PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE INTERMEDIATE LEVEL WRITING CLASS

Jenny H. Pakasi, Jeremy Beal
Sam Ratulangi University
Email: peningp@yahoo.com

ABSTRAK

Penilaian portofolio telah lama diadvokasi sebagai sarana bagi siswa untuk merefleksikan dan meningkatkan tulisan mereka. Hal ini memungkinkan siswa dan guru untuk mengidentifikasi bidang kekuatan dan kelemahan yang konsisten untuk meningkatkan tulisan siswa. Paper ini ini melaporkan studi penelitian tindakan dalam kelas menulis semester ketiga di jurusan bahasa Inggris Universitas Sam Ratulangi di Indonesia. Tujuan studi ini adalah untuk menentukan bagaimana dan sejauh mana penilaian portofolio berguna untuk meningkatkan penulisan siswa. Setiap siswa menyimpan portofolio kerja tertulis mereka, yang digunakan oleh para guru untuk menganalisis kemajuan siswa selama semester tersebut. Para siswa menulis beberapa paragraf, dengan setiap paragraf melalui tiga draf dan menggabungkan *self and peer editing*, di samping diedit oleh instruktur kursus. Pada akhir semester, para guru membandingkan penulisan siswa dari awal, tengah, dan akhir semester. Tulisan mereka dianalisis untuk menentukan perubahan dalam pengembangan paragraf, organisasi, dan fitur tata bahasa yang dipilih. Secara umum, pengembangan dan pengorganisasian tulisan siswa menunjukkan peningkatan yang signifikan, sementara hasil untuk tata bahasa kurang konsisten, lebih tergantung pada faktor individu dan jenis kesalahan.

Kata kunci: penilaian portofolio, penulisan siswa, *self and peer editing*, pengeditan guru.

ABSTRACT

Portfolio assessment has long been advocated as a means for students to reflect on and improve their writing. It allows students and teachers to identify consistent areas of strength and weakness to improve the students' writing. This paper reports on an action research study in a third semester writing class in the English department of Sam Ratulangi University in Indonesia. The objective is to determine how and to what extent portfolio assessment is useful for improving students' writing. Each student kept a portfolio of their written work, which was used by the teachers to analyze students' progress over the course of the semester. Students wrote several paragraphs, with each paragraph going through three drafts and incorporating self- and peer-editing, in addition to being edited by a course instructor. At the end of the semester, the teachers compared the students' writing from the beginning, middle, and end of the semester. Their writing was analyzed to determine changes in paragraph development, organization, and selected grammatical features. In general, the development

and organization of the students' writing showed significant improvement, while results for grammar were less consistent, depending more on individual factors and error type.

Keywords: portfolio assessment, student writing, self and peer editing, teacher editing.

Introduction

Recently there has been significant interest in using portfolios in teaching writing. Numerous studies show that using portfolios as instructional tools in writing class can promote fluency in writing and provide many benefits to be used in writing class (Elbow, 1994, Coombe dan Barlow, 2004). Additionally, a portfolio provides a useful space for writing multiple drafts (Coombe and Barlow, 2004; Wolf, 1989) and engages in self- and peer-editing, which have often been suggested as a means to build learner autonomy and improve students' editing ability (e.g., Penaflorida, 1998).

Murphy (1994) defines writing portfolios as "selections of students' work, produced as a normal part of the course work or outside class for the purposes of construction and evaluation. While Baker (1993) defines portfolios as a collection of students' writing over period of times represents a range of students' writing in a variety of genres. In other words, any collection of students' work, such as log or journal-log, journal entries (Penaflodia, 1998), diaries, letters, draft, notes, poems, reviews, reports, narratives, etc., when collected in file(s) over a period of time, are called portfolios. Portfolios show a collection of students' work, both good and the best work (notes. brainstorming ideas, drafting, revision, and final draft) from the beginning of the term to the end giving both teacher and student a chance to assess the progress of the students' writing.

Baack (1997) further claims that teacher should consider portfolio development in their composition classes because portfolios can measure the growth of students' abilities as writers, promote ownership of students' own writing, and along with a scoring rubrics, provide by mechanism by which students can assess their own strengths and weaknesses as writers.

Despite having the advantages of using portfolio assessment mentioned above, the portfolio assessment has the weaknesses that should be considered. Portfolio assessment can be time consuming for teachers especially if portfolios are done in addition to traditional grading, (Pierce and O'Malley, 1992).

Penaflorida (1988) notes that traditional way of evaluating papers where the teachers is the only reader for whom the students write and that the teacher's role is to assume responsibility for reading through errors and editing paper for grammatical and mechanical mistakes is now being gradually replaced by the so-cold extended readership. Moreover, Penaflorida (1988) claims that assessment and evaluation are not the sole responsibility of the teacher. It is a job of a teacher to make their students realize that their paper is their own property. One way to do this is through self -correction.

Self-correction is important for students to do before handing in their own writing to the teacher as long as they are given a guideline. Wanchid (2013) notes that self-correction is a strategy according to which students read, analyze, correct, and evaluate their own writing by using guided questions or checklists, both form-focused and meaning focused feedback.

