Portfolio Assessment in Enhancing the Grammatical Competencies in Writing

Lylanie A. Esternon[1], Cecilia B. Diva[2]
[1]Secondary School Teacher I- JHS, [2] Professor Graduate Studies and Applied Research (GSAR)
[1]Callejon National High School, Callejon, San Antonio, Quezon, Philippines
[2]Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Laguna, Philippines

ABSTRACT: This study determined the role of the portfolio assessment as a learner-centered assessment in enhancing learners' grammatical competencies of students in writing during the third quarter of School Year 2023-2024. The researcher used descriptive rubrics to determine the gain scores in writing through portfolio assessment. This study utilized quantitative research design that draws statistical conclusion from quantitative data. The students' performances in writing have been described in terms of portfolio assessment highlighting the grammatical competencies of the students in terms of Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation, Cohesion and Coherence. As a result from the statistical analysis, there is a significant difference in the mean pre-writing and post-writing test scores of the students in the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities across all three grammatical competencies although the study concludes Grade 8 students need to further enhance their level of grammatical competence in cohesion and coherence compared to lexis and spelling and grammar and vocabulary. The merits and essentials of the findings were drawn and treated as inputs in the development of portfolio assessment in enhancing the grammatical competencies in writing. Recommendations are offered to improve strategies and techniques in instruction and in the development of this strategy will complement the goal to develop the relevant competencies of students in the field of English language learning.

KEYWORDS – Cohesion and Coherence, Grammatical Competencies, Grammar and Punctuation, Lexis and Spelling, Portfolio Assessment, and Rubrics.

INTRODUCTION

The skill of effective writing is increasingly vital, and writing instruction is becoming more significant in second language (L2) education (Weigle, 2002). The task of evaluating writing is also becoming a priority for experts in the field. The rise of portfolio assessment as a direct method of evaluating writing stems partly from the need to align writing assessment with contemporary cognitive and social perspectives on writing (Graziano-King, 2007). Additionally, new insights into the learning process suggest that assessment and learning are closely connected. These modern approaches to language assessment should be incorporated into classroom-based assessment practices (Marzano, Pickering & McTighe, 1993).

The classroom portfolio is designed to enhance teaching and learning within a learner-centered framework (Hirvela & Sweetland, 2005). It is an effective pedagogical tool that combines assessment and teaching (Hamp-Lyons, 1994 as cited in Chen, 2006; Nunes, 2004; Klenowsky, 2002). Portfolios show students' progress and integrate assessment with learning (Nunan, 2004; Barootchi & Keshavarz, 2002). A well-crafted student portfolio focuses on what students can do and allows for ongoing, adapted instruction where assessment is continuous (Valencia, 1990). Portfolios are particularly beneficial for non-native English students as they provide a more comprehensive measure of student ability and eliminate the pressure of timed writing exams, which can be especially challenging for non-native writers (Hamp-Lyons & Condon, 2000, p.61). They are promising tools for enhancing various learning dimensions, promoting student autonomy (Chen, 2006), and encouraging student ownership of their work (Genesee & Upshur, 1996; Tierney, Carter & Desai, 1991).

Despite these advantages, writing portfolios are not commonly used in the students' writing context. Students typically receive numerical grades for their end-of-term writing assignments, which may not accurately reflect their writing abilities. Consequently, teachers may struggle to make precise evaluations of their students' development as writers. Hedge (2000) argues that portfolio assessment offers a more complete picture of students' writing abilities than a single essay written under timed conditions. Evaluating portfolios instead of just one timed writing sample allows teachers to make better-informed judgments about students' writing skills. Beyond this summative aspect, portfolio assessment also provides continuous feedback that benefits both teaching and learning (Dysthe, 2008). This study aims to determine whether portfolio-based, process-oriented writing pedagogy enhances

Portfolio Assessment in Enhancing the Grammatical Competencies in Writing

the students' grammatical competencies in writing such as Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Vocabulary and Cohesion and Coherence.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study aimed to enhance the grammatical competencies in writing using portfolio assessment in English 8 at Callejon National High School, school year 2023-2024. Specifically, the researcher sought answers to the following questions: 1. What is the mean pre-writing test score of the students in the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities as to: 1.1. Lexis and Spelling; 1.2. Grammar and Punctuation; and 1.3. Cohesion and Coherence? 2. What is the mean post-writing test score of the students in the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities as to: 2.1. Lexis and Spelling; 2.2. Grammar and Punctuation; and 2.3. Cohesion and Coherence? 3. Is there a significant difference in the mean pre-writing test and post-writing test scores of the students in the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities?

The objective of this research was to examine how portfolio assessment contributes to the improvement of students' grammatical skills in writing. The study consisted of students aged 13 to 15 years old, all sharing the same cultural background. Over a four-week period in the third quarter of the academic year 2023-2024, Grade 8 English students were tasked with writing paragraphs of increasing complexity, with specific word count requirements, as part of various writing activities. The researcher employed descriptive rubrics to assess the progress in writing through portfolio assessment.

A portfolio serves as a structured compilation of students' work, showcasing their activities, accomplishments, and achievements over a defined timeframe. In this study, students were required to present their portfolios by submitting their best work from a specific period. The portfolio assessment focused on evaluating the outcomes of their learning. In line with the concept of developmental portfolios, students submitted pieces of work that demonstrated evidence of improvement or progression over time, depending on the extent of their written assignments.

For data collection purposes in this study, a designated instrument was employed. The students' reflective essays or written paragraphs, adhering to specific word count requirements, served as the primary source of portfolio assessment to evaluate the enhancement of students' grammatical skills in writing.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Genesee and Upshur (2014), reviewing portfolios enhances students' engagement and ownership of their own learning, leading to positive effects on student learning outcomes. Portfolios offer students valuable opportunities to actively participate in the assessment process and take charge of their learning journey.

