UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

PORTFOLIO AS AN ASSESSMENT TOOL IN SELECTED MALAYSIAN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

CHARANJIT KAUR A/P SWARAN SINGH

FPP 2014 38

PORTFOLIO AS AN ASSESSMENT TOOL IN SELECTED MALAYSIAN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

CHARANJIT KAUR A/P SWARAN SINGH

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA
2014

© COPYRIGHT UPM

PORTFOLIO AS AN ASSESSMENT TOOL IN SELECTED MALAYSIAN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

By

CHARANJIT KAUR A/P SWARAN SINGH

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

October 2014

© COPYRIGHT UPM

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia, unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia

© COPYRIGHT UPM

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of the Universiti Putra Malaysia in Fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PORTFOLIO AS AN ASSESSMENT TOOL IN SELECTED MALAYSIAN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

By

CHARANJIT KAUR A/P SWARAN SINGH

October 2014

Chairman : Arshad Abdul Samad, PhD

Faculty : Educational Studies

This study investigated the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool for learning in selected Malaysian ESL (English as a Second Language) secondary classrooms. It was also conducted with the intention of constructing a model of portfolio assessment for ESL teachers to integrate assessment with teaching. It also investigated students' response towardsthe use of portfolio as an assessment tool on learning and factors that influenced ESL teachers to use portfolio as an assessmenttool.

Qualitative approach specifically, a case study was employed so that a detailed information could be obtained from the teachers' experiences in the natural context of implementing portfolio as an assessment tool. Data collected through interviews, observations and documents were analysed inductively using the data analysis approach expounded by Miles and Huberman (1994). Data from interviews, observations and documents were analysed inductively for dominant issues and categories. The portfolio assessment was implemented at the beginning of the year in January, in two different schools in an ESL class of 35-40 students in Perak and Selangor. The participants consisted of nine ESL teachers and forty-five ESL students, who come from a variety of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, in a Malaysian classroom setting. The nine ESL teachers were interviewed. The students were also interviewed in groups to ascertain their response towards the use of portfolio as an assessment tool. Each interview lasted between an hour to about two hours, were taped

© COPYRIGHT UPM

recorded, transcribed verbatim and analysed manually. Observations were made to investigate the teachers' implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool. The model was developed based on the teachers' pedagogical practices. Triangulation method was used to interpret the data and the findings showed that the overall content of the portfolios can be used to validate and document both process and product of learning and formation of language.

The findings showed that the teachers followed a general procedure for implementing portfolio as an assessment tool which included: explaining the assessment purpose, evaluating the portfolio and preparing the teaching and learning activities. The findings also revealed that there were five major considerations in implementing portfolio as an assessment tool, namely assessment purpose, collection of evidence, evaluation of evidence, reflecting on learning and assessment decision. Teachers adhered to these stages to ensure the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool work smoothly. It was also found that the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom has allowed the teachers to evaluate their students' potential in tracking the ability to master the topics taught and enable students to know how they progressin their lessons. The findings also indicated that the students noticed the potential of using portfolios thatcould improve their learning because it enabled students to think critically and independently.

Four major conclusions were drawn from this study. First, teachers, who implemented portfolio as an assessment tool, sustain their teaching to ensure accuracy of the assessment techniques, improve their satisfaction in evaluation, and ultimately benefit the ESL students. Second, portfolio assessment model allows the teachers to see new developments and directions in teaching and learning if it is implemented appropriately. Third, addressingthe issue that students study merely for the examination can reduce the stress for the stakeholders involved and integrate portfolio and traditional assessment complementarily can make evaluation practical. Finally, portfolio assessment processes are in line with the social constructivist view of learning which promotes learners to create their personal meaning from any learning situation or social context without relying too much on the teachers.

The study has provided several pedagogical implications for adopting portfolio as an assessment tool in the ESL classrooms for instruction, assessment and curriculum to ESL teachers, policy makers and educational researchers in the Malaysian and other similar contexts. Recommendations have also been made for the benefits of ESL teachers and future researchers more broadly.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

PORTFOLIO SEBAGAI ALAT PENILAIAN DALAM BILIK DARJAH TERPILIH BAHASA INGGERIS SEBAGAI BAHASA KEDUA DI MALAYSIA

Oleh

CHARANJIT KAUR A/P SWARAN SINGH

Oktober 2014

Pengerusi : Arshad Abdul Samad, PhD

Fakulti : PengajianPendidikan

Kajian ini meninjau pelaksanaan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian untuk pembelajaran Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Kedua (ESL) di dalam bilik darjah di sekolah menengah yang terpilih di Malaysia. Ia turut dijalankan dengan tujuan membina satu model penilaian portfolio bagi guru-guru ESL supaya penilaian dapat diintegrasikan dalam pengajaran. Ia turut meninjau respons pelajar terhadap penggunaan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian ke atas pembelajaran dan juga faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi guru-guru ESL menggunakan portfolio sebagai satu alat penilaian.

Rekabentuk kajian kualitatif menggunakan kaedah kajian kes telah digunapakai untuk memperolehi maklumat terperinci daripada pengalaman guru-guru dalam konteks semulajadi dalam melaksanakan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian. Data dikumpul melalui temubual, pemerhatian, dan dokumen dianalisis secara induktif dengan menggunakan pendekatan analisis data oleh Miles dan Huberman (1994). Data daripada temubual, pemerhatian dan dokumen dianalisis secara induktif bagi isu-isu dan kategori yang dominan. Penilaian portfolio telah dilaksanakan pada awal tahun dalam bulan Januari, di dua buah sekolah yang berlainan di dalam bilik darjah ESL yang mengandungi 35-40 orang pelajar di negeri Perak dan Selangor. Responden terdiri daripada sembilan guru ESL dan empat puluh lima orang pelajar ESL, yang datang dari pelbagai jenis latarbelakang linguistik dan budaya, di dalam persekitaran bilik darjah Malaysia. Sembilan orang guru ESL telah ditemubual. Pelajar turut ditemubual di dalam kumpulan untuk menentukan respons mereka terhadap penggunaan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian. Setiap temubual mengambil masa di antara sejam hingga dua jam, telah dirakamkan, ditranskrip secara verbatim and dianalisis secara manual. Pemerhatian juga dibuat bagi meninjau pelaksanaan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian oleh guru-guru.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

Sebuah model telah dibentuk berdasarkan amalan pedagogi guru. Kaedah pengesahan digunakan untuk menerangkan data dan dapatan kajian menunjukkan keseluruhan kandungan portfolio boleh digunakan untuk mengesahkan dan mendokumentasikan proses dan produk pembelajaran dan juga pembentukan bahasa.

Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa guru-guru mengikuti satu prosedur am dalam melaksanakan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian yang merangkumi: menerangkan tujuan penilaian, menaksir portfolio dan menyediakan aktiviti-aktiviti pengajaran dan pembelajaran. Dapatan kajian turut menunjukkan terdapat lima pertimbangan utama dalam pelaksanaan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian yang terdiri daripada tujuan penilaian, pengutipan bukti, petaksiran bukti, refleksi terhadap pembelajaran dan keputusan penilaian. Guru-guru mematuhi setiap peringkat bagi memastikan pelaksanaan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian dapat dijalankan dengan lancar. Turut didapati bahawa pelaksanaan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian di dalam bilik darjah telah membolehkan guru-guru menaksir potensi pelajar-pelajar dalam mengesan kebolehan mereka untuk memahami topik yang diajar dan membolehkan pelajar-pelajar mengetahui pencapaian mereka dalam pelajaran. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan pelajar-pelajar telah menyedari potensi menggunakan portfolio dapat meningkatkan pembelajaran mereka kerana ia membolehkan pelajar-pelajar berfikir secara kritis dan secara berdikari.

