portfolio group's progressive performance shown in the mean score of the students' writing analytically and holistically (Phase I, 43.60, Phase II, 71.67, Phase III, 74.55 and 45.47, 65.38 and 68.38 respectively). Time pressured writing showed significant effect on students' written English performance analytically and holistically across the three phases. (Phase I, 50.70, Phase II, 49.86, Phase III, 48.93 and 52.48, Phase II 52.88, Phase III, 57.79 respectively).

Progressive result in portfolio students written English performance was due to the autonomous behaviour of the portfolio writing method. The method emphasizes peer and teacher dialogue, feedback and revision. Fear, panic, imposition of topic and teacher correction induced the pressure writing students'

general retardation in written English performance. This is in contrast with Gomez' (2003) finding that pressured students performed better both holistically analytically than the portfolio group.

This shows that collaborative teaching/learning of writing yields more positive result than the teacher-domination teaching/learning of writing. It also revealed that portfolio writing procedure promotes construct validity of writing and may best be measured by using holistic rating index.

Table 4.10: A Summary of Writing Skills Developed (in Progression) Holistically and Analytically under Portfolio Writing Procedure

Holistic Writing Skill Developed	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**
Purpose	The writing was not generally focused on the purpose and audience for which it was aimed.	Writing purpose became clear though some ideas expressed did not align to the topic.	The purpose, audience and task became clearer as writing growth became more explicit.
Idea Development	Ideas were either disjointed or irrelevant.	Relevant ideas increased though skill disjointed.	There was considerable idea development with remarkable coherence.
Sentence	Ideas expressed were either incomplete or clumsy.	Ideas and thought seemed complete but still clumsy.	Good development of variable sentence.
Language	No personal linguistic investment and expression.	There were efforts in linguistic investment.	Personal expressions appeared in the writing (idioms proverbs and metaphor).
Analytic Writing Skill Developed	**Phase I**	**Phase II**	**Phase III**
Organization	The degree to which the writing illustrated unity and coherence was low.	Ideas became more connected to each other.	There was remarkable growth in sentence, ideas and thought coherence and unity.
Detail	There was no sufficient supporting details.	Details became more appropriate to the writers purpose.	Details were appropriate to the purpose of the writing and supported main ideas.
Tone/Voice	There was poor linguistic expression effort.	Good attempts were made to express complex ideas	Generally, the writing reflected personal linguistic investment and expression.
Usage/Mechanical Grammar	(a) Tense formation, agreement and word choice were poor. (b) Spelling, capitalization and punctuation were generally poor. (c) Grammar and sentence structure were below average.	Some efforts were personally made to improve on the tense, capitalization and punctuation. Grammatical and spelling mistakes persisted.	Tense formation, capitalization and punctuation became considerably improved. Grammar and spelling were getting stabilized.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the study, draws implication of the finding and consequent conclusion. It also provides recommendations and discusses the limitations of the study with areas of further study.

5.1 Summary of the Findings

The study was designed to find out the comparative effects of writing under time pressure with portfolio writing on the writing performance of SS II Government Secondary School Malumfashi. In carrying out the investigation, the following research questions were raised:

(a) What are the relative effects of writing under pressure on students' writing performance?

(b) What are the relative effects of portfolio writing on students' writing performance?

(c) Which one is more effective, writing under time or portfolio writing procedure?

To answer the research questions stated above, a pre-test was given to the two groups (pressure and portfolio groups). The pressure group was made to write under pressure writing treatment while the portfolio wrote under portfolio writing treatment.

In the end, the following findings were obtained:

(1) Time pressure writing had significant inhibitive effect on students' writing performance. From the analytic score, derived from student writing in phases, pressured students did not show significant development in their writing performance (Phase I, 50.69:49.15%, Phase II 49.86:48.53%, Phase III, 48.93:48.58%).

(2) Writing under pressure had no significant effect on students' holistic writing performance (52.48 – 52.88 – 51.79).

(3) Portfolio writing had significant facilitative effect on students' writing performance. Results from analytic rating showed significant writing development by the portfolio group across the three phases (Phase I, 43.60, Phase II, 71.67, Phase III, 74.55) Table 4.4 and 4.5.

(4) Portfolio writing had significant effect on students holistic writing performance. Across the three phases of the writing, portfolio students' group showed significant writing development in their holistic performance (45.47, 65.38 and 68.38) Table 4.2 and 4.3.

(5) Portfolio writing showed significant effect on the written English performance of students. This was observed in portfolio group's progressive performance shown in the mean score of the students' writing analytically and holistically (Phase I, 43.60, Phase II, 71.67, Phase III, 74.55 and 45.47, 65.38 and 68.38 respectively). Pressure writing showed no significant effect on students written English performance analytically and holistically across the three phases. (Phase I, 50.70, Phase II, 49.86, Phase III, 48.93 and 52.48, Phase II 52.88, Phase III, 57.79 respectively).