Moya and O'Malley (2012), highlight that portfolio assessment is a specific type of portfolio, where a portfolio refers to a collection of samples of student assignments. Portfolio assessment, on the other hand, involves the creation, compilation, and evaluation of the portfolio contents.

Similarly, Mayer and Tusin (2016), emphasize that the concept of portfolio assessment is not novel. Portfolios originally emerged as collections of works by artists and have long been utilized to showcase competencies. As a response to the need for alternative and more authentic assessment practices, portfolios have become a common substitute for traditional assessment methods.

Steffe and Gale (2014), emphasize that portfolio assessment aligns with constructivist theories, which advocate for learners constructing knowledge themselves rather than passively receiving it from teachers. In portfolio assessment, students are required to present selected evidence demonstrating their learning in relation to the course objectives. They must also justify their choice of portfolio items with reference to these objectives.

According to Biggs (2015), the process of preparing an assessment portfolio is an active one that involves collecting, synthesizing, and organizing relevant items to provide the strongest evidence of achieving the learning objectives. This process necessitates ongoing assessment, reflection, and justification.

Klein (2015), defines writing as the ability to use written symbols to express ideas, allowing for meaningful communication of thoughts to others. Writing skills encompass specific abilities that enable writers to articulate their thoughts in a coherent manner and engage with the message mentally. Writing goes beyond conveying content; it also serves as a representation of oneself.

According to Fahed Al-Serhani's study in 2007, portfolio assessment had a significant positive influence on students' overall writing performance, including various sub-skills such as purpose, content, organization, vocabulary, sentence structure, and mechanics. In a related study by Liu in 2003, students' experiences with writing portfolios in college composition courses and their attitudes towards portfolios were investigated.

Chung and Pullum (2015), define grammar as the system that governs how words are manipulated and combined to form meaningful units in a language. Every language has a set of rules that dictate how these units of meaning can be constructed. A learner who has mastered grammar can effectively apply these rules to express themselves using acceptable language forms.

Ur (2009) defines grammar as the system by which a language operates and combines words to convey specific meanings that cannot be adequately expressed through vocabulary alone. Grammar encompasses the organization and relationship of ideas, the functions of different types of utterances (statements, questions, requests, etc.), and the expression of time relations, singular or

plural distinctions, and other aspects of meaning. There are rules that govern how words should be manipulated and arranged to effectively and acceptably convey intended meanings.

Allen (2013) suggests that grammar can have a significant impact and influence, often more so than its denotation. Many of the connotations associated with grammar carry negative undertones, but these connotations are often based on misunderstandings of the fundamental definitions of the word. Developing an understanding of the various connotations associated with grammar can help English teachers comprehend students' potential aversion to studying grammar and address their own difficulties or confusions regarding the subject.

Burns (2009), explains that grammar involves understanding the systems and patterns used to select and combine words. By studying grammar, individuals can recognize the structure and regularity that form the foundation of language, providing them with the tools to discuss and analyze the language system.

Mellish and Ritchie (2008), state that when developing a grammar, it is necessary to create appropriate grammatical categories to classify words and other constituents. The names given to these categories are essentially arbitrary, as their significance lies in how they are used in the rules and lexicon.

According to Algeo and Pyles (2010), grammar is sometimes defined as the general rules of a language, while lexis refers to unpredictable elements. However, this definition is not entirely accurate, as certain word combinations, known as collocations, can be predicted.

Kirkham (2010) highlights that grammar, at its core, consists of the rules of language. However, the interpretation and scope of these rules can vary significantly from one definition to another. As a result, the common understanding of grammar may differ subtly but importantly from the linguistic sense of the term.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology that is being adopted in the study. A description of the research methodology including the setting, theoretical basis, data collection procedure, and data analysis strategies are presented.

Research Design

This study utilized quantitative research design. It is quantitative experimental design has been adopted in which it involves numerical data collection and statistical analysis. It draws statistical conclusion from quantitative data. The students' performances in writing have been described in terms of portfolio assessment highlighting the grammatical competencies of the students in terms of Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation, Coherence, and Cohesion.

Their performances were checked using repeated statistical technique to see the amount of students' improvement over the period through descriptive rubric scoring. The design was also qualitative in that students' growth over time has been described through the portfolio they have prepared. In each writing activity, students write a reflective essay with a set number of words during the third quarter grading period, and they were graded based on the scoring rubric provided by the researcher.

Respondents of the Study

The researcher utilized Callejon National High School in San Antonio Quezon as respondent school with 30 students from Grade 8 Blueberry in the School Year 2023-2024. They were in the age range of 13 to 15 at the time of the study with same cultural background. As far as the writing instruction is concerned, the researcher guided the respondents on how to accomplish the writing tasks and in using portfolio assessment on their writing activities.

Since, there have been some criteria for students to meet in their portfolio, the students were instructed to have their formal theme to serve as their portfolio for varied writing activities. During the quarter, students had a specific writing task with a certain number of words describing the grammatical competencies. With the use of scoring rubrics, the researcher monitored the students' progress over a certain period.

Research Instruments

The purpose of the study was to utilize an instrument for collecting the relevant data. The students' reflective essays were the primary source of portfolio assessment. The researcher also provided writing activities with rubrics scores aligned in the lesson plan to express the respondent's knowledge about the certain issue where writing skills about the certain grammatical competencies were measured. Their attitude towards the role of portfolio assessment on their reflective process writing was investigated. The instructional material was provided for the basics of paragraph writing, and essay writing, among others.