Empat kesimpulan telah dirumus dari kajian ini. Pertama, guru-guru, yang telah melaksanakan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian, kekalkan pengajaran mereka untuk memastikan ketepatan teknik-teknik penilaian, meningkatkan kepuasan mereka dalam pentaksiran di mana akhirnya memanfaatkan pelajar-pelajar ESL. Kedua, model penilaian portfolio membolehkan guru-guru melihat perkembangan dan arah baru dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran jika ia dilaksanakan dengan tepat. Ketiga, menangani isu pelajar-pelajar yang belajar semata-mata untuk peperiksaan boleh mengurangkan tekanan pemegangtaruh yang terlibat dan mengintegrasikan portfolio sebagai pelengkap kepada peperiksaan tradisional akan menjadikan pentaksiran lebih praktikal. Akhirnya, proses penilaian portfolio adalah sejajar dengan pandangan pembelajaran social konstruktivist yang menggalakkan pelajar-pelajar mencipta makna peribadi dari mana-mana situasi pembelajaran atau konteks sosial tanpa terlalu bergantung kepada guru-guru.

Kajian turut menyumbang beberapa implikasi pedagogi menggunakan portfolio sebagai alat penilaian di dalam bilik darjah untuk pengajaran, penilaian dan kurikulum bagi guru-guru ESL, pembuat-pembuat dasar dan para penyelidik pendidikan di Malaysia dan bagi konteks lain yang sama. Cadangan juga telah dikemukakan bagi faedah guru-guru ESL dan juga penyelidik-penyelidik masa depan secara umum.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praises worthy and due to 'WAHEGURUJI', The Most Gracious and The Most Merciful.

First, i am indebted to the Chairperson, Associate. Professor. Dr. Arshad Abdul Samad, who has never doubted my ability; i appreciate his guidance, patience and constant support throughout the course of the study. To Dr Tajularipin and Dr Habsah Husin, who believed in me and supported me from the beginning. Most importantly, the advice and concern all along my journey has allowed me to learn practical skills in research. i am forever grateful. Thank you to Professor Dato Dr. Tunku Mohani Tunku Mohtar and Associate. Professor Dr NorazmiMostafa, who have been my best teachers.i have learnt so much from you.

My special appreciation goes to Baba Joginder Singh Ji and Balwinder Singh Deol (RG), many of your words, advice and prayers comfort me, lift me and inspire me when i faced significant challenges. i am truly grateful.

i am most grateful to the nine and forty-five outstanding people who have enormously supported me through their tireless participation in the study. To Puan Zaiton, i fondly remember you and truly appreciate your assistance provided throughout the duration of my data collection at the schools.

i am grateful for the love and support of my family, especially my husband, Satpal Singh who has been very supportive and loving throughout my journey searching for knowledge. To my parents, mother in law and late father in law, sister, brothers, sisters and brothers in law and all the relatives, i thank you for being there for me. To my lovely kids, Peviterraj Singh Thind, Har Maanesha KaurThind, Kirenneesha Kaur Thind, nieces and nephews, this is dedicated to you all with the hope it will inspire you all to further your studies.

Finally, i am greatly indebted to the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia and Sultan Idris University of Education for granting me with a scholarship to pursue my PhD.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

© COPYRIGHT UPM

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of the Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Arshad Abdul Samad, PhD
Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

TajularipinSulaiman, PhD
Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

HabsahHussin, PhD
Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

BUJANG BIN KIM HUAT, PhD
Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 30th October 2014

© COPYRIGHT UPM

Declaration By Graduate Student

I hereby confirm that:

● this thesis is my original work;
● quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
● this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any otherdegree at any other institutions;
● intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia(Research) Rules 2012;
● written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of DeputyVice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in theform of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals,modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts,posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
● there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, andscholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia(Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarismdetection software.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name and Matric No.: CharanjitKaur a/p Swaran Singh (GS28622)

© COPYRIGHT UPM

© COPYRIGHT UPM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		i
ABSTRAK		iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		v
APPROVAL		vi
DECLARATION		viii
LIST OF TABLES		xv
LIST OF FIGURES		xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		xvii
CHAPTER		
1	**INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY**	
	1.0 Assessment and Portfolio Assessment	1
	1.1 Background of the Study	1
	1.2 The Portfolio as an Assessment Tool	5
	1.3 The Statement of Problem	7
	1.4 Purpose of the Study	8
	1.5 Research Questions	9
	1.6 Significance of the Study	10
	1.7 Definition of terms	11
	1.8 Limitations of the Study	12
	1.9 Summary	13
2	**LITERATURE REVIEW**	
	2.0 Introduction	14
	2.1 Part I: Current assessment in Malaysia	15
	2.1.1 Assessment for learning	15
	2.1.2 School-based assessment	16
	2.1.3 Alternative assessment in Malaysia	17
	2.1.4 Portfolio assessment	18
	2.2 Part II: Constructivism	20
	2.2.1 The Social Constructivist Approach and Its Relations to this study	26
	2.2.2 Classroom learning in Malaysian secondary classroom and its relevance to the Zone of Proximal Development	27
	2.3 Part III: Portfolio Assessment and Portfolio Assessment Models	29
	2.3.1 Different types & Purposes of Portfolio	34
	2.4 Part IV: Past Studies On Portfolios As An Assessment Tool and its Relevance in Framing this Research	35
	2.4.1 Sample of student work	35

© COPYRIGHT UPM

2.4.2 Student self-assessment 35
2.4.3 Clearly stated criteria 36
2.4.4 Portfolio as an assessment tool 36
2.4.5 Portfolio as an L2 Learning Tool 38
2.4.6 Portfolio for Self-Reflection 40
2.4.7 Portfolio for Self-Assessment 40
2.4.8 Portfolio for Formative Assessment 41
2.4.9 Portfolio for Self-Directed Learning 42
2.4.10 Portfolio Contents and its Relevance to Learning 43
2.4.11 Portfolio for writing purposes 43
2.4.12 Portfolio for Continuous Assessment 44
2.4.13 Portfolio for Learning Accountability 46
2.4.14 Electronic Portfolio 47
2.5 Summary 47

3 METHODOLOGY
3.0 Introduction 48
3.1 Research Design 48
3.2 Sampling and Participant Selection 54
3.3 Research Sites 57
3.3.1 Historical Location 58
3.3.2 Social Location 59
3.3.3 Institutional Location (School A & B) 59
3.4 Data Collection Method 60
3.5 The Research Procedure 63
3.6 Instrumentation 69
3.6.1 Semi Structured Interview 69
3.6.2 ESL Teachers' and Students' Interviews 69
3.6.3 Classroom observations 72
3.6.4 Classroom observations protocol 72
3.6.5 Portfolios 73
3.6.6 Field Notes 73
3.6.7 Student's Self-Reflection 74
3.6.8 Review of Documents 74
3.6.9 Document Analysis 74
3.6.10 Pilot Study 75
3.7 Data Analysis 76
3.7.1 Analysing Classroom Observation Data 78
3.7.2 Quality Data Generation 78
3.8 Trustworthiness, Credibility and Conformability of the present study 79
3.8.1 Validity and Reliability 80
3.8.2 Reliability 81
3.8.3 Validity 82