Another means of sharing responsibility for assessment and evaluation is through peer feedback. Peer feedback which is referred to under different names such as peer response, peer review, peer editing, and peer evaluation, can be defined as "used of learners as sources of information and interactant for each other in such a way that learners assumes roles and responsibilities normally taken by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing" (Liu and Hansen, 2002)

The use of portfolios in academic writing class using peer-feedback and self-correction is seldom used in the classroom particularly on academic writing in Indonesia. This is one of the underlined reasons why this topic is chosen. Besides, the undergraduate students of the English Departments in most of state universities in Indonesia are required to write their thesis in English, so writing seems the most needed and the most demanding skill for them to master. Moreover, it is a requirement that their thesis should be published in electronically university journal, and to be promoted to higher level, university lecturers are required to publish their work in academic journal both nationally and internationally, but the problems are the learners have limited linguistic knowledge which indirectly has an impact in their writing ability, particularly in Indonesia. For example, the university where I teach now, Sam Ratulangi University, Manado Indonesia, there are 360 PhD lecturers, but only 5%

were successfully promoted to be professors. One of underlying reasons is that they are lack of international journal publications. Particularly, the learner's most significant communicative problems, such as in appropriate language use, incomprehensible passages, run on sentences, the unorganized text, and grammatical errors, have been found in writing courses. Another reason, there is a little research on portfolio use particularly on academic writing in Indonesia.

The objective of this study is to determine how and to what extent portfolio assessment is useful for improving students' writing This paper reports the results of an action research study done in a third semester writing class in the English department of Sam Ratulangi University, Manado. The main objective of the class was for students to write short but well-developed academic paragraphs about personal and general topics. Each student kept a portfolio of their written work, which was used by the researchers to analyze students' progress over the course of the semester. Students were taught a process approach to writing, with each paragraph going through three drafts and incorporating self- and peer-editing, in addition to being edited by a course instructor. At the end of the semester, the teachers compared the students' writing from the beginning, middle, and end of the semester. Their writing was analyzed to determine changes in paragraph development, organization, and selected grammatical features.

Review of Related Literature Portfolio Assessment

Chung (2012) in his thesis on: *Portfolio Assessment in ESL Academic Writing: Examining the Effects of Reflection in the writing Process*. He examined students' perceptions of the portfolio assessment in advanced academic writing course for ESL graduate students at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign. The results show that students were able to identify their strength, weaknesses, and areas for improvement in the journal. However, the analysis also revealed that an overreliance on peer reviews and writing conferences to write journals. The students' perceptions about portfolio assessment were generally positive with some recommendation

Baack (1997) in his article entitled "Portfolio Development describes how he applied existing theoretical research at the practical level in the advanced composition class from teaching experiences in both the U.S. and Mexico. The study results show

that the two common themes that run throughout almost all final, in class-essays are that of student and self -assessment, which is consistent with other advocates of portfolio development who say that portfolio development "put the ball in the student's courts (wherein they become) active, thoughtful participants in the analysis of their own learning" (Murphy and Smith, 1992). He believed that teachers should consider portfolio development in their composition classes because portfolios can measure the growth of students' abilities as writers, promote ownership of students' own writing, and a long with a scoring rubric, provide a mechanism by which student can assess their own strengths and weaknesses. He further states that an important of characteristic of portfolio development is its "adaptability" to other levels and contexts.

Smith (2002) on *Learner Portfolios* notes that there are two distinct types of portfolios, the working and the assessment portfolios. The working portfolios contain the worksheets and the assignments the learners have worked on during the course. The learners are asked to produce a written reflection for each assignment on the learning; the assessment portfolios on the other hand, the contain assessment, not just feedback. The teacher might want to decide on some core assignment, to make sure there is some standardization in the assessment. The learners then select the fixed number of other assignments, which they believe best represent their present stage of learning.

Coombe and Barlow (2004) conducted a research on the Reflective Portfolio; Two Case Studies from the United Arab Emirates. This paper provides a rationale for using one type of alternative assessment, the portfolio, as a measurement of writing ability. The study results show that although inclusion of a reflective element in the portfolios strengthen students' writing, it took time to train students to assess themselves and to reflect. There is no single right way to design a portfolio. Each classroom or institution will require a unique approach to authentic assessment and in this case, each portfolio will differ somewhat. Implemented appropriately, portfolio assessment with a reflective element is a type of assessment that is continuous, collaborative, multidimensional, grounded in knowledge, and authentic.

Babaee and Tikoduadua (2013) wrote an E-Portfolios: *A New Trend in Formative Writing Assessment*. This article examines assessment methods from traditional to

alternative, as well as new trends in writing assessment to improve this skill of (English as a Foreign Language) EFL, (English as a Second Language), EFL learners. Both the advantages and challenges of e-portfolio based assessment employs dynamic, ongoing evaluation tools such as e-portfolios to empower learner's knowledge. Explosive growth of e-portfolios provides the opportunities to identify learners' needs. Reflection, collaboration, self-assessment, peer-assessment and self- regulation may be promoted in students by means of e-portfolios.

Self-Correction Peer Feedback and Teacher's Response

The range of reaction is extensive and diverse because an individual teacher is responding to an individual student, and the student is turn in passing through an ever-changing process of discovery through writing. Penaflorida (1998) claims that "self-correction and assessment of one's own writing or feedback is a step forwards learner autonomy". He also notes that "studies on self-assessment reveal that students are capable of analyzing and responding to their own writing given the proper training".