Research Procedure

The following procedures were observed by the researcher in conducting the study.

Conceptualization and Preparation of the Proposal. To perform the analysis, the researcher had conceptualized and completed the requisite preliminary procedures. Through a letter detailing the study's intent and goals, she sought permission to conduct the study from the school principal; once accepted, the researcher prepared the necessary instrument in conducting the research. The research tools, which included the students' portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities, pre-writing test and post-writing tests,

Portfolio Assessment in Enhancing the Grammatical Competencies in Writing

and an adopted scoring rubrics consisting of Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Vocabulary and Cohesion and Coherence, were created for validation and evaluation.

Validation and Evaluation of the Instrument. English teachers and experts were asked to evaluate and validate the instrument. As a guide in evaluation, they were given a written validation tool. The researcher considered comments, suggestions, and recommendations for improving and revising the learning resource. The instrument was checked and validated for instrumentation and implementation after revision and necessary improvement.

Implementation of the Learning Resource. The following procedure dealt with the study's instrument implementation. The study samples consisted of 30 participants out of 42 students from English 8 Blueberry section and were selected using random sampling procedures. In (Creswell (2008), justified the relevance of random sampling as a method to randomly assign individuals to the study group. In doing so, each student is provided the same probability to be included within the research project.

In this study, random sampling is defined as the process of systematic selection of subjects for analysis, without having local and contextual features considered (Cohen, 2006).

The students accomplished writing outputs from simple to complex and assessed by the researcher using the set of repeated scoring rubrics ensuring the proper use of cohesive devices in the paragraph. The use of appropriate transition words to ensure coherence and cohesion in writing. Considering the rules of grammar and mechanics, including punctuation and spelling. With the use of formal theme notebook, and constructed feedback of the teacher, the students' progress in writing has been assessed.

In each lesson, there were set of writing activities that students were required to accomplish. The writing activity was given during the application part of the lesson where students' knowledge about the certain issue was being assessed.

As the teacher discussed the lesson about the importance of paragraph writing, outlining, and identifying the parts of writing a paragraph, the students finally had an idea on how to write or compose an effective paragraph as it consists of the topic sentence, supporting sentences and concluding sentences with the application of coherence and other grammatical competencies.

Before the portfolio assessment, the respondents answered the pre-writing test which composed of four writing prompts with repeated scoring rubrics about lexis and spelling, grammar and punctuation and cohesion and coherence.

Then, the portfolio assessment began during the first lesson which deals with Identifying the Authors' Biases, students were required to give opinions about wearing proper school uniforms, a reflective essay expressing their viewpoint with at least 60 words. The writing activity has been assessed with scoring rubrics highlighting the Lexis and Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar, and Cohesion and Coherence.

The second writing activity was a reflective essay discussing the advantages and disadvantages of technology in the classroom composed of 80 words. The third writing activity was a reflective essay consisted of 100 words discussing the importance of exercise.

Finally, the last writing activity was about how social media has become an integral part of teenagers' lives, influencing their social interactions, self-esteem, and behaviour. A reflective essay discussing the impact of social media on teenagers that should have 120 words.

These written reflections of the students were assessed after the lesson where a specific writing activity with repeated scoring rubrics was given. Students also answered the pre- writing test and post-writing test which then analysed with the help of quantitative research techniques.

At the end of the study, students' writing skills and its relation to the use of portfolio assessments in enhancing their grammatical competencies of the students during the quarter were evaluated through the data collected students' written outputs during their writing activities as well as from the pre-writing test and post-writing test. Comprehension level of the students was measured by means of scoring rubrics. Rubrics measured the comprehension in terms of the required design skills, as well as the analysis of the design concepts.

Data Analysis and Presentation. The researcher encoded the results of the study. Data from the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities were tallied, tabulated, analysed, and interpreted statistically.

Ethical Considerations. The researcher wrote a letter to the principal of Callejon National High School requesting permission to conduct the study and asked for the permission of the adviser of the students who served as the researcher's respondents in the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities. The respondents took the pre-writing test consisting of four writing prompts as well as the pos-writing test. The respondents had written consent form of participation, and their identity was kept confidential. Test protocols results were encoded without exposing the name of the respondents. Beforehand, they were given an orientation on the purposes of the study.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Portfolios are collections of relevant work that reflect students' individual efforts, development, and progress over a designated period and can provide students, teachers, parents, and administrators with a broad picture of each student's growth over time. To

---

obtain accurate data in response to the specific questions, the study used statistical techniques to arrive at the correct interpretation and analysis of data.

Rubric scoring employed in getting the mean pre-writing test and post-writing test scores of the students in portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities.

In response to the analysis on the extent of student-respondents' experience in the pre-writing test and post-writing test, mean and standard deviation were used.

To find the significant difference in the pre- writing and post-writing test scores of the students in the portfolio assessed reflective learning activities, paired t-test was used

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of the study in tabular forms with corresponding interpretation. The data collected are further analyzed and interpreted to draw relevant conclusions and recommendations.

Table 1. Mean Scores of the Students' Grammatical Competencies in Pre-Writing Test in terms of Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation and Cohesion and Coherence

Grammatical Competencies	Mean	SD	…	Verbal Interpretation
Lexis and Spelling	2.93	0.25	…	Good
	2.77	0.43		Good
Grammar and Punctuation Cohesion and Coherence Overall	2.60	0.50	…	Good
	2.77	0.28		Good

Legend: *1.0-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.0 (Outstanding)*

Table 1 demonstrates the mean pre-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 2.93, with a standard deviation of 0.25. This suggests that, on average, students scored relatively high in terms of Lexis and Spelling proficiency. The mean pre-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 2.77, with a standard deviation of 0.43. This indicates that students' performance in Grammar and Punctuation was slightly lower compared to Lexis and Spelling, but still relatively strong. The mean pre-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 2.60, with a standard deviation of 0.5. This suggests that students' performance in Cohesion and Coherence was slightly lower compared to Lexis and Spelling and Grammar and Punctuation, indicating some room for improvement in organizing and connecting ideas within their writing. The mean pre-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 2.93, with a standard deviation of 0.25. This suggests that, on average, students scored relatively high in terms of Lexis and Spelling proficiency. The result suggests that most of the students were able to express their ideas with an excellent range of vocabulary and spelling mostly correct.