5.2 Implications

From the findings of the study, the following implications relating to pressured and portfolio writing procedures should be considered. They include: implications for time pressure writing procedure, implication for portfolio writing procedure, implication for O' level English writing students, implication for teachers of writing under achievers, implication for educational administrators and curriculum developers, implication for examination bodies and implication for employers and parents.

5.2.1 Implication for Time Pressured Writing Procedure

In this study, a time pressure writing program was found to have negatively affected students' writing performance. The activity was capable of diminishing the written English performance of students. It equally did not improve performance in sub-components like content, organization, idea development and mechanical accuracy. Therefore, time pressure writing should be discouraged in language teaching methods in order that product oriented writing may be replaced with better method.

5.2.2 Implication for Portfolio Writing Procedure

Portfolio writing procedure as indicated by the findings in this study, accounted for students' superior development in their writing performance as compared with the pressure group's. It showed improvement in sub-components of writing such as organization, grammar and idea development. Portfolio writing

therefore, should be encouraged and its use made mandatory in language teaching/learning methods.

By getting students to be recording their work in formative manner and then introducing the idea of small group brain-storming on self-selected topics, the concept of portfolio writing can be encouraged among students. It can be planned in such a way that could ensure writing on self-selected topic is done in drafts and recorded on weekly basis. At the end of the term and/or year each student's file of work is evaluated and graded on the basis of idea discovery, idea organization, development, defense and relationship; and language usage and accuracy in explaining ideas. The teacher guides and monitors the writing and portfolio compilation processes to ensure writing is authentically done by the students. This is to avoid plagiarism and examination malpractice.

5.2.3 Implication for Teaching Essay to O' Level English Writing Students

The findings in this study revealed that portfolio writing program is capable of improving O' Level English writing skills. It could be realized by using those procedures and writing activities discussed in the methodology chapter. That is, engaging students in writing activities on Mondays, Wednesday and Fridays. They select topic (in group), brainstorm on the topic and then write the first draft individually. They exchange their works for peer correction and feedback. The teachers serve as a scene director, resource and evaluator. Dialogue between the teacher and students follows on Fridays. Each student's

work is documented and registered every Friday. The work is graded by the teacher after every third draft.

The activities could serve as effective means of developing individualized writing through which massive writing problem can be reduced to the minimal. The procedures can equally equip students with the skills of writing that could enable them to write independently not only within the classroom, but also under different situations and demands in their life time.

5.2.4 Implication for Teachers of O ‘ Level English

Writing problems are prevalent in matters regarding Second Language Acquisition. Teachers are, therefore, faced with the painstaking task of improving students’ writing habits. The role of the teacher in this case is to provide portfolio writing guidance to the lower performance level, middle performance level and high level performance students. The teacher is to be a kind of director by setting a framework within which learning is to take place and can also serve as a listening ear and a helping hand. He should serve as a resource person who helps the students in the set up framework he has created. This can be achieved by helping the students identify and recognize the kind of help they need and how to work best within the set up framework. Then the teacher assists them learn how to support each other in learning to write. The teacher should therefore be well acquainted with the process - oriented writing rather than the product – oriented writing.

5.2.5 Implication for Educational Administrators and Curriculum Developers

Portfolio writing, emphasizing process oriented writing, should henceforth be included in any materials selection and adoption especially those relating to the teaching and learning of writing as a language skill. In the same vein, portfolio writing programme should be encouraged in the existing as well as subsequent curriculum designs of language learning and teaching.

Materials that help students on how to explore their own mental resources in creating ideas and formulating meaningful generalizations, task students to use simple and reliable forms in developing the generalizations, and those that help students manipulate way of defending an idea as different from saying its significance in a context, should be selected. This should be done in order that traditional classroom instructional style of writing (time pressure or directed writing) will be changed. Portfolio writing which encourages acquisition of creativity, problem solving, social learning, spirit of adventure, self-reliance and versatility will replace it as the 21st century child will face. Challenges that require problem solving skills and adventurous thinking. This liberal way of teaching/learning and assessment of writing will face resistance. A change from school, and teacher dominance will not be easy even among the educational authorities. In any case, educational administrators, the school, and teachers should be made aware of the gains expected from it, and what it will involve in implementing it.

The process of implementing portfolio writing programme cannot be rushed. Trial and errors will require money and time, pilot projects, conferences, revisions and evaluations. Teacher training for the use of the new method and sensitizing them on the need to discard the pressured writing method, need to be considered.

5.2.6 Implication for Examination Bodies

Since the findings in this study have explicated that writing under time pressure did account for writing under achievement among students, it is pertinent to infer that it equally could be capable of inducing students to resort to examination malpractice such as getting somebody else to sit for the writing exam for somebody. There could be the possibility of even negotiating with the marking personnel or examination body's officials. But with portfolio writing procedures, examination malpractices could be reduced to minimal since the teacher guides through monitoring the process and the whole writing process is basis for evaluation.