© COPYRIGHT UPM

3.8.4 Content Validity 82
3.8.5 Systemic Validity 82
3.8.6 Face Validity 86
3.9 Conclusion 86

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
4.0 Introduction 84
4.1 Implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in the teaching and learning of ESL in Malaysian classroom. 84
4.1.1 General procedures 85
4.1.1a A thorough planning 85
4.1.1b Requires as assessment purpose 85
4.1.1c Exposing students to learning outcomes 85
4.1.1d Explaining the contents of a portfolio 87
4.1.1e Teachers explaining the assessment procedures 88
4.1.1f Teachers evaluating the portfolios 90
4.1.1g Teachers preparing the teaching and learning materials 90
4.1.1h Teachers adopt an ordered manner in implementing portfolio as an assessment tool 92
4.1.2 Major considerations at each stage of implementing portfolio as assessment tool 92
4.1.2a Assessment purpose: developing assessment purpose based on the learning outcomes 92
4.1.2b Preparing the assessment tasks 92
4.1.2c Setting the assessment goals for students 94
4.1.2d Collection of evidence: getting the students to collect their evidence of their learning 94
4.1.2e Producing the self-reflection 94
4.1.2f Collecting materials from other sources 94
4.1.2g Students collecting evidence for learning 95
4.1.2h Evaluation of evidence: teachers examining evidence collected by the students 95
4.1.2i Scoring criteria for students' portfolios 96
4.1.2j Reflection on learning: students reflecting on their learning 96
4.1.2k Assessment decision: teachers making assessment decision based on the portfolios 98
4.2 ESL students' respond to portfolio assessment that is being used in the classroom 99
4.2.1a Students notice the potential of using portfolio to improve their improve their learning 99
4.2.1b Creating & compiling the portfolios 100
4.2.1c Learning to assess 101

© COPYRIGHT UPM

4.2.1d Assessment tasks for portfolios 101
4.2.1e Students sharing their experience doing the self-assessment 102
4.2.1f Changes in student attitudes 103
4.2.1g Learning through reflecting 104
4.2.1h An increase in student motivation 106
4 .2.1i Student inability to understand self-assessment and peer-assessment 106
4.3 The factors that influence the ESL teachers to use portfolio assessment for the teaching and learning of ESL in Malaysian classrooms 107
4.3.1a The low English proficiency of the students 108
4.3.1b Help the weak learners 108
4.3.1c Responding to specific student needs 109
4.3.1d Promote learning 109
4.3.2 The need to ensure the accuracy of the assessment technique 112
4.3.2a Assessing student performance and confirming their level of achievement 112
4.3.2b Strengthen teacher evaluation 113
4.3.2c Alternative to available tests 115
4.3.2d Issues related to the findings 115
4.3.2e Logistical issues 115
4.3.2f Time and financial constraint 115
4.4 Portfolio assessment models that would be appropriate in implementing portfolio assessment for ESL teaching and learning in Malaysian classrooms 116
4.4.1 The proposed portfolio assessment model and its appropriateness 116
4.4.1a Specify important skills 118
4.4.1b Teacher's instructional strategies 119
4.4.1c Teacher assesses students' work 119
4.4.1d Teacher provide feedback on performance 120
4.4.1e Provide opportunities for practice for students 120
4.4.1f Compiling evidence of 'best efforts' in a portfolio 121
4.4.1g Evaluate the contents of portfolio 121
4.4.2 Comparison between the teachers' models in this 122
4.4.3 Some recommendations to the teachers' portfolio assessment model 123
4.4.3a Selecting forms of assessment (for stage 3) 124
4.4.3b Reliability and validity of portfolio (for stage 7) 125
4.4.3c Parents' involvement 125
4.5 Discussions 125
4.5.1 Implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool 125
4.5.1a General procedures 126
4.5.1b Portfolio as an assessment tool 127
4.5.1c Teachers adopt an ordered manner in implementing portfolio as an assessment tool 127
4.5.1d Collection of evidence 128

© COPYRIGHT UPM

4.5.2 ESL students' response to portfolio assessment that is being used in the classroom 128
4.5.2a Learning to assess 128
4.5.2b Changes in student attitudes 129
4.5.2c Learning through reflecting 130
4.5.2d An increase in student motivation 131
4.5.3 The factors that influence the ESL teachers to use portfolio as an assessment tool 130
4.5.3a Responding to specific student needs 130
4.5.3b Promote learning 131
4.5.3c Strengthen teacher evaluation 132
4.5.3d Alternative to available tests 133
4.5.3e The need to ensure the accuracy of the assessment techniques 133
4 5.3f Assessing student performance and confirming their level of achievement 133
4.6 Portfolio assessment model 134
4.7 Conclusion 135
4.8 Summary 135

5 IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
5.0 Introduction 138
5.1 Summary 138
5.2 Conclusions 140
5.3 Implications for Practice and Theory 144
5.3.1 Implications for Practice 144
5.3.2 Implications for Theory 146
5.3.3 Methodological contribution 147
5.3.4 Pedagogical Implications 147
5.4 Recommendations for Future Research 149

REFERENCES 152
APPENDICES 172
BIODATA OF STUDENT 173
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS 174

© COPYRIGHT UPM

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Smart School Assessment	18
2.	Breakdown of teacher sampling	55
3.	Brief information on the selected students	56
4.	Some recommendations to the Portfolio Assessment Model	124

© COPYRIGHT UPM

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Graphic model of a learning portfolio	22
2.	Positioning Vygotsky's learning theory	23
3.	CRADLE: Developmental Scheme for Portfolio Assessment	33
4.	Design of a case study: A funnel approach	52
5.	Data Triangulation	63
6.	Flow chart of research procedures	68
7.	The Interactive Model in data analysis	77
8.	An appropriate model of portfolio assessment	143

© COPYRIGHT UPM

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SBA	School-based Assessment
MOE	Minister of Education
KSSR	Kurikulum Standard Sekolah Rendah
PBS	Pentaksiran Berasaskan Sekolah
PKBS	Penilaian Kendalian Berasaskan Sekolah
KBSM	Curriculum for Secondary Schools

© COPYRIGHT UPM

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Assessment and Portfolio Assessment

The concern for students' achievement in English has received a lot of attention. The problem of mastering English does not involve students alone. The English language teachers are also affected. The nature of assessment plays a crucial role in English language curriculum in the schools. Teachers use assessment to assist students to attain the aims of English language curriculum by comprehensively accounting students' learning over a period of time. As such, teachers use assessment to diagnose students' weaknesses to improve their own teaching strategies so that they can evaluate the students' styles and strategies to scaffold those who need assistance (Hosseini & Ghabanchi, 2014).

Teachers have realized that the current design of evaluation procedures does not truly reflect students' capabilities in the English language. The fact is that evaluation has been generally in the traditional approach, which holds the philosophy that one test will represent all students despite individual differences (Mohtar, 2010). The stakeholders including school board, parents, staff and students are highly concerned about the examinations scores as they use them to show how diligent students are and how well teachers perform. Consequently, teachers have great anxiety preparing students for examination rather than focusing on the curriculum and needs of the students under these circumstances. Thus, teachers are on the lookout for an alternative form of evaluation which allows for effective teaching and learning. Teachers have resorted to alternative assessment as a means to modify their teaching and make learning more meaningful in the classroom.

Teachers of English as a second language (ESL) use portfolios, a non-traditional form of assessment as a means of gathering information on their students to examine achievement, effort, improvement and the process of self-assessment. While many proposals have been made on how portfolios can be implemented, there is a need to seek teachers' views on the use of portfolio as an assessment tool in the classrooms. Teachers use portfolios to complement the traditional examination in order to assist students to improve their learning.

1.1 Background of the Study

Although the term 'assessment' is familiar, much of what we understand and read in magazines, newspapers and online resources is about its nature either summative or formative or its importance in the process of teaching and learning. There is little information about how it promotes students' multiple knowledge, and operation at higher cognitive skills.