In the past two decades, peer feedback has been used in English as a second and foreign language (ESL/EFL) writing instruction. Moreover, some other researchers claims that peer feedback has a pivotal role in improving student writing skills and learning achievement (Topping et al., 2000). Wu (2006) investigated adult learners' reactions to once highly acclaimed writing pedagogic techniques: peer review and teacher feedback in an EFL composition class. Both the peer review and teacher feedback were given via the web to learner's blog. The study result shows that while the teacher feedback appeared to lead to both positive and negative revisions, depending on learners' attitude and English proficiency, a significant proportion of peer review did not serve a linguistic function to give meaningful and constructive comments but serve a pragmatic function to give complimentary praise or blessings. As far as the effectiveness of teacher feedback is concerned, Wu (2006) quoted research reviews suggested that no matter how written feedback was delivered, there was no evidence that it would produce significant improvements in student's subsequent writing.

The last respond to a written work is the teacher. The teacher's load is lightened

when students have done both individual and peer feedback. Penaflorida (1998) notes that "conferencing is one-to-one conversation between teacher and student, is an effective means of teacher responding to student writing. According to Kroll (1991: 259) in Penaflorida (1998), one advantage of conferencing "allows the teacher to uncover potential misunderstandings that the student might have about prior written feedback on issues in writing that have been discussed in class".

Theoretical Framework

In the mid-1970s, the process approach began to replace the product approach. The process approach identifies four stages in writing: (1) previewing, (2) composing/drafting, (3) revising, and editing (Tribble, 2009), including prewriting. These stages are recursive, or no linear and they can interact with each other throughout the writing process. The process approach emphasizes revision, and also feedback from others, or so students may produce many drafts with much crossing out of sentences and moving around paragraphs. The correction of spelling and punctuation is not the central importance at the early stages (Yan, 2005).

According to Badger and White (2000), the process approach has been criticized because it views the process as the same for all writers, regardless of what is being written and who is doing the writing, and because it gives insufficient importance to the purpose and of the piece of writing social context. Nevertheless, the process approach is widely excepted and utilized because it allows students to understand the step involved in writing, and it recognizes what the learners bring to the writing classroom contributes to the development of the writing skills (Badger and White, 2000).

Although the process approach is now widely accepted in the TESOL professions, it is not used by many instructors particularly in my English Department in Indonesia.

Portfolio Assessment

There are several pedagogical reasons why portfolio assessment has been used widely in ESL context. First, Yancey (1992) and Elbow (1994) note that the portfolio system focuses on the writing process: the way the writer approaches the task and how the writer develops their ideas cognitively. These include note taking, brainstorming, and drafting, redrafting, reviewing, and getting

feedback. It allows students to explore their topics. Second, the process of selection is very essential in portfolio system where students can choose the topic, the audience (teacher, the writer themselves, and select from their work the pieces they want to include in their portfolio (Yancey, 1982; Penaflorida, 1998). In this case, there is a sense of authenticity of the tasks, as what normally a good writer does. Third, Belanoff (1994) asserts that since student literacy varies by genre and context, assessment should consider the complexity of genres and composing contexts that students work and throughout the year. The portfolio assessment of student work provides the opportunity to acknowledge these multiple literacies. This model gives teacher valid information how much progress a student has done and gives more valid evaluation towards student is writing. Baker (1993) noted that student began to value peer groups and getting feedback on revisions as they took control of their writing. The process gave students a sense what they are doing was real. Furthermore, in portfolio system students are encouraged to revise their own writing since writing occurs over time and cannot be created in a single setting. Revision of student writing is very essential especially for second language learners. Even an experienced writer usually asks other readers to proofread their writing before publishing.

Methodology

Since much of the research has shown peer feedback to be ineffective, this study attempted in action research to make it more beneficial of which students marked in small group to give feedback on grammar and teachers specified the types of errors that students gave feedback on. Example: only mark S-V errors.

1. Subjects

The under graduate English department students enrolled in Writing Class III as a required course were in the third semester of academic year 2015. The students' age were range from 19-21. They all had passed Oral English 1-2, Writing 1-2, and they have different levels of general English proficiency (high, moderate, and low). The subjects of the sample data collection were taken from one of the classes consisting 20 students. They were placed not based on the level of English ability, so their general English proficiency was various.

2. Class Description

The writing class III was conducted for two semesters, two hours per week or 16 meetings. In this class there was no

midterm test, therefore, the writing evaluation is in an on-going based evaluation using the portfolio system of evaluation, a process when students start their writing from the first meeting until the final meeting. Every student used a developed writing text book which combined reading, grammar and writing activities. Students were well-informed that they will use a portfolio system during the semester. At the first class meeting, students were assigned a free writing in which students choose their own topics. There were several topics and functions were given during the writing course, but in this research three topics were analyzed such as: narrative, giving opinion and comparison and contrast with three times revises. These three topics, the beginning, mid and final semester were the source of data collection. In subsequent classes, students wrote other paragraphs with several topics too. In the writing class, students were given reading skills with activities such reading comprehension, vocabulary activities, some useful grammar exercises that support the academic reading and academic research writing skills. Most of the writing activities were done as a home assignment, as normal writer does. Normally a good writer writes based on their own time, and

their own mood. Every topic, teachers edit twice for three draft total. First rough draft peer edit, then second draft teachers edit and third draft student did self -correction before teacher finally correct. For self-correction, peer correction as well as teacher response students were given guidelines.