Portfolio writing cannot prevail unless internal and external examinations and methods of student assessment are subjected to portfolio based assessment of writing. Emphasis given to examinations on single-product-basis may have been responsible for failures in written English performance and examination malpractice among secondary school students. Arrangement should be made to introduce portfolio-based writing assessment by reorganizing and making administrative changes, to this effect, in conventional testing and assessment.

Grading students' writing should be based on the whole final year of their study (SS III) to show writing process and evidence of learning; not on a single-product basis which is susceptible for examination malpractice.

5.2.7 Implication for Employers and Parents

The findings in this study revealed that developmental writing achievement accomplished through process writing by the portfolio group promoted independent performance among students. This could help, where applicable, in tackling the problem of mediocrity the employers are faced with nowadays. The employers and parents (literates) could access students or candidates portfolio for writing diagnoses relating to making decision on placement and guidance purposes.

5.2.8 Portfolio Writing Implementation Procedure Grid for Schools

This section discusses steps to developing and implementing portfolio writing in schools and classrooms. It highlights on stakeholders' common vision about what the students should learn and be able to do, the criteria and the goals to be presented.

Goals and Contents: The stakeholders (students, teachers, school administration, parents) decide the type of the goal of writing portfolio and how they can be achieved. A group of teachers are to lead the programme.

Portfolio Design; The lead teachers and school administrators decide on the materials and products to be included in the portfolio programme.

Scoring Criteria: The lead group of teachers decides on common goals for learning and performance and how they will be assessed. The scoring rubrics and checklists could be developed based on agreed performance to be attained. Benchmarks that show student work are articulated.

Curriculum Focus: Portfolio tasks and assessment should be made to align to curriculum contents and frameworks.

Implement a Pilot Site or Group: Decide on a number of students and provide staff development on implementing the portfolio for at least one year. From the score of the pilot group, assess the effectiveness of the program, modify the scoring criteria based on feedback from the pilot educators. Examine the effects of the programme to determine whether improved information is obtainable as a result of the implementation.

Full Implementation: Once the program has been piloted and found effective, implement the portfolio program fully in the school.

Teacher Training: Train the teachers to score students' work using portfolio program's scoring criteria and benchmarks. Training should include, teacher formative feedback, language proficiency and its impact on student achievement, and efforts are to be made to reach inter-rater reliability level of .7 - .8.

Scoring the Portfolio: Teachers score the portfolios based upon predetermined criteria. This could be done over several days in a central location by teachers who have been trained.

Report: All stakeholders receive information about the results of the portfolio writing and assessment in a timely way that will make the result meaningful to everybody; teachers, students, school administrators and parents.

Evaluation: The effectiveness of portfolio writing programme can be evaluated after one year in order to make possible judgment.

5.2.9 Steps to Introducing Portfolio Writing in the Classroom

This section discusses general procedures for introducing portfolio writing in the classroom. It presents gradual steps to be taken in developing portfolio by the students, introduced and guided by the teacher.

Phase I: Getting students to form small groups and acquainting them with brain storming on topics selected by the teacher and the students themselves.

Step I: Students are then asked to select topics, based on individual interest, to write on. This selection is guided by the teacher.

Step II: Students are allowed to write freely on the topics they selected, engaging in peer dialogue, discussing with friends, relations, parents and teachers. The idea is for them to have ideas and develop the ideas personally in writing. Verbatim copy from consulted materials (newspapers, magazines, books) should be discouraged by sanctions.

Step III: Materials to be included in the portfolio could be formal or informal. They can include, writing drafts, homework, pieces of work done outside classroom, self and peer revising checklist and goal cards.

Step IV: Writing is done in drafts by students freely including items them consider relevant to their respective topic.

Step V: Revision is done by students using self, teacher and peer checklist.

Step VI: Students/teacher dialogue takes place at the end of every week.

Phase II

Step I: At this stage, a show case portfolio will be developed. This includes any material the students regard as demonstrating their personal writing development and academic achievement.

Step II: Assessment of the portfolio is done by the teacher using peer and authors revising and editing checklist, based on agreed marking criteria.

5.3 Conclusion

The study was able to compare the effectiveness of writing under time pressure and portfolio writing on students' writing performance (SS II Government Secondary School Malumfashi). The study found that portfolio writing students' group performed better than the pressured writing students' group across the three phases of the writing programme for three months. This was indicated in both the holistic and analytic rating indices of the writing scores of the two groups. The implications of the study's findings to teacher, educational administrators, examination bodies, O' level writing under achievers, employers and parents were presented.

5.4 Recommendations

1. The present study recommends the inclusion of portfolio writing into the teaching of writing at Senior Secondary School. To this effect, portfolio writing procedure selection is very important. Therefore, procedures used in this study could be adopted. This will make students develop positive attitude towards writing as a tool for language development, communication and literature in general.
2. The portfolio writing programme should be considered a means through which students of English as a Second Language could enmesh themselves with English even outside the classroom.
3. Portfolio writing, if painstakingly incorporated into the teaching of English, will assist in guarding against examination malpractices. This could be done by the use of students' portfolio for scoring and grading of their work, for a length of time to show writing process, rather than using one product, the production of which is always questionable. It is a systematic, consistent, persistent and long drawn which makes copying and plargiasm difficult. Therefore, portfolio writing should be formalized as assessment tool in schools to the degree that it either replaces, or supplements limited time frame testing and assessment.
4. Portfolio writing being free writing, involving peer group discussion, brain storing and reading for ideas, should formalized in school, since it can lead to development of other language skills as speaking, listening and reading.