Furthermore, the mean pre-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 2.77, with a standard deviation of 0.43. This indicates that students' performance in Grammar and Punctuation was slightly lower compared to Lexis and Spelling, but still relatively strong. In which the students applied the how importance of using mixture of simple, compound, and complex sentences with accurate and correct punctuation. On the contrary, the mean pre-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 2.60, with a standard deviation of 0.5. This suggests that students' performance in Cohesion and Coherence was slightly lower compared to Lexis and Spelling and Grammar and Punctuation, indicating some room for improvement in organizing and connecting ideas within their writing. It highly expresses that the students' knowledge about cohesion and coherence needs to improve and organize their ideas in a logical way. The result also dictates that students need to develop the use of cohesive devices appropriately. Overall, the students achieved an average score of 2.77 with a standard deviation of 0.28. This suggests that while there is generally strong performance in these areas, there is still some variability and room for improvement, particularly in Cohesion and Coherence.

Additionally, the study cited by Mojabi (2014), supports the notion that grammatical competence is essential in writing. According to Chomsky's theory, grammatical competence refers to the ability to recognize and produce grammatical structures accurately and effectively in communication. This emphasizes the significance of students' knowledge in all aspects of grammatical competencies.

In summary, writing is a multifaceted process that requires both cognitive abilities and social skills. Improving writing skills, especially in a second language, is crucial, particularly in terms of cohesion and coherence. Grammatical competence plays a vital role in effective communication, as it involves understanding and using the grammatical structures of a language.

Portfolio Assessment in Enhancing the Grammatical Competencies in Writing

Table 2. Mean Scores of the Students' Grammatical Competencies in Post Writing Test in terms of Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation and Cohesion and Coherence

Grammatical Competencies	Mean	SD	…	Verbal Interpretation
Lexis and Spelling	4.4	0.56	…	Very Good
	3.93	0.58		Very Good
Grammar and Punctuation				
Cohesion and Coherence	3.57	0.50	…	Very Good
Overall				
	3.97	0.43		Very Good

Legend: *1.0-1.49 (Poor); 1.50-2.49 (Fair); 2.50-3.49 (Good); 3.50-4.49 (Very Good); 4.50-5.0 (Outstanding)*

The table 2 shows the mean post-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 4.4, with a standard deviation of 0.56. This indicates a significant improvement compared to the pre-writing test, suggesting that students' proficiency in Lexis and Spelling has increased after the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities. The mean post-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 3.93, with a standard deviation of 0.58. Like Lexis and Spelling, there is a notable improvement compared to the pre-writing test, although the increase is slightly lower. This suggests that students' performance in Grammar and Punctuation has also improved after the reflective learning activities. The mean post-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 3.57, with a standard deviation of 0.50. While there is an improvement compared to the pre-writing test, the increase is relatively smaller than that of Lexis and Spelling and Grammar and Punctuation. This indicates that students' performance in Cohesion and Coherence has improved, but there may still be some areas for further development. Overall, the students achieved an average score of 3.97 with a standard deviation of 0.43. This suggests a significant improvement in their writing skills because of the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities. However, there may still be room for further enhancement, particularly in Cohesion and Coherence.

 As what stated in the overall results, it was given that there was an improvement in the post-writing test from its pre-writing test. It is highly suggested that after the portfolio-assessment with varied reflected learning activities, students were able to enhance their grammatical competencies as they applied the use of outstanding range of vocabulary and correct spelling, they used an accurate mixture of simple, compound, and complex and correct punctuation. Lastly, they able to well organize and logically present their paragraphs with the used of variety of cohesive devices outstandingly.

The effectiveness of portfolios in developing both reading and writing skills has been supported by research. Eissa (2003) conducted a study that focused on the impact of portfolios on these skills. In English writing classrooms, portfolio creation involves students actively participating in four main practices: collection, selection, reflection, and conferencing.

During the portfolio development process, students are asked to collect samples of their work, select their best writing samples, reflect on their work, and confer with their teacher regarding their learning products and processes. These practices encourage and motivate students to improve their writing performance. Additionally, the portfolio development process allows students to experience the different stages of the writing process, including planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

Weiser (1992) also asserts that portfolios can be considered an effective teaching strategy in writing classes. The current study aimed to prove the effectiveness of portfolios in enhancing writing skills. It is important to note that evaluation is an integral component of the instructional process, as highlighted in the present study.

 In summary, the study by Eissa (2003) demonstrates the positive effects of portfolios on the development of reading and writing skills. The practices involved in portfolio creation, such as collection, selection, reflection, and conferencing, motivate students to improve their writing performance. Portfolios are considered an effective teaching strategy in writing classes, and evaluation plays a crucial role in the instructional process.