In the peer correction, first students wrote a topic mostly at home, then they brought their rough draft as assignment to the class to be edited by their peer, then students did self -revised, before giving it for final correction by teacher. Furthermore, peer correction was done in groups of three to four, then teachers distributed the student' assignment one for each group. Each group then marked certain grammatical form or one kind of error, for example, only subject verb agreement, or run on sentences, etc.

The written feed-backs on student's essay given by teachers including direct error correction, error codes such as subject-verb, singular -plural, run on sentences, sentence fragment, and written comments on the content organization (topic sentences, supporting details and concluding sentences).

3. Data Collection

The portfolios of student work are selected only three writing paragraph written during

the course. For example, the first written paragraph (a narrative about their holiday), second paragraph during midterm (about giving opinion), and final paragraph (comparison and contrast) were counted how many clauses used of each paragraphs, how many grammatical errors such errors- subject-verb agreement (SVA), sentence fragment (SF), run on sentences (RON), and missing subject (MS or verb (MV). Then peer-editing markings were analyzed for three different paragraphs. It is to find out what types of grammatical errors and how much number of errors are edited correctly, incorrectly marked or overlooked.

The analyzed results were to see what improvement if any was made. The error correction task on the final exam including the correct grammatical errors in a paragraph then, teachers counted how many students successfully corrected each error, how many identified but were unable to correct each error, and how many did not detect each error. Finally, teachers compared results for students who had completed all writing assignments with those who had not. Moreover, the final paragraphs were graded in term of content and organization using a rubric.

Results

1. Content and Organization

Three paragraphs were used as the source of data collection. First, the narrative paragraph was written by students as home assignment at the beginning of the semester, and the opinion paragraph was written by students as home assignment at the mid semester, while the comparison and contrast paragraph was written by students in the classroom as the final exam. They were graded in terms of content organization using a rubric.

As seen on the table the content and organization of students' writing improved significantly (Table 1), and the most significant improvement occurred in the first half of the semester. At this point, all students were able to write well-organized and well-developed academic paragraphs.

2. The results of grammatical errors

The most common grammatical errors used in this research are missing subject (MS), missing verb (MV), sentence fragment (SF), run-on sentences (RON), singular/plural, and subject-verb agreement (Table 2-9).

Table 1. Topic Sentence, Supporting Detail and Concluding Sentence.

	Narrative Paragraph			Opinion Paragraph			Comparison Paragraph		
	Topic Sentence	Supporting Detail	Concluding Sentence	Topic Sentence	Supporting Detail	Concluding Sentence	Topic Sentence	Supporting detail	Concluding Sentence
If	3	**3**	2	4	**4**	3	4	**4**	4
Ma	1	**2**	1	3	**3**	3	4	**3**	3
Gl	3	**3**	1	4	**3**	3	4	**4**	4
Ni	2	**2**	2	3	**4**	4	4	**4**	4
So	2	**2**	2	3	**3**	3	2	**3**	2
Wi	1	**2**	2	4	**4**	4	4	**3**	4
Ak	2	**2**	2	4	**3**	4	4	**3**	4
Sa	2	**2**	2	3	**3**	2	3	**3**	2
Ch	2	**2**	2	3	**3**	3	3	**3**	2
Total	**18**	**20**	**16**	**31**	**30**	**29**	**32**	**31**	**29**

Notes: Four (excellent), Three (very good), Two (acceptable) and One (need improvement)

Table 2. Number of students with each kind of error

	Narrative paragraph		Opinion paragraph		Comparison paragraph	
Average # clauses	14.9	% of students with error	19.3		29.7	
missing subject	3	33%	6	67%	1	11%
missing verb	3	33%	4	44%	2	22%
fragment	3	33%	2	22%	3	33%
run-on	4	44%	5	56%	4	44%
sing/plural	4	44%	8	89%	7	78%
subject-verb agreement	2	22%	5	56%	4	44%

Table 3. Missing subject, by student

	Narrative paragraph			Opinion paragraph			Comparison paragraph		
	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses
Wi	10	0	0%	15	3	20%	22	0	0%
So	16	0	0%	24	1	4%	17	0	0%
Ma	16	0	0%	16	0	0%	16	0	0%
Sa	14	0	0%	17	1	6%	25	0	0%
Ch	14	1	7%	27	1	4%	46	1	2%
Ak	24	0	0%	20	1	5%	40	0	0%
If	21	2	10%	17	1	6%	34	0	0%
Ni	13	0	0%	21	0	0%	45	0	0%
Gl	6	0	0%	17	0	0%	22	0	0%
Total:	134	3	2%	174	8	5%	267	1	0%

Table 4. Missing verb, by student

	Narrative paragraph			Opinion paragraph			Comparison paragraph		
	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses
Wi	10	0	0%	15	1	7%	22	0	0%
So	16	0	0%	24	1	4%	17	0	0%
Ma	16	0	0%	16	0	0%	16	2	13%
Sa	14	1	7%	17	1	6%	25	0	0%
Ch	14	1	7%	27	2	7%	46	1	2%
Ak	24	0	0%	20	0	0%	40	0	0%
If	21	1	5%	17	0	0%	34	0	0%
Ni	13	0	0%	21	0	0%	45	0	0%
Gl	6	0	0%	17	0	0%	22	0	0%
Total:	134	3	2%	174	5	3%	267	3	1%