By sharing and discussing ideas, students learn to listen and speak and to write in portfolio treatment.

5. The success of portfolio writing as a tool for language development largely depends on all the tiers of the Government, education board, examination bodies, school managers and teachers' appreciation of the importance of the program. The Governments should therefore be positive in providing supports needed for the writing activities.

6. Finally, considering the increase in the rate of failure in English Language at the O' Level English Language, other means of improving the performance of students' writing should be sought. Future researchers on writing development are expected to compliment the finding of this study in achieving the improvement.

5.5 Limitations

Portfolio writing may not be the only answer to writing problems among students of SS II Secondary School Malumfashi. The writing programme could be a formative way of improving writing performance. In the course of the study, other extraneous variables such as interest, extra – effort and teacher factor and motivation could not be prevented entirely. All the same, the findings showed significant difference between the performance of time pressure group and portfolio group which made it apparent that the treatment was effective over accident event. However, over generalization from a single study such as this, limited to three months, cannot be made.

5.6 Area for Further Research

Considering the scope of the present research, areas for further studies could include:

(a) The effects of writing rubrics on portfolio writing.

(b) Effects of feedback on students' writing performance.

(c) Determining explicit and implicit language knowledge in portfolio and time pressure writing.

(d) Effects of metalinguistic knowledge on portfolio and time pressure writing.

REFERENCES

Abercrombie, D. (1995). The social basis of language. In H.B. (Ed), *Teaching English as a second language,* New York: McGraw Book Company.

Allen, R. V. (1976). *Language experiences in communication*, Boston, Houghton: Mifflin Company.

Anderson, E. (1993). *Campus use of the teaching portfolios: twenty-five profiles.* Washington, D.C: American Association for Higher Education.

Anson, C. (1989). Writing and response: Theory, practice and research; urbans IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Applebee, A. (1984). *Contexts for learning to write.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Arter, J. A. & Spandel, V. (1992). *Using portfolios of students work in instruction and assessment, educational management:* Issues and practices. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: is Content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? Journal of Second Language Writing 9/3: 227 – 57.

Barton, J. & Collins, A. (Eds.). (1997). Portfolios assessment: A handbook for education. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Belanoff, Pat and M. Dixon. Eds. (1991). Portfolios: Process and product. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Belanoff, P. (1994). Portfolio and literacy: Why? In L. Black et. Al (Eds), *New directions in portfolio assessment: Reflective practice, critical theory, and large-Scale scoring.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Bird, T. (1989). The school teachers portfolio: *An essay on possibilities.* In J. Miliman and L. Darling – Hammond (Eds.). Handbook of teacher evaluation and secondary personnel. 2nd edition. Newbury Park, CA: Saga.

Borthwick, A. (1995). Body of evidence. Vocational Education Journal, 70 (3), 24 – 26, 48.

Brown, B. L. (1997). *Portfolio assessment*: Missing link in students evaluation, Eric Alert, Career and Vocational Education Journal, 70(3), 24-26, 48.

Bruder, I (1993). Alternative assessment: Putting technology to the test *Electronic Learning* 12(4), 22-28.

Burkhalter, B (1988). *Performance appraisal: Concepts and techniques,* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Brumfit, C. J. (1982). *Problem and principles in English teaching.* New York, Pergomon Press.

Cole, D. J., Ryan C.W. and Kick (1995). Portfolio across the curriculum and beyond. thousand Oask, C.A: Corwin Press

Crockett, T. (1998). *The portfolio journey:* A creative guide to keeping students – managed portfolio in the classroom. Eagle word, teacher Idea Press.

Crossby (1991). *Bridging the gap in writing.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Daiker, D. Sommers, J. and Staygall, G. (1996). The pedagogical implications of a college placement portfolio. In E. M. White et. Al (Eds.), assessment of writing: *Politics, and practices*. Modern Language Association.

Daro, (1996). Standards and portfolio assessment. In J. B. Baron & D. P. Wolf (eds) Performance-based student assessment: Challenges and possibilities, ninety- fifth year book of the national society for the study of education Part 1. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Daute, D. (1985). *Writing and computers.* Addison Wesley Compositions.

Del Veccio, A., Guerrero, M., Gustke, C., Martinez, P. (1992). Whole-school biblingual education programs: Approaches for sound assessment. NCBE program information guide series, 18. Washington, D.C, National clearing house for biblingual education.

Edelsky, C. (1982). *Development of writing in bilingual program.* Final report. volumes 1 and 2. Tempe, Arizona. Arizona State.