In Malaysia, examination is the method used to assess student's performances. In fact, there is no other form of assessment apart from examination. In reality, the purpose of examination is for summative evaluation (Udoukpong & Okon, 2012). These evaluations are to see if the students understand and could apply the concepts that they have learned throughout the year. As a result, the centralized examinations influenced teachers to narrow the curriculum by giving students previous tests or teach unnaturally which focused on more examination kind

© COPYRIGHT UPM

of teaching (Herman & Golan, 1991). This indirectly motivates students to prepare solely for the examinations. With examination being the only form of assessment, therefore, it is essential that the examination must be able to reflect the student's knowledge and performances (Mohtar, 2010). Students create a culture of scoring A's as their goals (Hsu, 2010). Students believe that being academically successful is when they are able to score straight A's. Students give priority and emphasis on scoring for examinations and not to learn. The purpose of learning is not given priority because students have no choice other than memorizing and regurgitating information in the examinations. Therefore, the process of learning is lacking and it is not a true evaluation on their performance as it has become a process of scoring (Black & William, 1998).

Students are comfortable memorizing every single fact that they read and this has become a common phenomenon in Malaysia. Notable here is that any student with excellent memory is able to score high marks. The question of administering the right assessment strategy to the students and the need to know how reliable these results are in reflecting the students' understandings are of great concern (Mohtar, 2010).

On the contrary, the National Philosophy of Education emphasizes on "developing the potential of individuals in a holistic and integrated manner, so as to produce individuals who are intellectually, spiritually, emotionally and physically balanced and harmonious" (National Education Philosophy, 1998). Stiggins (2005), for example, suggests that one strategy teachers can explore in assessment for learning is to provide students with a clear vision of the learning target from the beginning of the learning. It is crucial for teachers to provide students with continuous access to descriptive feedback which can give students an idea on how to improve the quality of their work. As a result, students will learn to generate their own descriptive feedback in their learning and take the responsibility in monitoring their own success (Stiggins, 2005). Thus, some researchers suggest that the use of portfolios will benefit and assist English as a Second language/English as a Foreign Language ESL/EFL students to monitor their own learning (Hamp-Lyons, 1995; Hamp-Lyons & Condon, 2000; Delett, Barnhardt & Kevorkian, 2001; Song & August, 2002).

Malaysian students come from different backgrounds with diverse cultures, and they have different needs based on their abilities. The Humanistic philosophies believe that in order for students to perform well, all basic needs must be provided (Huitt, 2009). This would mean looking at the students' background as well as teacher's pedagogies (Oran, 2009). Therefore, the results of a single form of examination do not indicate the multiple intelligences that students have and do not reveal the students' real abilities (Mohtar, 2010).

With the above, clearly examination being the only assessment itself is not a good way of evaluating students. Assessment itself should be a continuous process, and not just through one process of examination. The recent move by the Ministry of Education to make the education system less examination oriented with the introduction of a new alternative system of assessment, School-based assessment, is a positive move forward (Omar & Sinnasamy, 2009). School-based assessment made its entry into Malaysian classrooms at the beginning of 2000. Centralized examinations generally have been summative in nature and also norm-referenced (Mohtar, 2010). They show the products of learning and produce no feedback to

improve student learning. Hence, both policymakers and educators are now looking at School-based assessment (SBA) as a catalyst for education reform (Chan & Sidhu, 2010). It is viewed as a vehicle that will provide new instructional and assessment roles for teachers to track what and how students learn in the classroom.

According to the former Minister of Education, Tan Sri Musa Mohamed, there would be greater reliance on SBA in the future. According to him, such a method of assessment would be in line with current practices in other countries such as the United States, Britain, Germany, Japan, Finland and New Zealand (Karim, 2002; Musa, 2003). Thus, the Ministry of Education in Malaysia has looked into ways of expanding this approach to all levels of education. Furthermore, with greater reliance on SBA in the future, some major examinations may be abolished while some would have less bearing on students' overall grades (Chan & Sidhu, 2010).

The Malaysian Examinations Syndicate (MES) holds the view that SBA is any form of assessment that is planned, developed, conducted, examined and reported by teachers in schools involving students, parents and other authorities (Adi Badiozaman, 2007). These kinds of school assessment can be formative in nature, enable students to know how they are progressing and enabling teachers to inform students how they have performed. This move will assist teachers in working on students' strengths and weaknesses in learning.

In line with the changing trends in assessment, SBA or PKBS (*Penilaian Kendalian Berasaskan Sekolah*) has been introduced into Malaysian schools under the New Integrated Curriculum for Secondary Schools. It has introduced 'coursework' for a few subjects in secondary schools such as History, Geography, Living Skills and Islamic Education for the lower secondary classes and Biology, Chemistry and Physics for the upper secondary classes. The Ministry of Education introduced the school-based oral assessment for both *Bahasa Malaysia* and English Language in 2003. It is a compulsory component for Secondary Five candidates taking the *Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia* (SPM) Examination. It gives all educational stakeholders, namely educators, parents, students and the community-at-large, the power to improve teaching and learning practices. By transferring SBA decisions to schools, teachers are now empowered to help students perform better in learning (Chan & Sidhu, 2010).

In this study, the significance of alternative assessment is discussed in the light of the present demands of education. It explains the need to use alternative assessment in the context of education today. The form of alternative assessment that is presented here is the portfolio.

The implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool helps teachers to take a step forward toward making learning more meaningful for students instead of merely studying for the examinations (Pal et al., 2012). Today, classroom assessment is no longer teacher oriented because one of the core features in portfolio assessment requires students to self-assess their work and it is known as *self-assessment*. Self-assessment allows students to view learning within their own control (Hansen, 1992). Therefore, students no longer depend on their teachers for detailed information but they develop a sense of ownership of their own learning and progress through preferences and responsibility. Thus, this diverts students' attention to focus more on their production of work rather than just memorizing and regurgitating

information in the examinations (Davies, 2000). Standardized tests produce students who study for examination but do not educate students to set and complete appropriate goals of learning (Wolf, 1989, Valencia, 1990).

The introduction and implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool will create paths and ways for students to set their own goals of learning, which will indirectly facilitate teachers to focus on their teaching, on the individual student's needs and interests specifically relating to learning (Burke, 2005). The idea is that assessment is inseparable from the teaching and learning and it has to be a part of their classroom context (Berimani & Mohammadi, 2013). Assessment then becomes collaboration between teachers and students. Portfolio tracks the students' performance in class where examinations do not always tell teachers about what students have learned but rather what students have learned to pass the tests or to achieve certain grades (Mohtar, 2010). However, there are some reservations pertaining to self-assessment. Many teachers are not comfortable with the idea of students assessing themselves because this involves relinquishing too much control to the students (Joyce et al., 2009).

Therefore, teachers as well as students must understand the motivation behind employing portfolio if they want to make use of it. For teachers to implement portfolio as an assessment tool in their classroom, they have to understand the criteria involved. Portfolio assessment demands the following: clarity of goals, explicit criteria for evaluation, work samples tied to those goals, student participation in selection of entries, teacher and student involvement in the assessment process, and self-reflections that demonstrate students' metacognitive ability, that is, their understanding of what worked for them in the learning process, what did not, and why (Fernsten, 2005). In other words, there are models for portfolio assessment that ESL teachers in Malaysia can use as a guideline. These models are significant in the sense that they offer certain criteria teachers may take into considerations while implementing the portfolio as an assessment tool although at present ESL teachers in Malaysia do not have a specific model or technique to conduct the portfolio assessment process because portfolio is heard of but not widely used (Mohtar, 2010). The techniques ESL teachers used in implementing portfolio as an assessment tool for the teaching and learning in this study enabled the researcher to propose a model for portfolio assessment.