Table 3. Test of Difference Between the Pre-Writing test and Post Writing Test of Grammatical Competencies as to Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation and Cohesion and Coherence

Grammatical Competencies in Writing	PRE-Writing test		POST-Writing test		t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Verbal Interpretation
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD				
Lexis and Spelling	2.93	0.25	4.4	0.56	12.775	29	.000	Significant
Grammar and Punctuation	2.77	0.43	3.93	0.58	8.558	29	.000	Significant
Cohesion and Coherence	2.6	0.50	3.57	0.5	6.922	29	.000	Significant
OVERALL	2.77	0.28	3.97	0.43	12.411	29	.000	Significant

Legend: *If p-value Sig. (2-tailed) ≤.05, then it is statistically significant. If p-value Sig.(2-tailed) >.05, then it is NOT statistically significant*

Portfolio Assessment in Enhancing the Grammatical Competencies in Writing

Table 3 presents the comparative mean scores and standard deviations for pre-writing test and post writing tests in three grammatical competencies: Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation, and Cohesion and Coherence. It also includes the t-value, degrees of freedom (df), and the significance level (Sig. 2-tailed) for each competency. The t-value measures the difference between the mean scores of the pre-writing and post writing tests, considering the standard deviation and sample size. A higher absolute t-value indicates a greater difference between the means. The significance level (Sig. 2-tailed) shows whether the observed difference between the mean scores is statistically significant.

As shown in the Table, the mean pre-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 2.93, with a standard deviation of 0.25 while the mean post-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 4.4, with a standard deviation of 0.56. This indicates a significant improvement compared to the pre-writing test, suggesting that students' proficiency in Lexis and Spelling has increased after the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities. This suggests that, on average, students scored relatively high in terms of Lexis and Spelling proficiency.

Furthermore, the mean pre-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 2.77, with a standard deviation of 0.43. This indicates that students' performance in Grammar and Punctuation was slightly lower compared to Lexis and Spelling, but still relatively strong while the mean post-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 3.93, with a standard deviation of 0.58. Like Lexis and Spelling, there is a notable improvement compared to the pre-writing test, although the increase is slightly lower. This suggests that students' performance in Grammar and Punctuation has also improved after the reflective learning activities.

In addition, the mean pre-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 2.60, with a standard deviation of 0.5. This suggests that students' performance in Cohesion and Coherence was slightly lower compared to Lexis and Spelling and Grammar and Punctuation, indicating some room for improvement in organizing and connecting ideas within their writing while compared to the mean post-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 3.57, with a standard deviation of 0.50. There is an improvement compared to the pre-writing test, the increase is relatively smaller than that of Lexis and Spelling and Grammar and Punctuation. This indicates that students' performance in Cohesion and Coherence has improved, but there may still be some areas for further development.

In this case, all three grammatical competencies (Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation, Cohesion and Coherence) have shown significant differences between the mean scores of the pre-writing and post-writing tests, with p-values < 0.05. This indicates that the improvement in scores from pre-writing to post writing tests is significant as what the p-value which is ≤ 0.05. Therefore, based on the statistical analysis, there is a significant difference in the mean pre-writing and post-writing test scores of the students in the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities across all three grammatical competencies.

It is indeed true that writing skill cannot be developed without a strong command of vocabulary and grammar. Students who acquire vocabulary proficiently and enhance their grammatical competencies in terms of Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Vocabulary, and Cohesion and Coherence have a greater possibility of becoming good and proficient writers. Possessing the necessary writing skills, such as effective learning outcomes and producing well-written outputs, is crucial.

The study by Richards (2016) aligns with this understanding, as it indicates that grammar refers to the system of rules used to create grammatically well-formed sentences in English. This further supports the significance of portfolio assessment as a strategy to enhance students' grammatical competencies in writing.

During the treatment phase, it was observed that students who were taught using portfolio assessment actively engaged in writing activities. They questioned what they did not understand, particularly regarding vocabulary items and verb tense changes. Despite some confusion about verb change from present to past form, students were enthusiastic about revising their drafts after receiving feedback from their teachers. This feedback allowed them to identify and correct mistakes, resulting in improved writing products.

This finding is consistent with research by Efendi et al. (2017) and Tabatabaei and Assefi (2012), which suggest that portfolio assessment increases students' motivation by helping them recognize and address their problems during the teaching-learning process. Writing is a complex process that involves selecting, combining, and arranging ideas to create a coherent and well-structured piece of writing.

Lundstrom and Baker (2009) categorize writing into global issues (content and organization) and local issues (vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics). During the treatment, students faced difficulties with grammar and mechanics when writing a recount text, particularly in constructing sentences in the past tense and using proper capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.

Studies by Prastikawati et al. (2016), Obeiah and Bataineh (2016), Shokraie and Tabrizi (2016), and others have shown that portfolio assessment leads to significant improvements in students' writing ability across various aspects, including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

However, some studies, such as Roohani and Taheri (2015), and Uçar and Yazıcı (2016), suggest that portfolio assessment may not have a significant impact on vocabulary and mechanics.

In conclusion, vocabulary and grammar proficiency are crucial for developing writing skills. Portfolio assessment has been found to be an effective strategy for enhancing students' grammatical competencies in writing. It motivates students to actively participate in writing activities, seek clarification, and receive feedback to improve their writing. While portfolio assessment has shown positive

effects on various aspects of writing, some variations exist in its impact on vocabulary and mechanics. Overall, portfolio assessment plays a significant role in improving students' overall writing ability and supporting their learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter consolidates the summary of the gathered findings, the implications drawn from the discoveries, and the recommendations proposed for future studies. This study aimed to determine the role of the portfolio assessment in enhancing students' grammatical competencies in writing. Students were in the age range of 13 to 15 with same cultural background. During the third quarter of School Year 2023-2024, students in Grade 8 English will write a paragraph from simple to complex with a certain number of words in varied writing activities during four weeks of the Third Quarter. The researcher used descriptive rubrics to determine the gain scores in writing through portfolio assessment. As portfolio being a systematic collection of students' work that represents student activities, accomplishments, and achievements over a specific period, students are expected to showcase their portfolio by submitting their best work over a specific period.