Edelsky, C., & Smith, K. (1989). Is that writing – or are those marks just a figment of your curriculum. In G. Manning & M. Manning (Eds.), *Whole language: beliefs and practices,* K-8 (pp.183-193). Washington, D.C, national Education Association.

Edgerton, R. and Hutchings, P. (1991). The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship in teaching. Washington D.C, American Association for Higher Education.

Elbow, P. and Belanoff, P. (1991). State University of New York at Stonybrook, Portfolio-based evaluation programm. In P. Belanoff and M. Dickson (eds.), Portfolio. Process and product, portsmouth.

Ellis, R. (1997). Second language acquisition. *Research and language teaching.* Oxford University Press, London.

Elton, L. & Laurillard, D. M. (1979). Trends in research in student learning, Studies in Higher Education, 4 (1), 87 – 102.

Elton, P. T. and Lawson, S. (1999). *Evaluating teachers of writing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Emig, J. (1991). *The Composing process of twelfth graders.* Urbana, IL: The national council for teacher education, (Eric document reproduction No. 058205).

Ferguson, G.A. (1965). Nonparametric trend analysis: A practical guide for research workers. Montreal, Quebec: McGrill University Press.

Ferris, S. P. (1997). The Effects of computer on traditional writing. *The New Jersey Journal of Communication,* 4, 55-60.

Ferris, D. (2003). Response to student writing: Implication for second language students. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Eribaum.

Ferris, D. (2003). Responding to writing in B. Kroll (ed.) Exploring the dynamics of second language writing Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (2004). The grammar correction debate in L2 writing: Where are we and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime..?). *Journal of Second Language Writing 13/1; 49 – 62.*

Fleiss, J. L. (1981). *Statistical methods of rates and proportions.* (2^{nd} ed.) New York, Wiley.

Florez, V. and Hadaway, N. (1987). *Relationship of Oral language proficiency and Ws of secondary language learners.* paper presented at the Southwest regional conferences of the International Reading Association, Phoenix. AZ.

Genessee, E. (1996). Writing. Oxford University Press, London.

GIHE, (1996). *Teaching portfolio:* Guidelines for academic staff. Queensland, Griffith Institute for Higher Education.

Gillespie, C. S. Ford, R. D. and Leaved, A.G. (1996). *Portfolio assessment: Some questions some answers, some recommendations*, Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 39)6), 480-491.

Glen, S. and Hight, N.F. (1992). *Portfolios: An affective assessment strategy?* Nurse Education Today 12, 416-423.

Glynn, T. Jerram, H., & Tuck, B. (1986). Writing as an interactive social process. *Behavioral Approaches with Children*, 10, 116-126.

Gomez, E. and Emily, D. (2000). Assessment portfolio: Including English language learners in large-scale assessments. ERIC Digest.

Graves, D. H. (1981). *A case study observing the development of primary children 5 composing, spelling, and motor behaviors during the writing process*. Final report. NE Gant No. 678-0174. Durham, NH: University of new Hampshire Press (ERIC document production No. 218653)

Hammond, E.R. (1983). *Teaching writing*. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. New York, Longman Group UK Limited.

Harris, M. (1985). Diagnosing writing process problems: A pedagogical application of speaking –aloud protocol analysis. In M. Rose (Ed). *When a writer can't write* (Pp. 166-181). New York, Guilford Press

Hedy McGavrel and Jeff Verbeem – ELF Journal Vol. 61/2 April 2007.

Hendrickson, J.M. (1980). The treatment of error in written work. *Modern Language Journal*, 46,216-221.

Herman, J.L., Gearhart, M. and Whittaker, A.K. (1993). *Whose work is it?* A question for validity of large scale portfolio assessment. (CSE technical report No. 363). Los Angeles, CA: national centre for research on evaluation, standards, and student testing.

Hewitt, G. (1993). Vermont's portfolio – based writing assessment programme: *A brief history* Teachers, Writers, 24(5), 1-6.

Hight, B. (1992). Writing Skills assessment: Problems and prospects. *Policy issues perspective series*, ERIC document reproduction service No. ED 401317.

Hillocks, G. (1986). *Research on written composition*. Urbana, IL: ERIC clearing house on reading and communication.

Hold, C. Baker, J. Dennis, C. and Nancy, S. (1990). Developing portfolios for barrier testing: Problems and possibilities. Notes from the national testing network in writing 20 – US.

Holly, M. C. (1989). *Writing to grow:* Keeping a personal professional journal. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hudelstone, S. (1984). Kan yu ret an rayt an ingles: Children become literate in English as a Second Language. TESOL quarterly, 18,221-238.

Hutchings, P. (1993). *Campus use of the teaching portfolio*. Washington DC, American association of higher education.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback". System 31/2: 217 – 30.

Jasper, M. (1994). "The use of a portfolio in assessing professional education. In G. Gibbs (ed.) improving students learning through assessment and evaluation. Oxford, The oxford centre for staff development.