Table 5. Sentence fragments, by student

	Narrative paragraph			Opinion paragraph			Comparison paragraph		
	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses
Wi	10	0	0%	15	0	0%	22	1	5%
So	16	0	0%	24	0	0%	17	0	0%
Ma	16	0	0%	16	0	0%	16	2	13%
Sa	14	1	7%	17	1	6%	25	0	0%
Ch	14	1	7%	27	0	0%	46	2	4%
Ak	24	0	0%	20	0	0%	40	0	0%
If	21	1	5%	17	0	0%	34	0	0%
Ni	13	0	0%	21	1	5%	45	0	0%
Gl	6	0	0%	17	0	0%	22	0	0%
Total:	134	3	2%	174	2	1%	267	5	2%

Table 6. Run-on sentence, by student

	Narrative paragraph			Opinion paragraph			Comparison paragraph		
	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses
Wi	10	0	0%	15	1	7%	22	0	0%
So	16	1	6%	24	0	0%	17	0	0%
Ma	16	2	13%	16	0	0%	16	0	0%
Sa	14	1	7%	17	0	0%	25	1	4%
Ch	14	1	7%	27	1	4%	46	1	2%
Ak	24	0	0%	20	1	5%	40	0	0%
If	21	0	0%	17	1	6%	34	4	12%
Ni	13	0	0%	21	1	5%	45	1	2%
Gl	6	0	0%	17	0	0%	22	0	0%
Total:	134	5	4%	174	5	3%	267	7	3%

Table 7. Singular/plural errors, by student

	Narrative paragraph			Opinion paragraph			Comparison paragraph		
	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses
Wi	10	0	0%	15	3	20%	22	0	0%
So	16	1	6%	24	5	21%	17	4	24%
Ma	16	1	6%	16	4	25%	16	3	19%
Sa	14	6	43%	17	7	41%	25	6	24%
Ch	14	0	0%	27	4	15%	46	10	22%
Ak	24	0	0%	20	6	30%	40	0	0%
If	21	1	5%	17	0	0%	34	1	3%
Ni	13	0	0%	21	2	10%	45	4	9%
Gl	6	0	0%	17	4	24%	22	1	5%
Total:	134	9	7%	174	35	20%	267	29	11%

Table 8. Subject-verb agreement error, by student

	Narrative paragraph			Opinion paragraph			Comparison paragraph		
	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses	#clauses	#errors	% of clauses
Wi	10	0	0%	15	2	13%	22	0	0%
So	16	1	6%	24	0	0%	17	1	6%
Ma	16	0	0%	16	0	0%	16	1	6%
Sa	14	1	7%	17	3	18%	25	2	8%
Ch	14	0	0%	27	1	4%	46	0	0%
Ak	24	0	0%	20	0	0%	40	0	0%
If	21	0	0%	17	2	12%	34	4	12%
Ni	13	0	0%	21	0	0%	45	0	0%
Gl	6	0	0%	17	1	6%	22	0	0%
Total:	134	2	1%	174	9	5%	267	8	3%

Note: In the paper, "sentence fragments" needs to be defined and distinguished from missing subject and missing verb errors, as many language teachers consider sentences with missing subjects or verbs to be sentence fragments

Table 9. Contrast between opinion paragraph (midterm) and comparison/contrast paragraph (final)

Name	Number of Clauses		Number of Error		Final Comments
	Mid	Final	Mid	Final	
Wi	15	22	3 MS	0	Much improved
			1 MV	0	
			1 RO	0	
			3 S/P	0	
			2 SV	0	
Sonya	24	22	No significant diff. in		Came late at the final

			errors		
Mariska	24	22	0 MV 0 SF 4 S/P	2 MV 2 SF 3 S/P	More errors
Saund	16	16	1 MS 1MV 1 SF 0 RON 7 S/P	0 0 0 1 RON 6 S/P	Some improvement
Christie	27	46	1 MS 2 MV 1 RON 1 SV 0 SF 4 S/P	1MS 1 MV 1 RON 0 SV 2 SF 10 S/P	Mixed results, some improvement, some worst
Amalia	20	40	1 MS 1 RON 6 S/P	0 MS 0 RON 2 S/P	Much improvement
Ifana	17	34	1 MS 1 RON 2 SV	0 MS 4 RON 4 SV	Mixed results
Nikita	21	45	1 SF 1 RON 2 S/P 1 SV	0 SF 1 RON 4 S/P 0 SV	Slight improvement
Gloria	17	22	4 S/P 1 SV	1 S/P 0 SV	Some improvement

3. The results of grammatical errors

In short, this table shows that there are seven students increased the number of clauses; four approximately double the number, one with the same number and one decreased. Regarding the missing subject (MS) error, five students reduced while the missing verb (MV) error, three students reduced, but only one had more errors. Concerning the sentence fragment (SF) error, two reduced errors while other two had more errors.

Discussion

Students wrote several paragraphs, with each paragraph going through three drafts such as narrative paragraph, opinion paragraph and comparison/contrast paragraph and incorporating self- and peer-editing, in addition to being edited by a course instructor. At the end of the semester, the teachers compared the students' writing from the beginning, middle, and end of the semester.