This study utilized quantitative research design. It is quantitative experimental design has been adopted in which it involves numerical data collection and statistical analysis. It draws statistical conclusion from quantitative data. At the end of the study, students' writing skills and its relation to the use of portfolio assessments in enhancing the grammatical competencies of the students during the quarter were evaluated through the students' written outputs during their writing activities as well as from the pre-writing test and post-writing test. Comprehension level of the students was measured by means of scoring rubrics.

As to the level of the students' grammatical competencies in their pre-writing test in terms of Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation and Cohesion and Coherence, the mean pre-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 2.93, with a standard deviation of 0.25. Furthermore, with the mean pre-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 2.77, with a standard deviation of 0.43. On the contrary, as the mean pre-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 2.60, with a standard deviation of 0.5.

As to the level of the students' grammatical competencies in their post-writing test in terms of Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation and Cohesion and Coherence, the mean post-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 4.4, with a standard deviation of 0.56. The mean post-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 3.93, with a standard deviation of 0.58. The mean post-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 3.57, with a standard deviation of 0.50. Overall, the students achieved an average score of 11.90 out of 15 across all grammatical competencies assessed in the post-writing test.

As to the test of difference between the pre-writing test and post-writing test on the dependent variable, the mean pre-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 2.93, with a standard deviation of 0.25 while the mean post-writing test score for Lexis and Spelling is 4.4, with a standard deviation of 0.56. Furthermore, the mean pre-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 2.77, with a standard deviation of 0.43. The mean post-writing test score for Grammar and Punctuation is 3.93, with a standard deviation of 0.58. In addition, the mean pre-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 2.60, with a standard deviation of 0.5 compared to the mean post-writing test score for Cohesion and Coherence is 3.57, with a standard deviation of 0.50. In this case, all three grammatical competencies (Lexis and Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation, Cohesion and Coherence) show highly significant differences between the mean scores of the pre-writing and post-writing tests, with p-values < 0.05. Therefore, based on the statistical analysis, there is a significant difference in the mean pre-writing and post-writing test scores of the students in the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities across all three grammatical competencies.

Based on the findings of the study, the conclusion is drawn: There is significant difference between the mean pre-writing test and post writing test scores of the student-respondents in the portfolio-assessed reflective learning activities. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that "there is no significant difference between the mean pre-writing test and post-writing test of the student-respondents" is not sustained.

Based on the results and conclusions posted in the study, the following recommendations are formulated: Since the researcher only had 30 respondents for the study, the researcher suggests that all Grade 8 students in the school be the respondents for the study to be more reliable.

Since the study revealed the role of the portfolio assessment in enhancing the grammatical competencies in writing, it is suggested that the study be conducted across grade levels.

Since portfolio assessment helped the students in enhancing their grammatical competencies in writing, teachers may be encouraged to incorporate portfolio assessment into the teaching-and-learning process in all subject areas which utilize English as a medium of instruction.

Future researchers may consider the use of portfolio assessment as a great strategy to enhance one's skill in writing and incorporate it into their studies to further validate the findings of the study.

Training and seminars on preparing instructional materials, workbooks, and modules are recommended for school administrators to set the teachers on integrating portfolio assessment that can help learners improve their writing outcomes.

Portfolio Assessment in Enhancing the Grammatical Competencies in Writing

REFERENCES

1) Algeo, John & Pyles, Thomas (2010). The Origins and Development of the English Language, Sixth Edition. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. Boston, Massachusetts, USA.

2) Allen, Graham (2013). Rolland Barthes. London & New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.

3) Allen, G. (2013). Rolland Barthes. London & New York: Routledge/Taylor and alternative language assessment. CRILE Working Papers, 58. (Online) Retrieved 10 March 2008, from http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/groups/crile/docs/crile58tsagari.pdf.

4) Aly, M. M. (2002, April). The effect of using the writing workshop approach on and principles. London: Routledge Falmer. and readers. New York: Longman.

5) Apple, M., & Shimo, E. (2004). Learners to teacher: portfolios, please! Perceptions as writers. Studies in Curriculum & Instruction, 62, 232-69. assessment: Helping students evaluate their progress as readers and writers. Assessment: Some Questions, Some Answers, Some Recommendations. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 39(6), 480–491. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40014037 Attitudes toward Writing." Research in the Teaching of English 27.2 (May 1993).

6) Aydin, S. (2014). EFL Writers' Attitudes and Perceptions toward F-Portfolio Use.

7) Balili, Bines (2012). Let's Learn All About Subject and Verb Agreement. Retrieved from https://medenglish2012.weebly.com/uploads/2/0/8/6/20862786/let_us_all_learn_about_subjectverb_agreement__a_module_for_grade_7_by_bines_balili.pdf.

8) Barraquio, Dulce Corazon T. (2015). Grammar Proficiency of Colegio de San Juan de Letran Calamba College Students. Philippine E-Journals. 1 (1).

9) Biggs, J. B. (1996). The teaching context: The assessment portfolio as a tool for Birenbaum & F. Dochy (Eds). Alternatives in assessment of achievement. Learning, Processes and Prior Knowledge, 3-31.

10) Birenbaum, M. (1996). Towards a plurastic approach to assessment. In M. British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Leeds, September 2001.

11) Bradshaw, William B. (2013). Why is Grammar Important. Retrieved from https://m.huffpost.com/us/entry/4128521.

12) Brown, H. D. (2004). Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices.

13) Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment.

14) Bryan & K. Clegg (Eds.), Innovative Assessment in Higher Education (pp.37-47).