Johnson, K. E. (1996). Portfolio assessment in second language teacher education, TESOL, volume 2, pp. 22 -27.

Jordan, C. (1997). *Language teaching. Journal of Cambridge,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Juddy, S and Debby E. (2001). *Assessment portfolios:* Including English language learners in large-scale assessment, Eric Digest.

Kaikkonen, P. (2000). Intercultural learning through foreign language education. In Kohonen, V. et al., Experiential learning in foreign language education. London, Pearson. Education (in press).

Kaye, S. (1989). *Writing under pressure:* The quick writing process. London: Oxford University Press

Kentucky Writing Portfolio (2001). *Grade 12 teacher's hand book* (Frankfort: Kentucky department of education, nd).

Klein, S and Mccaffrey, D. (1993). *Can portfolios assess student performance and influence instruction?* The 1991-92 Vermont experience. (CSE technical report No. 371). Los Angeles, CA: national centre for research on evaluation, standards, and student testing.

Kohonen, V. (2000). Toward experiential foreign language education. In V. Kohonen, *experiential learning in foreign language education.* London, Pearson education (in press).

Kolu, U. (1999). Interactive self-assessment experiment at Pynikki School. In P. Kiakkonen and E. Kohonen (eds.) *The living curriculum 2.*

Koretz, D. (1993). The reliability of scores from the 1992 Vermont portfolio assessment program interim report (Los Angeles: Centre for the study of education, University of California, technical report No. 355, 1992).

Krashen, S. D. (1977). The monitor model for adult second language performance. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finocchiaro (eds.) *Viewpoints on English as a second language* (Pp. 151 – 156) New York, Regents.

Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement.* Pp. 607-610

Kulski, M. (1998). Teaching portfolio: A threat or a promise? In B. Black and N. Stanley (eds.), *Teaching and learning in changing Times.*

Lau, J. (2001). How to improve teaching with learning-centred evaluation. *The National Teaching and Learning Forum,* 1, (6), 6-8.

Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written resporise. In B. Kroll (ed.). *Second language writing: Research insights from the classroom.* Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press.

Lemaheu, P. Gitomer, D. and Eresh, J.T. (1995). Portfolio beyond the classroom: Data quality and qualities. Princeton, N.J: Educational testing service, centre for performance assessment.

Linda, S.; Flower and John, R Hayes (1977). Problem-solving strategies and the writing process, 39 C. English 449.

Linda, B., Edward, R. ad Selina, C. (1998). *Trend in state student assessment Programs:* Fall 1997 DATA on state wide student assessment programs (Washington, D. C, Council of Chief State School Officers, 1998).

Little, D. (1999). *The European language portfolio and SELF-Assessment.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Document DECS/EDU/LANG/(99) 30.

Mabry, L. (1999). *Writing to the rubric:* Lingering effects of traditional standardized testing on direct writing assessment. Review of Testing Methods in Education, 17, 75 – 125.

Mabry, L and Katrina, G. (1997). *State mandated performance assessment:* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, Chicago.

McAlister, K. M.; N. W. Nelson and M. C. Bahr (1999 – 2000). Something to shoot for: A systematic functional approach to teaching genre in secondary school science. In A. M. Johs (ed.). *Genre in the classroom:* Multiple perspectives London, Lawrence Earlbaun associates.

McGregor, G. P. (1971). English in Africa: *A guide to the teaching of English as a second language*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Meriwether, D. (1991). Writing- left handed submitting full portfolio. To improve the academy, 10, Stillwater o.k, New Forum Press.

Meril Skilltext Series (1984). *Grammar and composition*, book one Columbus.

Meyer, P. (1991). The teaching portfolio: The Department Chair 2 (1), 33-35.

Moss, P. A.; Beek, J. S.; Ebbs, C.; Matson, B.; Murchmore, J.; Steele, D.; Taylor, C. and Herter, R. (1992). Portfolio accountability and an interpretive approach to validity, Educational measurement – Issues and Practice, 11 (30), 12 – 2.

Moya, S. and O'malley, J. (1994). *A portfolio assessment model for ESL* The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 13, 13-36.

Muchinsky, D. (1985). The unnatural approach: Language learning in Poland (Report) Washington.

Mullen, K. A. (1976). Evaluating writing proficiency in ESL. In J.QW. Oiler Jr. & K. Perkins (Eds.), *Research in language testing* (pp. 160-170). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Muncie, F. (2000), R. L. (1978). *Writing, reading and language growth:* An introduction to language Arts. Columbus, Charts E. Merril publishing company.

Muray, D.M (1978). Internal revision: A process of discovery. In R. Cooper & L. Odell (eds.) *Research on composing:* points of departure. (Pp. 85-103). Urbana, IL: National council for teacher education

Murphy, M., Sandra, E and Smith, M. (1991). Writing portfolios: A bridge to teaching assessment. Marken, Ontario, Pippin Publishing Limited.

Nancy, S. (1988). A Realist's appraisal of the prospects of unifying instruction and assessment. *In proceedings of the invitational conference on assessment in the service of learning* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1988).