In Malaysia, much emphasis is given to the centralized public summative examination which focuses on students studying only for examination purposes rather than learning for the sake of exploring and gaining knowledge. The standardized examinations reveal that assessment in the Malaysian context is very much examination oriented, resulting in students being passive recipients in the classroom (Chan & Sidhu, 2010).Providing guidelines on how to implement the portfolio in the Malaysian classroom is an important task that teachers and educators should not ignore because assessment is an integral aspect to sustain teaching and learning.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

1.2 The Portfolio as an Assessment Tool

Portfolios have been around for a long time, either as collections of artifacts in artist's portfolios or teaching or professional portfolios (Guard, Richter & Waller, 2003).There is also a wide body of theoretical research that recommends the use of portfolios in ESL and EFL classrooms (Hedge, 2000; Rea, 2001). The portfolio is selected as an alternative form of assessment in view of the shortcomings of standardised examinations (Mohtar, 2010). According to Paulson, Paulson & Meyer (1991), a key value associated with student portfolios and a rationale for using them is that: portfolios permit instruction and assessment to be woven together. The use of portfolio as an assessment tool requires students to collect and reflect on examples of their work, providing both an instructional component to the curriculum and offering the opportunity for authentic assessment (Leung, 2007). A portfolio is a purposeful collection of student work that exhibits the students' efforts, progress, and achievements in one or more areas (Carr & Harris, 2001; Genesee & Upshur, 1996; Paulson et al., 1991). The collection include work samples made by students over a period of time, the criteria for selection, the criteria for judging merits, and evidence of self-reflection (Paulson et al., 1991). The use of portfolio as an assessment tool becomes more meaningful when teachers encourage students to select the items, write self-reflection and provide criteria for success (Burke, 2005). The most common types of portfolios are process-oriented portfolios and product-oriented portfolios. Process-oriented portfolios document the process of learning and creating, including earlier drafts, reflections on the process, and obstacles encountered along the way (Epstein, 2000c). Product-oriented portfolios are a collection of work a student considers his or her best which aims to document and reflect on the quality and range of accomplishments rather than the process that produced them (Epstein, 2000c).

It is believed that educational portfolios allows students to think critically, and also become active, independent and self-regulated learners (Bergman, 1994). However, Sweet (1993) argued that portfolios, across diverse curricular settings, student populations, and administrative contexts are significant because they engage students in their own learning so that they are responsible of their personal collection of work, reflect on what their strengths and weaknesses, and use this information to improve their performance. In other words, portfolios are a commonly used technique for formative assessment to promote assessment for learning.

The use of portfolio as an assessment tool is capable of enhancing student learning (Biggs, 1999; Smith & Yancey, 2000). Portfolio assessment entails the procedure used to plan, collect, and analyse the various types of products kept in the portfolio (Mohtar, 2010). Hanson & Gilkerson (1999: 81-82), suggested that there are several criteria portfolio assessment must meet. The portfolio must be clearly linked with an instruction objective, be an ongoing assessment system, avoid becoming a teacher-manufactured document, and be performance based and emphasize purposeful learning. Portfolio assessment requires students to provide selected evidence to show that learning relevant to the course objectives has taken place (Tiwari & Tang, 2003).Portfolio assessment can be used as an integral part of learning as it provides students with opportunities to overcome their weaknesses (Barootchi & Keshavarz, 2002).In short, portfolio assessment is not about a final exam, but it emphasizes on the students' learning experience that is part of the ongoing and serves as a

guide to the student as well as the teacher. Such assessment informs students and their teachers how well they are developing their skills and knowledge and what they need to do to develop them further. This process is based on reflections provided by assessment to both students and teachers. Thus, portfolio assessment serves as a diagnostic tool which provides students with profiles of their emerging skills to help them become increasingly independent learners.

Borowski et. al (2001) reported that the current assessment methods which were more examination based were inadequate for measuring student learning as they focused on memorization than acquisition of knowledge, and a considerable amount of research on portfolio assessment proved they can be valuable tools for individualizing the learning process and documenting student progress over time. For example, studies on the implementation of portfolio for examining learning processes and pedagogical tools (Chen, 2006; Gonzalez, 2009); the studies of portfolio providing criteria for identifying students' language level reported by Karababa and Suzer (2010) showed that significant learning took place within the school context as both the teachers and students were satisfied with the positive outcomes of the integration of portfolio assessment in the ESL classroom (Chan et al., 2010). At the same time, it was found by studies that many students who have been exposed to portfolio assessment say that they managed to learn English in a better manner, in a meaningful and fun way (Chan et al., 2010). The students appreciated the portfolio assessment process and when they were able to learn from their mistakes, know their strengths and correct the errors, this made them regard portfolio assessment was a fair and fun way to help them evaluate their performance in ESL classes (Chan et al., 2010). However, the teachers' experiences in implementing the portfolio assessment in teaching ESL in the classroom are seldom if ever used in research. Previous studies have not been specifically focusing on teachers implementing the portfolio as an assessment tool whereby their experience in implementing the portfolio is viewed as an important factor in the teaching and learning process of ESL students in the classroom.

It would seem that teachers' experience in implementing the portfolio assessment is due to the demand for more meaningful assessments that involve students in reflecting on their own learning and the need to satisfy the different learning styles that will enable students to evaluate what they learn in and outside of their classrooms. Within the context of a secondary school, ESL teachers search for alternative types of assessments as test scores often did not correspond to the teacher's and parents' perceptions of the student's achievement. In addition to such processes, ESL teachers also find that alternative assessment is suitable for classroom use in view of the shortcomings of standardized examinations (Chan & Sidhu, 2010). Coombe (2004) supports the use of portfolio assessment as a leading alternative assessment approach. The rationale for using portfolio as an assessment tool is based on considerations such as the limitation of standardized tests, the complexity of the constructs (language competencies) to be measured and the need to have assessment techniques which can be adapted in the ESL classroom to measure higher cognitive skill. A single form of assessment is incapable of assessing a diversity of skills, knowledge and strategies to determine student progress. Unfortunately, research shows that such effects are yet to be substantiated by credible research studies.

1.3 Statement of Problem

English had been used extensively as the medium of instruction at secondary schools for decades before the Malay language replaced it in 1981. The decline in the students' proficiency in English was gradual but by the later part of 1990s, the results became obvious. In 2011, more than 40,000 Malaysian graduates from public Universities could not get jobs in the private sector because they were not proficient in English (The Star Online, January 7, 2014). Some did very well in the written examination but failed to communicate in English during job interviews (Rodridges, 2006). According to the former Malaysia Director of Education, Tan Sri Murad Mohd Noor, "The attitude of being obsessed to too many standardized examinations in the national education system is the factors to not being able to achieve maximum level of creativity and innovation. Too many examinations at primary, secondary and university levels cause students to not having time to develop their talents, ability and potentials in an area of interest" (Utusan Malaysia, 29th September 2005). The rote learning over life-long learning and too examination-oriented system may lead to students not demonstrating real capacities (Mohtar, 2010). One way of assisting weak learners improve their proficiency is to provide assistance to the teachers who are teaching and assessing them (Mohtar, 2010). In order to do that, an investigation of the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool by the ESL teachers will need to be conducted to establish the type of assistance they require.

So, how has portfolio assessment been implemented in the teaching and learning of ESL in Malaysian classrooms? How did the implementation of portfolio assessment within the ESL classroom facilitate students' learning? Amidst the changes that took place, the fact is that there is a significant lack in understanding the implementation of portfolio assessment by the teachers in the classroom and the factors which contribute to student learning. Hence, a primary concern of this study is to have in-depth understanding about the nature of the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool and the processes involved in assessing students' learning.