1) The Analysis Of Missing Subject Errors

There are many different kinds of missing subject errors. First, In the independent clause, five students had missing subject errors four in mid paragraph and one in the final paragraph while in the dependent clause two students had subject errors both in the first paragraph. In the noun clause, three students had three errors all in the mid paragraph. Second, three students used prepositional phrases as subjects on their midterm paragraph, but did not make the same mistake on the final. This kind of error did not show up in the narrative because it was not an academic paragraph, so it did not use this kind of structure. Besides, after students made this error, they were given explicit instruction on this kind of error, and how to use prepositional phrases correctly, in the following class meeting. Third, one student had missing subjects in the noun clauses after academic listing transitions, such as "the first reason is make the air polluted". She did not make the same error on the final paragraph, and in fact, he used the same structure correctly six times in her final paragraph. It is to be noted that using academic transition signals was an important focus of class instruction. Forth, two students had missing subjects when the word "it" should had been the subject. One of these correctly used "it" as subject in the final paragraph while the other student did not use any other sentences requiring "it" as subject. Seventh, one student had missing subjects in the dependent clauses on the first two paragraphs, but no missing subjects on the final paragraph, despite the fact that her final paragraph had twice the number of clauses as her midterm paragraph. Eight, one student made a different missing subject error in each paragraph, but it is hard to tell what kind of progress she made. Finally, among the nine students, three students had no missing subject at all.

In conclusion, students benefitted from feedback on these different types of errors. The most common were using prepositional phrases as subjects, and subjects in the noun clauses after academic listing signals, for example the first reason is…….and failure to use "it" or "there" as subject. By the end of the semester, all but one student had eliminated this kind of error.

2) The Analysis of Missing Verb Errors

The missing verb errors involve some form of verb "be". All students seem to understand the grammar, but make occasionally mistakes, for example, one

student had missing verb errors in each of three paragraphs. However, she had also many instances of using "be" correctly in the final paragraph. On error correction, tasks which were done in-group, only three out of nine students corrected the errors (missing "be" verb) while others failed to detect the error. For example, error in the sentence "Finally there many differences in pronunciation. Of the students who did not complete all the assignments, three out of the eleven students identified the error, and one of them corrected it.

In sum up, more time needs to be spent on avoiding the error of omitting the "be" verb. This verb is not used in Indonesia, for example, "Saya Lapar" in English "I am hungry", and so students make many errors of this type due to L1 interferences. This shows that the classroom instruction is ineffective in addressing this type of error. The diligent students and less diligent students showed similar pattern of error.

3) The Analysis Of Sentence Fragment Errors

A sentence fragment is a piece of sentence, not a complete sentence. There are eight different errors made by students. First, one student had sentence fragment error in the noun phrase and prepositional phrase in the first paragraph. Second, one student had sentence fragment error in the first paragraph, in lone independent clause beginning with a coordinating conjunction "so". This is really more style issue than a sentence error- an academic writing vs. casual writing or speaking. Second, one student had sentence fragment error in the noun phrases following a colon after an independent clause. This is really probably just a misunderstanding about how colons are used. This student did not make any other sentence fragment errors on any paragraph, for example "I helped my mother: cooked fish, cleaned my bedroom, and washed my clothes." Third, one student had sentence fragment error in the first paragraph in two dependent clauses with no dependent clause. Forth, four students had sentence fragment errors in lone dependent clause, one in the mid paragraph beginning with "although", three in the final paragraph, all began with "whereas". Fifth, one student had sentence fragment error in the final paragraph in subject and adjective clause, beginning with transition signal "Moreover": "Moreover Indonesian who lives in the city." Sixth, in the first paragraph of the semester, probably only one student made a true sentence fragment on writing a noun phrase plus prepositional phrase, for example "Instant noodle for Indomie,

Supermie and their friends". The other two students made errors related more to style and misunderstanding of how to use the colon. Finally, on the mid and final paragraphs, all but one of the sentence fragment error were dependent clauses without independent clauses. Four of these began with the subordinator "whereas". The other sentence fragment began with the word "moreover" and completed thought from the previous sentence. Using these connecting words and writing complex sentences was a major focus of this semester, so it seems that these were new structures that the students were learning to use. On the editing task, six out of nine students were able to identify this kind of error, but only two of them were able to correct. None of the students who failed to complete their writing assignments identified this error.

In conclusion, instruction of sentence fragment was effective. All of the errors were related to the structures that the students were learning to use in class, particularly complex sentences. It seems that more practice is needed using subordinators such as "whereas".

4) The Analysis Of Run-On Sentences

A run-on sentence is a mistake. Run-on sentences happen when writers do not connect sentences correctly. In this analysis, there are four different types of run-on sentence errors. First, the two errors on the mid-paragraph were probably more vocabulary errors than the run-on sentence errors. Second, all but one error were comma splices. Then three of the comma splices involved using transition signals: "for example," "also", and "on the other hand". These occurred on the mid and final paragraphs. Finally, all but one student significantly reduced the percentage of run-on sentences in their paragraphs over the course of the semester. The other students made many comma splices, but we do not know why.

To sum up, the students all understand what constitutes a clause as shown by the frequency of comma splices in their writing, by the end of the semester, all but one of the students were able to reduce the frequency of comma splices in their writing. Moreover, seven out of nine of them were able to correct it. This provide evident that the classroom instruction was effective.