Newman, C.; Smolen, E. and Lee, A. (1995). *Developing student self-assessment strategies* TESOL Journal, 5(1), 22-27.

Newstandards (1997). Performance standards: 3, high school. Washington, D.C. and Pittsburgh, PA: National Centre on Education and the Economy and the University of Pittsburgh .

Nunan, D. (1999). *Students reflection in portfolio assessment:* Making language learning more visible. Tampere University Press, US.

Nunes, A. (2004). *Portfolios in the ELF classroom:* Disclosing an informed practice: ELT Journal, 58, 27-35. retrieved December 6, 2006 from education fall text (Wilson).

Olagoke, D.O (1979). The mother-tongue and ESL in Nigeria education. In E. Ubahakwe (ed.) *Teaching of English studies.* Ibadan University Press, Ibadan.

Olawadiya, A. O. (1979). *The Teaching of writing in Borno State secondary schools.* A survey study of instructional practices. University of Maiduguri, Ph. D. Thesis, Unpublished.

Olayemi, A.E (1980). Error analysis of written composition of Zaria advanced teachers college students of English with suggestions for a remedial programme, A.B.U. Zaria M.ed Thesis Unpublished.

Olsen, J.F (1996). Increasing the inclusion of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students in NAEP. Focus on NAEP (on-line).

Oluikpe, B. O. A. (1979). Can a knowledge of grammar make us better writers. In E. Ubahakwe (ed.) *The teaching of English studies.* Ibadan, Ibadan University Press.

Omaggio, A.C. (1986). *Teaching language in context.* Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Omalley, J.M. and Valdez P. (1992). *Performance and portfolio assessment for language minority students* NCBE programme, information guide series, No. 9 Washington D. C. National clearing house for Bilingual education.

Pajikunta, U. (1999). The language portfolio as a tool for tutoring students, Oral skills and reflections. In Kaikkonen, P. and Kohonen V. (eds.) *The living curriculum* 2, Tampere: Department of teacher education publication series A. 18, 109-118 (in Finnish).

Paulson, F. and Mayer, C. (1991). *What makes a portfolio?* Educational Leadership. London, Routledge.

Perron, V. (1991). Expanding student assessment. Alexandria, V.A.: *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 10, 23 - 24.*

Ralph, F. (1987). *Emig's the composing process* of twelfth graders: A reassessment. *Composition and Communication*. 34, (1) 23 - 27.

Rea, S. (2001). *Earning strategies in foreign and second language classrooms.* London, Continuum.

Redman (1994). The showcase PH – resources on PH University of Wyoming.

Reimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing:* London: Oxford University Press.

Reimes, A. (1984). Anguish as a second language? Remedies for composition teachers. In S. Mckay (Ed.) *Composing in a second language* (Pp. 81-96). Rowley, MA: Newbury House

Richards, J. (2000). New trends in the teaching of writing in ESL/EFL. In Z. Wang (ed.) ELT in China. papers presented at international symposium on teaching English in the Chinese context. Bejin: Foreign long teaching and research press.

Roselyn, V.(1995). Special issues center. London, Longman.

Routeman, W. (1991). To capture the ineffable: New forms of assessment in higher education. Review of Research in Higher Education, 17, 75-125.

Samway, K.D. (1993). This is hard, isn't it? Children evaluating writing. TESOL Quarterly, 27,233-258

Santos, M. G. (1997). Portfolio assessment and the role of learner reflection. Forum 35:2. Pp. 10 – 16.

Sawyer, W. E. and Sawyer, J. C., (1993). Integrated language arts for emerging literacy. New York, Delmar Publishers.

Scriven, J., & Glynn, T. (1983). Performance feedback on written tasks for low achieving secondary students. *New Zealand journal of Educational Studies*, 18, 133-145.

Seifert, L. (1993). *Portfolio assessment in graduate teacher education* programmes. Unpublished paper presented at California education research associate.

Shackleford, E. (1996). The teaching portfolio. A practical guide to improve performance and promotion/tenure decisions. Bolton, NA: Anker Publishing 176 Bellvile Toad, P.O. Box 249, Bolton.

Shackleford, E. (1997). Writing on the wall. *News Magazine.* The Torch University, Jackson, T.N.

Sharples, M. (1985). *Cognition, computers and creative writing.* West Sussex, Illis Horwood Ltd.

Slater, S. (1997). *Collaborative writing.*_ A two tier approach to the teaching of scientific writing. Longman, New York.

Smith, E. B.; Goodman, K. S. and Meredi, R. (1981). *Language and thinking in school*. New York, Rinehart and Winston.

Solomon, G. (1993). Planning for gold. Electronic Learning, 12(3), 20-21.

Sommers, A. (1979:14). Portfolio for biology teacher association. *Journal of School Personnel Evaluation in Education* 5(2): 147-167.

Sondra, P. (1980). Understanding composing, 31 C. Composition and communication. 363, New York: McGraw Books.