In short, the current literature on use of portfolio as an assessment tool in this specific setting is insufficient (Pillay, 2006; Kemboja, 2006; Sidhu, Chan & Hazadiah, 2008; Mohd Rashid & Mohd Asri; Mohtar, 2010; Chan & Sidhu, 2010). Missing from the portfolio in second language learning literature is research that describes the implementation process of portfolio as an assessment tool among ESL teachers in the classroom and the learning that takes place. Moreover, surveys of literature published on portfolios reveal that most of the studies on portfolio assessment have been conducted within the first language context, and document perceptions, reflections and experiences of teachers teaching within the context (Udoukpong & Okon, 2012; Berimani & Mohammadi, 2013; Czura, 2013; Sliogerine, 2012; Lynch & Shaw, 2005; Brady, 2001; Klenowski, 2000).

The study will address both these gaps and provide valuable information on the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool and the learning that will take place which is the interest of the field of second language learning. It is timely to address issues that lie within those ESL teachers who have implemented portfolio as an assessment tool in their classroom to improve students' learning. Thus, ESL teachers' experiences in implementing

the portfolio as an assessment tool to record students' learning acquire a unique viewpoint. Their experiences in implementing portfolio as an assessment tool need to be confronted and students' learning should serve as a platform of the world between ESL teachers and ESL students.

As this research intends to explore the implementation of portfolio assessment as an assessment tool, at selected lower and upper secondary schools in Malaysia, it attempts to investigate how teachers carry out the portfolio assessment to monitor student progress in learning. Such investigation is deemed important as according to Starck (1996) literature and studies show that not much has been done in "evaluating, awareness, reactions, and feelings of teachers who use, implement, or may plan to use portfolios" (p.2).

Furthermore, this research explores a group of teachers' implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool. Understanding the appropriate implementation of portfolio assessment is crucial as it will help both the teachers and students make relevant educational decisions to guide instruction and to demonstrate growth of individual students in the English language (Myford & Mislevy, 1995).

There is therefore a need to investigate how ESL teachers implement the portfolio as an assessment tool and how they use the assessment to monitor progress students make in learning. In order to achieve this, the researcher has observed and interviewed the teachers involved in the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom to determine the factors that influences the effective implementation of the portfolio assessment to examine the effects of portfolio as an assessment tool on student learning and to identify the models ESL teachers used for portfolio assessment in the classrooms.

Currently, the majority of available research related to ESL or EFL in the Malaysian context is focused on the teaching methods and how these methods can be transformed into effective tools that can be used to assist the teaching and learning process (Pillay, 1995). Consequently, less attention has been given to issues pertaining to classroom assessment that form a central part of the teaching and learning process. For example, a study on how implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool has been used to document student learning in the classroom , identify the models involved in the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool and how teachers employ portfolio as an assessment tool to gauge the effectiveness, level and pace of their instruction and use this as a tool to differentiate the degrees of understanding that their learners possess (Barnhardt et al., 1998) will be innovative in the sense that it gives the teacher fresh and invigorating perspectives of teaching.

1. 4 Purpose of the Study

Fundamentally, the purpose of this study is:

- investigate teachers implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in classroom and process involved
- examine students' response towards the use of portfolio as an assessment tool

© COPYRIGHT UPM

- identity factors influence ESL teachers to implement portfolio assessment
- propose an appropriate model of portfolio assessment for ESL teachers in the Malaysian ESL classroom context.

The overall goal of this study is to gain insights into the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool, which can further inform teacher training programs so that they can assist and expose teacher trainees to alternative assessment in the form of portfolio to improve teaching and learning. This knowledge and understanding can also better inform teacher educators on how to prepare teacher trainees to identify student needs so they can better match instruction to needs and assessment to instruction.

1.5 Research Questions

Based on the four principal areas that serve as the foundation of the research questions, the study seeks to investigate the following:

- implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool;
- examine students' response towards the use of portfolio as an assessment tool;
- factors that influence the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in Malaysia schools; and
- propose an appropriate model of portfolio assessment for ESL teachers in the Malaysian ESL classroom context.

More specifically, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How has portfolio assessment been implemented in the teaching and learning of ESL in Malaysian classrooms?

2. How do ESL students respond to portfolio assessment that is being used in the classroom?

3. What are the factors that influence the ESL teachers to use portfolio assessment for the teaching and learning of ESL in Malaysian classrooms?

4. What portfolio assessment models would be appropriate in implementing portfolio assessment for ESL teaching and learning in Malaysian classrooms?

The first question hopes to study the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool and the processes involved by the ESL teachers in the classroom. The second question looks at ESL students' response towards the use of portfolio assessment on their learning. The third question is aimed at understanding the factors that influence teachers' successful implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom. As many portfolio assessment models exist, the fourth question is aimed at examining the appropriateness of various models to the Malaysian classroom context.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the existing knowledge in educational research by drawing on teachers' personal experiences in carrying out the portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom as Cohen (1998) and Macaro (2001) said teachers' personal experiences are rich sources of research problem. This study is a quest to understand as well as investigate the factors influencing the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom by the ESL teachers. The interpretive paradigm of this study ensures that the teachers' voice is heard through their practices that they employ in implementing of portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom. By understanding the factors that influence teachers' implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom, this study hopes to see how this area can contribute to the assessment process particularly in the Malaysian ESL classroom.

Thus, this study can illuminate certain issues pertaining to how teacher training programs can:

- help teacher trainees to understand the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool and how this can help them make crucial instructional decisions inside the classroom
- hear voices of teachers in terms of the benefits and/or obstacles they encounter as they experiment with the implementation of portfolios and help find ways of better understanding those issues.
- reach to teachers who are not well-verse in assessment, to rectify the problem, knowledge and the rationale for using portfolio as an assessment tool has to be imparted in the teacher training.
- create awareness among teacher trainees to employ alternative assessment to collect information about students; achievement (Angelo & Cross, 1993; Nitko & Brookhart, 2007)

This study hopes to give insights to teacher trainees in managing the complexity of assessment in second language learning. The outcome of this study will help to inform induction programs or in-service courses to better suit the needs of the second language teachers and learners. This study also hopes to provide teacher training colleges/higher learning institutions with realistic views of assessment so that they can employ different types of assessment in the classroom.

Subsequently, it will help policy makers and curriculum developers to better understand the teachers' and learners' challenges where portfolio assessment is concerned. This study will shed some light on stakeholders including students, teachers, administrators, and parents as portfolio assessment will be the yardstick which will provide accurate information about the achievement of students' learning (O'Malley & Valdez-Pierce, 1996) and also contribute some positive impact on teacher and student learning.

Portfolios could improve motivation and communication among students which are important in learning. At the same time, teachers can guide students while diagnosing their performance in class as they progress. Portfolios provide the means to use for classroom assessment to support summative assessment. This will encourage the collection of data on

student progress over time and provide a fuller picture of student achievement; its principal importance is how residing this information can contribute to formative assessment and support the formative assessment.

Findings and results from this study are aimed at providing suggestions and insights on how teachers can implement portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom. In addition to the arguments in connection to teacher training programs, this study will make a significant contribution to educational research in Malaysia in terms of the use of case study approach in classroom research.

1.7 Definition of terms

a. Portfolio

Barton and Collins (1993) and Bird (1990) share a common definition, saying that "A portfolio is a container of documents that provide evidence of someone's knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions." More specifically, a language portfolio is 'a selection of examples of work that provides concrete evidence of a learner's progress in learning English" (Pettis, 2010).Paulson et al. (1991) define portfolio as "a purposeful collection of student work that exhibits the student's effort, progress and achievement in one or more areas. The collection must include student participation in selecting contents, the criteria for selection, the criteria for judging merit and evidence of student self-reflection" (p. 60).