5) The Analysis Of Singular/Plural (S/P) Errors

The singular/plural errors are the most common error by far and no apparent improvement although a couple students reduce the frequency of errors. The top error types are (1) using singular form

when plural is intended, (2) using singular noun to refer to something in general, for example "using cell phone in the public places is…… (3) Using a singular noun after quantifier, for example "every foods", "these thing", "many disease". On the editing task on the final exam, five out of nine students identified error involving a plural quantifies with singular noun, for example, "Some word is spelled one way in the U.S." Four of these students were able connect the error. Of the eleven students who did not complete the assignments, none were able to identify the error. Moreover, two out of nine students were able to correct the error of using singular noun to refer to something in general. One out of 11 of the other students corrected it. Furthermore, only one out of nine students corrected a singular noun where a plural noun was intended, for example "...U.S students live in dormitories on campus and in apartment off campus". Finally, four out of nine students were able to correct a singular noun preceded by "There are", for example "All in all, though there is difference between the English spoken in the U.S….."

In conclusion, classroom instruction and teacher feedback were insufficient to improve students' use of plural nouns. L1 interference is the major factor, as Indonesian seldom uses plural forms. Besides, it does not use quantifiers, which are always followed by a singular noun. Singular nouns are often used to refer to things in general or more than one of something. Another factor is probably the fact singular/plural errors usually do no cause a breakdown in communication. The intended meaning is usually understood even when the plural form is not used. As a result, students are used to always use singular forms when they speak or write in English with no detrimental effect on clear communication. More training is necessary to help students use plural when referring to more than one of something, when using quantifiers, and when referring to things in general.

6) Analysis of Subject-verb agreement (SVA) errors

The low occurrence of subject-verb errors in first paragraph probably because it was a narrative paragraph, which offered fewer opportunities for subject-verb agreement structures since it used mostly simple past tense. The mid and final paragraphs, on the other hand, required predominately-simple present tense, which requires more attention to subject-verb agreement.

The most common type of error was a basic lack of agreement when there were no intervening words between the subject and the verb. Six students made this types of error—one on the first paragraph, four on the mid paragraph, and two on the final paragraph. The ones on the final paragraph are just occasional mistakes, as the students who made them used subject-verb structures correctly several other times in the same paragraph, including in adjective and noun clauses. Those who made errors on the mid paragraph used the same structures correctly several times on the final paragraph.

Three students made errors with subject-verb agreement within an adjective clause (two on mid, one on final). All three students were able to make an adjective clause correctly on the final paragraph.

Two students made errors when there was an intervening phrase between the subject and verb of an independent clause. In each case, they used a verb that matched the last noun in the intervening phrase.

On the editing task, which contained a basic subject-verb agreement error ("A person go to a British theatre…"), five out of nine students were able to correct the error. Among the students who did not complete all of the assignments, three out of eleven students were able to correct the error.

To sum up class instruction seems to have been somewhat effective in helping student's correct subject-verb agreement errors. All students used basic subject-verb structures correctly on the final paragraph. Errors made using adjective clauses are evidence of developing grammatical competence, as adjective clauses were an important topic of instruction during the semester. Student errors when there was an intervening phrase between the subject and verb are also evidence of growing grammatical competence, as the verbs matched the noun immediately preceding the verb. It seems that all students understand the concept, but many probably need more practice identifying subject-verb errors, especially when there are intervening words between the subject and verb.

Besides self and peer editing there is also a group peer editing on the opinion paragraph (each student wrote one), comparison/contrast paragraph (students wrote them in groups-3 total), and definition paragraph (each student wrote one).

1) Subject-Verb Errors Edited Correctly

In the opinion paragraph, the total errors are seven. Students correctly

edited two errors, missed five errors, and made 11 incorrect markings. They did not seem to have a clear understanding of what constituted a subject-verb error while in the comparison-contrast paragraph the total errors are three. Students did not correctly edit any errors; they missed three errors, and made one incorrect marking. However, the incorrect marking showed some understanding of the concept of subject-verb agreement. Apparently, the students misidentified the subject because it was imbedded in a longer noun phrase: "…the similarity between Korean drama and Indonesian drama is the scene." "Is" was replaced with "are." Furthermore, in the definition paragraph total errors are six. Students correctly edited four errors, but they missed two errors, and did not make any incorrect markings.

In conclusions, students made clear progress in understanding the concept of subject-verb agreement errors, as shown by the dramatic reduction in incorrect markings throughout the semester. Students seemed to do better editing errors involving count nouns as subjects. All six of the errors that they edited correctly had count nouns as subjects. In contrast, of the 10 errors they failed to identify, 6 involved non-count noun subjects, 3 had count noun subjects, and 1 had a relative pronoun as subject (in an adjective clause).

2) Sentence Fragments, Missing Subjects and Verbs

Regarding the opinion paragraph, students correctly edited one sentence fragment and made two incorrect markings. They failed to mark one clause, which was missing subject and verb, three clauses with missing subjects, and five clauses with missing verbs.

Concerning the comparison/contrast paragraph, students correctly edited four sentence fragments, one clause missing both subject and verb, and one run-on sentence. They made no incorrect markings. They failed to mark one fragment, one clause missing subject and verb, 2 clauses with missing subjects, and nine clauses with missing verbs.