15) Burns, Anne (2009). Grammar and Communicative Language Teaching: Why, When and How To Teach It? Retrieved from http://www.professoranne burns.com/downloads/camtesol2009.pdf.

16) Cabansag, John N. (2013). "Written Language Proficiency of Laboratory High Cambridge University Press. ISSN: 1675-8021 GEMA Online ™ Journal of Language Studies 49 Volume 10(3) 2010

17) Chen, Y. M. (2006). EFL instruction and assessment with portfolios: A case study classroom. Retrieved April 27, 2011, from Latvian Association of Language Teaching Web Site: http: //www.1.vasa.1v/portfolio.php College Students." Unpublished master's Thesis. Pangasinan State University, School of Advanced Studies. Communication 28.2 (1977): 122-128. Print. Composition and Communication 40.3 (1989): 282-311.

18) Chung, Sandy & Pullum, Geoff (2015). Grammar. Retrieved from http://www. linguisticsociety.org/sites/default/files/Grammar. pdf.

19) Coombe, C., Folse, K., & Hubley, N. (2007). A practical guide to assessing English language learners. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press. Course in Writing. 3rd ed. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2000. Print.

20) Cucos C., Bogdan, B., Stefan, B., Butnaru, S., Ciobanu, C., Cozma, Th.Ms., L. delivery of English courses: Interfacing qualitative and quantitative paradigms. GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies, 8(2), 103-25. design. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Developing students' teachers composing skills. Proceedings of the 21st CDELT National Symposium on English Language Teaching: Meeting Challenges of ELT in the Arab World, Ain Shams University, Cairo, 131-169. Disorders Quarterly, 28 (1), 24-36.

21) Eisenmann, M. & Summer, T. (2012). Basic Issues in EFL Teaching and Learning. Heidelberg: Winter.

22) Ellis, R. (2007). The Differential Effects of Corrective Feedback on Two ELT Journal, 58(4), 327- 335. ELT Journal, 62(1), 18-28. ELT Journal, 64(1), 54-64.

23) Ellis, R. (2007). The Differential Effects Of Corrective Feedback on Two Grammatical Structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.), Conversational interaction in second language acquisition (pp. 339- 360). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

24) Epstein, A. (2005). Introduction to portfolios. Retrieved June 5, 2011, from Pearson Evaluating writing (pp. 114-136). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. exams. Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, 85-96. Sommers, N. (1992). "Between the Drafts." College Composition and Communication 43.1 (1992): 23-31. Print. experiences across learning-directed portfolio contexts. Assessing Writing, 10(3), 192-213. Expert Writers. International Education Studies. 2 (3).

Portfolio Assessment in Enhancing the Grammatical Competencies in Writing

25) Fahed Al-Serhani, W. (2007). The effect of portfolio assessment on the writing performance of EFL secondary school students in Saudi Arabia feedback as part of writing portfolios. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44(7), 1017 1028.

26) Flower, Linda. (1989). "Cognition, Context, and Theory Building." College for college students. IRAL, 41(4), 293-317. Retrieved December 7, for students in the technological and vocational education system. Asian EFL Journal, 10(2), 132-154 for students in the technological and vocational education system. Asian EFL Journal, 10(2), 132-154. Francis Group.

27) Genesee, E., & Upshur, J. (1996). Classroom-based evaluation in second language education. New York: Cambridge University Press.

28) Ghoorchaei, Tavakoli, & Ansari. (2010). The Impact of Portfolio Assessment On Iranian EFL Students' Essay Writing: A Process-Oriented Approach. GEMA Online ™ Journal of Language Studies, 35, Volume 10(3), 2010.

29) Gosselin, Linda A. (1998). "Is Ongoing Assessment Fully Learner-Centered?" Adventures in Assessment, Vol. 11, winter 1998.

30) Gottlieb, M. (2000). Portfolio practices in elementary and secondary schools. In G. Grammatical Structures. In A. Mackey (Ed.), Conversational interaction in second language acquisition (pp. 339- 360). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

31) Graziano-King, J. (2007). Assessing student writing: The self-revised essay.

32) Hamp-Lyons, L. (2006). Feedback in portfolio-based writing courses. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues (pp.140-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

33) Hamp-Lyons, L., & Condon, W. (2000). Assessing the portfolio: Principles for practice, theory, and research. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

34) Hamp-Lyons, L., & Kroll, B. (1996). Issues in ESL writing assessment: An Havnes & L. McDonald (Eds.), Balancing dilemmas in assessment and learning in contemporary education (pp. 15-32), New York: Routledge.

35) Hedge, T. (2000). Teaching and learning in the language classroom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

36) Hirvela, A. & Sweetland, Y. L. (2005). Two case studies of L2 writers' experiences across learning-directed portfolio contexts. Assessing Writing, 10 (3), 192-213.

37) Hirvela, A., & Sweetland, Y. L. (2005). Two case studies of L2 writers' experiences across learning-directed portfolio contexts. Assessing Writing, 10(3), 192 213. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2005.07.001

38) Klenowsky, V. (2002). Developing portfolios for learning and assessment: Process and principles. London: Routledge Falmer.

39) Krigere, G., & Sardiko, L. (2002). Portfolio assessment in a young learners' classroom. Retrieved April 27, 2011, from Latvian Association of Language Teaching Web Site: http: //www.1.vasa.1v/portfolio.php.

40) Lam, R., & Lee, I. (2010). Balancing the dual functions of portfolio assessment. ELT Journal, 64(1), 54-64.

41) Larsen-Freeman, D. (2010). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press.

42) McNamara, T. (2000). Language testing. In H. G. Widdowson (Series Ed.), Oxford Introductions to Language Study. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

43) Marefat, F. (2004). Portfolio revisited. Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7(2), 79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp024.