In the context of this study, a portfolio is a purposeful collection of upper and lower secondary school student work that shows the students' effort, progress and achievement specifically for English language. The portfolio consists of student selection of activities, student self-reflection, worksheets graded by the teachers and the criteria for judging the merit.

b. Portfolio Assessment

A portfolio used for educational must offer more than a showcase for student products; it must be the product of a complete assessment procedure that has been systematically planned, implemented, and evaluated. According to Pierce and O'Malley (1992), portfolio assessment:

- is the use of records of students' work over time and in a variety of modes to show the depth, breadth, and development of the student's abilities
- is the purposeful and systematic collection of student work that reflects accomplishments relative to specific instructional goals or objectives
- can be used as an approach for combining the information from both alternative and standardized assessments
- has as key elements student reflection and self-monitoring

This definition emphasizes some indispensable elements in portfolio assessment, which are portfolio objectives, evidence of student work, and alternative as well as standardized assessment. Student-reflection and self-monitoring are also important elements that any

© COPYRIGHT UPM

portfolio developer should bear in mind. In the context of this study, portfolio assessment refers to the procedures used to plan, collect, and analyze the various types of products kept in the portfolio.

c. Portfolio Assessment Model

The portfolio assessment model is a framework that outlines the necessary steps in implementing the portfolio assessment in the classroom (O'Maya & O'Malley, 1994).

As for the context of this study, the portfolio assessment model refers to the framework or guideline used by the ESL teachers in Malaysian secondary school classrooms. This portfolio model outlines the essential steps necessary to design and execute a portfolio assessment in the classroom. The portfolio assessment model helps teachers to design a reliable and valid assessment tool in the classroom.

d. Assessment

Taras (2005) refer assessment to activities used by teachers and their students to assess themselves. These activities provide information to be used as feedback to modify the teaching and learning activities in which they are engaged. White (2007) suggested that "assessment" is seen as a process for gathering evidence and making judgment about students' needs, strengths, abilities and achievements" (p.44).

In the context of this study, assessment refers to activities used by the ESL teachers to assess student learning for example, monthly tests, mid-term examination, activities or worksheets given to students to be kept in the portfolio and student oral test.

1.8 Limitations of this Study

It is not appropriate to generalize the results of this study to ESL populations situated in other settings. This study investigated only nine ESL teachers from Perak and Selangor; hence it is unsafe to assume that the same responses or actions would come from other populations such as ESL teachers at primary schools or lecturers from the higher learning institutions. Since there is no way to predict whether or how portfolios will be used in future schools where teachers would be teaching, it will be impossible to follow-up on their interactions with portfolio assessment.

The focus of this study has to look at the process of learning through the use of the portfolios as an assessment tool in a classroom context. Thus, it does not look at any specific aspects of English language nor can any correlations or links be made to particular language skills.

The schools selected are based on the snowball sampling that enabled the researcher to find out teachers who had implemented portfolio assessment to improve student learning in the state of Selangor and Perak. The findings are specified to only this school and cannot be generalized to the rest of the schools. However; findings from this study can be used for further exploration on the use of portfolios for instance e-portfolio.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

This study concentrates on two sites, two schools and nine classrooms tracing the teacher's implementation of portfolio assessment to improve student learning over time. However, visits to the schools could only be arranged throughout the term on the agreed terms with the teachers and students selected for this study. Thus, the time duration for this study was beyond the control of the researcher.

The findings in this study in particular how the data are presented are open to debate; about their comprehensiveness, and their reliability. Such questioning does not end with data collection and analysis; however the researcher has done to her fullest ability and knowledge to present the findings. It is hoped that a reconstructive way of looking at the study vis-à-vis the findings can be used for future research.

1.9 Summary

The objective of this chapter is to introduce the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool by the ESL teachers in Malaysian classrooms. It takes the view that implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in the form of alternative assessment in the classroom is essential to complement the centralized assessment so that learners are given an opportunity to monitor their own learning.

The chapter raises the challenges and issues of assessment in the Malaysian context and the need to administer the right assessment strategy and technique for students, teachers and also schools. For example, in the background of the study, it mentioned the positive effects of portfolio assessment on student learning will help students know the extent of the knowledge and skills they have gained from instruction and their strengths and weaknesses. Simultaneously, the assessment given to students facilitates teachers to know the effectiveness of their teaching. Teacher can examine the extent to which the learning outcomes are realistic and meaningful with the implementation of portfolio as an assessment tool in the classroom. Several issues such as limitations of standardized tests, the absence of assessment for learning, portfolio as an assessment tool, portfolio assessment models and the complexity of the constructs (language competencies) revealed that there is a demand for more meaningful and authentic assessments that involve students in reflecting on their learning to promote lifelong learning skills that will enable students to evaluate what they learn in and outside of their classrooms.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

REFERENCES

Adams, T. L. (1998). Alternative assessment in Elementary School Mathematics. Childhood Education, 74(4), 220-224.

Adi Badiozaman Tuah. (2007). *National Educational Assessment System: A proposal towards a more holistic education assessment system in Malaysia*. International Forum on Educational Assessment System organized by the Malaysian Examinations Syndicate, 8 May 2007, Sunway Resort Hotel, Petaling Jaya.

Adler, P. ,& Adler, P. (1998). Observational techniques.In Normand K. Denzin & Yvonna Lincoln(Eds.),*Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*.Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Allen, L. Q. (2004). Implementing a culture portfolio project within a constructivist paradigm. Foreign Language Annals, 37(2), 232-39.

Anderson, R.,& DeMeulle, L. (1998). Porfolio use in twenty-four teacher education programs, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *25*(1), 23–32.

Ahmad Sharifi&Hassaskah, J. (2011). The Role of Portfolio Assessment and Reflection on Process Writing.*Asian EFL Journal*. Retrieved from www.asian-efl-journal.com/PDF/March-2011-as.pdf

Angelo, T.A. & Cross, K.P. (1993).*Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook forcollege teachers* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Allright, D.,& Bailey, K. M. (1991).*Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Altinay, F. A., Gazi, Z. A., & Isman, A. (2008).A Comprehensive Look into the Learners'Transferable Skills Related to Constructivist Approach. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 4 (4): 558-567, 2008.

Ahmad Q.K. & Warrick, R.A. (Eds.) (2001).Methods and tools. In *Climate Change 2001:Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability.* [Contribution of Working Group II to theThird Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change].Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alabdelwahab, S. Q. (2002). *Portfolio assessment: A qualitative investigation of portfolio self-assessment practices in an Intermediate EFL Classrooms, Saudi Arabia*. (UMI No:3081894).

Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 115-129.

Aly, M. M. (2000, December). Portfolio assessment: Helping EFL students develop as writers. *Studies in Curriculum & Instruction, 62*, 232-69.

Ang Chooi Kean,& Mohamed Amin Bin Embi. (2010). Promoting learning awareness and self-monitoring through learning portfolio development among Japanese Language learners.*European Journal of Educational Studies,2*(3).

Ancess, J., & Darling-Hammond, L.(1994). Authentic teaching, learning, and assessment with new English learners at International High School: *A series on authentic assessment and accountability.* New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching.

Angelo, T.A. & Cross, K.P. (1993).*Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers* (2nd edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Apple, M., & Shimo, E. (2005). Learners to teacher: "Portfolios, please!" Perceptions ofportfolio assessment in EFL classrooms.In T. Newfields (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2004JALT Pan-SIG Conference* (pp. 53-58). Tokyo: JALT Publications. CD-ROM.

Aschbacher, P.R. (1993). Issues for innovative assessment for classroom practice: Barriers and facilitators. (Tech. Rep. No. 359). Los Angeles: University of California, CRESST; Center for Study of Evaluation.

Asmah Haji Omar.(1987). *Malay in its sociocultural context*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasadan Pustaka.

Asturias, H. (1994). Using Student's Portfolios to Assessment Mathematical Understanding.*The Mathematics Teachers*, 87 (9), 698-701.