In the definition paragraph, students correctly marked one sentence fragment and made no incorrect markings. They failed to mark one sentence fragment and one clause with

a missing subject. In the missing verb errors, 13 out of 14 missing verbs were "be" verbs. Four of these errors were in adjective clauses, and two of these involved errors in forming a passive verb. The students included the main verb but apparently did not know that the "be" verb was also required to make a passive verb. None of these errors was made in the definition paragraph. In the missing subject errors, all four missing subject errors were in the second clause of a compound, complex, or run-on sentence. None of these errors was made in the definition paragraph. One of the two sentence fragment errors in the definition paragraph was really an error in style: The student began her sentence with "so" to show a result from the previous sentence instead of connecting the two sentences to create a compound sentence.

In summing up, on the opinion and comparison/contrast paragraphs students missed a lot of missing subject/verb errors. By the time, students wrote the definition paragraph, they seem to have eliminated this kind of error from their writing. Students were fairly successful marking other kinds of sentence fragment errors. Since missing subject and missing verb errors received specific attention during class, it seems that the students benefitted from the instruction, as demonstrated by the absence of these kinds of errors in the definition paragraph. This seems to contrast with the analysis of missing verb errors in individual students' paragraphs (above), which showed that instruction was ineffective in helping students eliminating missing verb errors, especially when the missing verb was some form of "be." Perhaps this discrepancy can be accounted for by the fact that in the editing task on the final exam and when writing the final paragraph, the students were under pressure in a testing environment, and so they made more errors. In this analysis of the peer editing, however, the definition paragraph was written by the students at home, so perhaps they were able to avoid this kind of error when they were not under pressure.

Conclusion

The study results show that the portfolios were useful for comparing students' writing over the course of the

semester. There was significant improvement in the content and organization of students' writing, while results of grammar were less consistent depending on the individual factors and error type. It seems difficult to determine how much the use of portfolios contributed to this improvement, however, the compiling of students' work through self-editing, peer editing and teacher response in the portfolio system from the beginning of semester to the end likely contributed significantly to this improvement. Portfolios were just one of several teaching techniques that helped students improve.

Most of the literature includes reflection as an important component of portfolios, but we did not include it in ours. To make portfolios even more effective, it would be helpful to have students write a brief reflection after each assignment with the following elements: What did you do well on this paragraph? Did you understand all of the teacher's comments/markings? What errors did you make the most? What would you like to improve most for your next paragraph? In this way, students will become aware of their areas of strength and weakness and hopefully become more autonomous as they consider how to improve their own writing. This would also provide valuable information for teachers, as they would be able to see how well the students are able to assess their own writing.

References

Baack, E., 1997. portfolio development: an introduction. *In English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 38-43).

Babaee, M. and Tikoduadua, M., 2013, May. E-portfolios: A new trend in formative writing assessment. In *International Journal of Modern Education Forum* (Vol. 2, No. 2).

Badger, R. and White, G., 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), pp.153-160.

Baker, N.W., 1993. The effect of portfolio-based instruction on composition students' final examination scores, course grades, and attitudes toward writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, pp.155-174

Belanoff, P., 1994. Portfolios and literacy: Why? *Black et al*, pp.13-24

Chung, S.J., 2012. Portfolio assessment in ESL academic writing: Examining the effects of reflection in the writing process. *Unpublished MA Theses*, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champain

Coombe, C. and Barlow, L., 2004. The reflective portfolio: Two case studies from the united arab emirates. *In English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 18-23).

Elbow, P., 1994. Will the virtues of portfolios blind us to their potential

dangers? *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment*, pp.40-55.

Liu, J. and Hansen, J.G., 2002. *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Murphy, S. and Smith, M.A., 1992. Looking into portfolios. *Portfolios in the Writing Classroom*, pp.49-60.

Murphy, S., 1994. Writing portfolios in K-12 schools: Implications for linguistically diverse students. *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment*, pp.140-156.

Tribble, C., 2009. Writing academic English—a survey review of current published resources. *ELT Journal*, 63(4), pp.400-417.

Yan, Guo. 2005. A Process Genre Model for Teaching Writing. *English Teaching Forum* Vol. 43. Number 3.

Yancey, K.B., 1992. Portfolios in the writing classroom. *Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English*.

Penaflorida, A. H. 1998. Non-traditional form of assessment and response student writing: A step towards learner autonomy. In W.A. Renandya & G.M. Jacobs (Eds.). *Learners and Language Learning, Anthology* 39, 72-88.

Pierce, L.V. and O'Malley, J.M., 1992. *Performance and portfolio assessment for language minority students* (Vol. 9). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Topping, K.J., Smith, E.F., Swanson, I. and Elliot, A., 2000. Formative peer assessment of academic writing between postgraduate students. *Assessment & evaluation in higher education*, 25(2), pp.149-169.

Wanchid, R., 2013. The use of self-correction, paper-pencil peer feedback and electronic peer feedback in the efl writing class: Opportunities and challenges. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies,* 2(3), p.157.

Wolf, D.P., 1989. Portfolio assessment: Sampling student work. *Document Resume*, p.351.

Wu, W.S., 2006. The effect of blog peer review and teacher feedback on the revisions of EFL writers. *Journal of Education and Foreign Languages and Literature*, 3(2), pp.125-138.