44) Moya, S., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994, Spring). A portfolio assessment model for ESL. The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 13, 1336.

45) Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D., & McTighe, J. (1993). Assessing student outcomes: Performance assessment using the dimensions of learning model. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

46) Mohd Rashid Mohd Saad & Mohd Asri Mohd Noor (2007). Malaysian University students' perceptions on the use of portfolio as an assessment tool in an ESL writing classroom. Masalah Pendidikan, 30(2), 49-64.

47) Moya, S. S., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). A portfolio assessment model for ESL. The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 13, 13-36.

48) Murphy, R. (2006). Evaluating new priorities for assessment in higher education. In C. Bryan & K. Clegg (Eds.), Innovative Assessment in Higher Education (pp.37-47). New York: Routledge.

49) Nunan, D. (1992). Research methods in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

50) Nunan, D. (2004). Task-based language teaching: A comprehensively revised edition of designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

51) Nunes, A. (2004). Portfolios in the EFL classroom: Disclosing an informed practice. ELT Journal, 58(4), 327- 335.

52) Paesani, K. (2006). Exercises de style: Developing multiple competencies through a writing portfolio. Foreign Language Annals, 39(4), 618-39.

53) Pramela Krish (2008). Some considerations in investigating synchronous online delivery of English courses: Interfacing qualitative and quantitative paradigms. GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies, 8(2), 103-25.

54) O'Malley, J. & Pierce, L. (1996). "Authentic assessment for English language of Benguet State University." Unpublished master's Thesis. Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet. of portfolio assessment in EFL classroom. Proceedings of JALT pan-SIG Conference. Tokyo Keizai University, 53-58. Portfolio Assessment & Writing Performance 119. on reading, listening and writing skills of secondary school prep class Online ™ Journal of Language Studies 48 Volume 10(3) 2010.

55) Orlando: Harcourt Brace & Co. Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1989). Reporting reading overview. College ESL, 6(1), 52-72. Oxford University Press.

56) Paesani, K. (2006). Exercises de style: Developing multiple competencies through a writing portfolio. Foreign Language Annals, 39(4), 618-39.

57) Paesani, K. (2006). Exercises de style: Developing multiple competencies writing portfolio. Foreign Language Annals, 39(4), 618-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02280.x

58) Paulson, F. L., Paulson, P. R., & Meyer, C A. (1991, February). What make a portfolio Educational Leadership, 48(1), 60-63.

59) Paulson, F. L., Paulson, P. R., & Meyer, C A. (1991, February). What make a Performance assessment using the dimensions of learning model. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

60) Mohd Rashid Mohd Saad & Mohd Asri Mohd Noor (2007). Malaysian University students' perceptions on the use of portfolio as an assessment tool in an ESL writing classroom. Masalah Pendidikan, 30(2), 49-64.

61) Pramela Krish (2008). Some considerations in investigating synchronous online delivery of English courses: Interfacing qualitative and quantitative paradigms. GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies, 8(2), 103-25.

62) Reid, J. (2002). Writing. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages (4th ed., pp. 28-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

63) Ruetten, M. K. (1994). Evaluating ESL students' performance on proficiency School Freshmen." Unpublished master's Thesis. Naga College Foundation. Naga City. School Students in a State University in Cagayan Valley Philippines." Unpublished master's Thesis. Isabela State University.

64) Song, B. & August, B. (2002). Using portfolios to assess the writing of ESL students: A powerful alternative? Journal of Second Language Writing, 11(1), 49-72.

65) Tierney, R. J., Carter, M. A., & Desai, L.E. (1991). Portfolio assessment in the Reading-writing classroom. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

66) Tsagari, D. (2004). Is there life beyond language testing? An introduction to alternative language assessment. CRILE Working Papers, 58. (Online) Retrieved 10 March 2008, from http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/groups/crile/docs/crile58tsagari.pdf.

67) Ulla, Mark B. (2014). Analysis of the Language Errors in Writing among BSEE and AB English Students. Unpublished master's Thesis. Father Saturnino Urios University, Butuan City, Agusan del Norte.

68) Valencia, S. (1990). A portfolio approach to classroom reading assessment: The whys, whats and hows. The Reading Teacher, 43(4), 338-340.

69) Vaurula, Nina (2012). Subject-Verb Agreement of Finite Verbs in the Present Tense in Written Productions of Finish Secondary School Learners of English as a Second Language.A Pro Gradu Thesis. Jyvaskylan yliopisto. Kielten laitos. Englanti. Helmikuu.

70) Vega, Natividad V. (2000). "Student-Related Factors and the Composition Writing Performance of College Freshmen in the Catanduanes Agricultural and Industrial College." Unpublished master's Thesis. Panganiban, Catanduanes. Virac, Catanduanes.

71) Walker, R. & Perez Riu, C. (2008). Coherence in the assessment of writing skills. ELT Journal, 62(1), 18-28.

72) Wang, Y. H. & Liao, H. C. (2008). The application of learning portfolio assessment for students in the technological and vocational education system. Asian EFL Journal, 10(2), 132-154.

73) Weigle, S. C. (2002). Assessing writing, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

74) Weiser, I. (1992). Portfolio practice and assessment for collegiate basic writers.

75) In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), Portfolios in the writing classroom: An introduction (pp.89-101). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

76) Yan, Jeanne A. (2007). "Grammatical Competence of Fourth Year English Majors of Benguet State University." Unpublished Master's Thesis. Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet.

77) Yurdabakan, I. & Erdogan, T. (2009). The effects of portfolio assessment on reading, listening and writing skills of secondary school prep class students. The Journal of International Social Research, 2(9), 526-538.