Song, B. and August, B. (2002). Using portfolio to assess the writing of ESL Students: *A Powerful alternative? Journal of Second Language Writing 11, 49 – 72.*

Soonpaat, S. (2007). *Product versus process approach to teaching legal writing.* Conference on the pedagogy of legal writing for academics in Africa. Texas Tech University School of Law.

Spandel, V., & Stiggins, R.J (1990). *Creating writers: Linking assessment and writing instructions.* New York, Longman

Staton. J. (1982). *Analysis of dialogue journal: writing as a communicative event:* Vol. 1. *Final report to the national institute of education* Washington, D.C. centre for applied, linguistics.

Susan, E. (1993). *Legal issues in performance assessment:* Education Quarterly, 2, 329-358.

Tampere: Department of teaching education publication series A. 18, 9-37 (in Finnish).

Tann, S. (1991). *Developing language in the primary classroom.* London, Cassell Educational Ltd.

Tchudi, S.N. (1986). *Teaching writing in the Content areas: college level* Washington, D.C: National Education Association.

Thomas, W.H., Storm, B., and Sheingold, K. (1997). Percessters English portfolio assessment: 1995 report. Princeton, NJ: Educational testing service, centre for performance assessment.

Thornburg, D. (1991). *Education, technology and paradigm of change for the 21st century*. London: Star Song Publications.

Tieney, R. and Caster, M. (1991). *Portfolio assessment in the reading-writing Classroom.* Norwood: Christopher Gordon Publishers. Washington, D.C: American Association of Higher Education.

Valdez, P. (1992). Authentic assessment for language learners: Practical approach to teachers. New York: Addison-Wesley.

West African Examination Council Report (1992), Lagos: Macmillan.

White, R. V. (1988). *Academic writing.* Process and product. MEP/British council, ELT, 30 (2) 25 - 28.

Wienke, J. W. (1981). Strategies for improving elementary school students' writing skills. ERIC document No. ED 209679.

Williams, J.D. (1989). *Preparing to teach writing*. Belmont, CA: Wardsworth Publishing Company.

Winograde, P., and Jones, D.L. (1992). The use of portfolios in performance assessment. *New Directions for Educational Reform, 1(2), 37-50*

Wolf, D. and Reardon, S. (1996). Access to excellence through new forms of student assessment. In J. Baron and D. Wolt (eds.), Performance-based student assessment: Challenges and possibilities. Chicago: University Press.

Wolf, K & Siu-Rungan, S. (1996). Portfolio purpose and possibilities. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy 40: 1 Pp. 30 – 36.

Yang, N. D. (2003). Integrating portfolios into learning strategy-based instruction for EFL college students. IRAL, 41 (4), 293 – 317 retrieved December 7, 2005, from education full text (Wilson).

Yates, J.M. (1983). *Research implications for writing in the content areas.* Washington, D.C, National Education Association.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 195-209.

Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 697-715.

Zhenhui Rao – ELT Journal 61/2 April 2007.

GUIDE FOR RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

Guideline for Pressure Writing

Writing Guide

a. Students write on a teacher- selected topic.

b. Students write on a concentrated time frame.

c. No student-teacher or peer dialogue.

d. No writing draft; one product only.

Feedback Guide

(1) Focus on form (sentence level errors).

(2) Evaluative without concrete suggestions for addressing the weakness.

(3) Directive tone (e.g.) make the paper longer (but no guide).

GUIDE FOR RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

Guideline for Portfolio Writing

Writing Guide

a. Students select topic and write on it.

b. Writing is done in drafts.

c. Students dialogue with the teacher/peer.

d. Writing is done under no time pressure.

Feedback Guide

(1) Ask Probing questions such as why, how.

(2) Focus on content – deeper meaning of the text, idea.

(3) Provide suggestion for achieving meaning.

(4) Avoid evaluative comments (e.g. good! You text in interesting).

A **Sample of Revising/Editing Checklist**

Self Assessment Revising Checklist for Essay Writing **Name_____ Title _____ Date_____**	
Directions: Read the essay to yourself, and check your essay for each item below. Make any changes to make your essay better.	
1._____	The title goes with my essay.
2. _____	I like the beginning.
3. _____	I used good descriptive words to describe what I meant.
4. _____	Each sentence makes sense.
5. _____	The order is logical.
6. _____	I like the ending.

Self and Peer Editing Checklist

Author _____		**Peer _____**	
Title_____		**Date_____**	
Carefully read your essay out loud. And read each item below. Correct any mistakes you find, and tick off (v) the space next to the item. Then give the essay to a friend to check.			
	Author Check	**Peer Check**	**Item to Check**
	_____	_____	Each sentence starts with a capital letter.
	_____	_____	Names have capital letters.
	_____	_____	Right and left margins are OK.
	_____	_____	Each sentence has a verb.
	_____	_____	I checked for words left out.
	_____	_____	I circled words I was not sure how to spell
	_____	_____	I found the spelling of these words: _____ , _____ _____ , _____
I think I need help in: _____			