Aschbacher, P.R. (1993). Issues for innovative assessment for classroom practice: Barriersand facilitators. (Tech. Rep. No. 359). Los Angeles: University of California, CRESST; Center for Study of Evaluation.

Atherton, J. S. (2013). Learning & Teaching: Assimilation and Accomodation. (http:www.learningandreading.info/learning/assimacc.htm.

Bachman, L. F. (2000). Learner-directed assessment in ESL.In G. Ekbatani & H. Pierson (Eds.),*Learner-directed assessment in ESL* (pp. ix-xii). New Jersey: Lawrence ErlbaumAssociates, Inc.

Bahous, R. (2008). The self-assessed portfolio: A case study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(4), 381-393.

Bailey, K. M. (1996). Working for washback: a review of the washback concept in languagetesting. *Language Testing, 13,* 257-279.

Bailey, K. M. (1998). *Learning about language assessment: Dilemmas, decisions, and directions*. Toronto: Heinle & Heinle.

Baki, A. & Birgin, O. (2004). Reflections of Using Computer-Based Portfolios as an Alternative Assessment Tools: A Case Study. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology,* 3 (3).

Banfi, C. (2003). Portfolios: Integrating advanced language, academic, and professional skills.*ELT Journal, 57*(1), 34-42.

Banfield, G. (2004). *'What's Really Wrong with Ethnography?*' International EducationJournal 4(2): 53-63

Barnhardt, S., & et al., (1998).*Portfolio assessment in the Foreign Language classroom*.

Baron, Joan B. (1983).Personal communication.

Barootchi, N., & Keshavarz, M. H. (2002). Assessment of achievement through portfolios and teacher-made tests. *Educational Research, 44*(3), 279-288.

Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose(Ed.), *When a writer can't write: Studies in writer's block and other composing process* problems (pp. 134-65). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Barrett, H. (2001). *Electronic portfolios = multimedia development + portfolio development:The electronic portfolio development process*. Arlington Heights, IL: SkylightTraining & Publishing.

Baume, D. (2001). *A Briefing on Assessment of Portfolios*: Assessment Series, 6. LTSN Generic Centre.

Bartell, C., Kaye, C. & Morin, J. (1998). Guest editors' introduction: Teaching

portfolios andteacher education. *Teacher EducationQuarterly*, 5-8.
Barett, H. C. (2006). Researching Electronic Portfolios and Learner Engagement: The REFLECT Initiative.Retrieved from electronicportfolios.org/portfolios/JAAL-REFLECT3.pdf
Barrett, H. C. (2007). Researching electronic portfolios and learner engagement: The REFLECT initiative. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50*(6), 436–449.
Barton, J., & Collins, A. (1993).Portfolios in teacher education.*Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(3), 200-210.
Batzle, J. (1992). Portfolio assessment and evaluation.*Developing and using portfolio in the classrooms.* Cypress, CA: Creative Teaching Press.
Bedir, A., Polat, M. & Sakacı, T. (2009). Performance application of the 7th grade science and technology course: Portfolio]. *C.B.Ü. Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, *5*(1), 45-58.
Bell, J. (1993). *Doing your research project*. Buckingham, PA: Open.
Benoit, J., & Yang, H. (1996). A redefinition of portfolio assessment based upon purpose: Findings and implications from a large-scale program. *Journal of Research andDevelopment in Education,29*(3), pp. 181-191.
Berg, B. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the Social Sciences* (6th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
Bergman, T (1994). Feasible electronic portfolios: Global networking for the self directed learner in the digital age. Sitka, Alaska. Retrieved from http://www.mehs.educ.state.ak.us/portfolios/why_digital_portfolios.html
Berimani, SH. & Mohammadi, M. (2013). Investigating the effect of portfolio assessment on vocabulary learning ofIranian EFL learners. *ELT Voices- india,3*(6), 29-39.
Berryman, L.,& Russell D. (2001, July). Portfolios across the curriculum: Whole school assessment in Kentucky. *English Journal*, *90*(6), 76- 83.
Berlak H, Newmann F M, Adams E, Archbald D A,Burgess T, Raven J and Romberg T A 1992.*Toward a New Science of Educational Testing andAssessment* (Albany NY: State University of NewYork Press)
Biggs, J. & Tang, C. (2003). Assessment by portfolio: Constructing learning and designing teaching. In P. Stimpson, P. Morris, Y. Fung, & R. Carr (Eds.), Curriculum, learning and assessment: The Ilong Kong experience. Hong Kong: Open University of Hong Kong Press.
Birgin, O. (2003). Investigation of the Application Level of a Computer Based Portfolios.*Unpublished Master's Thesis*, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon
Bird, T. (1990). The schoolteacher's portfolio: An essay on possibilities. In J. Miilman & L. Darlind-Hammond (Eds.), The nm liandbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elernentary and secondary school teachers (pp. 241-256). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Biggs, J. B. (1999). Teaching for quality learning at university. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
Birgin, O. (2008). Students' views on portfolio application as an alternative assessment method. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 6*(1), 1-24.
Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998).Assessment and classroom learning.*Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *5*(1), *7-74.*
Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research for education* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Borowski, M. C., Thompson, C., & Zaccaria, K. (2001). Skylight professional development. *Portfolios: Authentic Assessment*, 143.

Burke, K. R., Fogarty & Belgrad, S. (1994). The mindful school: The portfolio connection. Arlington Heights, Illinois: Skylight Training and Publishing.

Bracey, G. (1989).The $150 million redundancy.*Phi Delta Kappan*, *70*(9), 698-702.

Brooks, J., & Brook, M. (1993).*The case for constructive classrooms.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language assessment. Principles and classroom practice.* New York, NY: Longman, Pearson.

Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (1998).The alternatives in language assessment.*TESOL quarterly*, *32*(4), 653-675.

Broad, R.L. (1994). "Portfolio Scoring": A contradiction in terms. In L. Black, D. A. Daiker, J.Sommers & G. Stygall (Eds.), *New directions in Portfolio Assessment: Reflective practices, critical theory, and large scale assessments* (pp. 263-276) Portsmouth, NH:

Brady, L. (2001). Portfolios for assessment and reporting in New South Wales primary schools.*Journal of Educational Enquiry, 2*(2).

Burke, K. (1997). *Designing professional portfolios for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Burke, K. (2005). *How to assess authentic learning* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Buzzetto-More, N. (2006). Using electronic portfolios to build information literacy. Global *Digital Business Review, 1*(1), 6-11.

Buzzetto-More, N. (2010). Assessing the Efficacy and Effectiveness of an E-Portfolio Used for Summative Assessment. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects,* V6.

Calfee, R.,& Perfumo, P. (1993). Student portfolios: Opportunities for a revolution in assessment. *Journal of Reading*, *36*(7), 532-537.

Calfee, R.C.,& Freedman,S.W. (1997). Classroom writing portfolios: Old, new, borrowed, blue. In R.Calfee & P. Perfumo (Eds).*Writing portfolios in the classroom: Policy and practice, process and peril* (pp. 3-26). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Callahan, S.F. (1995). State mandated writing portfolios and accountability: An ethnographic case study of one high school English department.*Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. University of Louisville, Kentucky

Camp, R. (1998). The place of portfolios in our changing view of writing assessment. In R. Bennett & W. C. Ward (Eds.), *Construction versus choice in cognitive measurement: issues in constructed response, performance testing, and portfolio assessment* (pp. 183-212). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Carr, W.,& Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Cassidy, S. (2006). Developing employability skills: Peer Assessment in Higher Education, Education + Training, 48, 7, 508-517

Celnick, A. (2002). Ethics in the field. In D. Burton (Ed.), *Research training for Social Sciences*. London, UK: Sage.

Condon, W.,& L. Hamp-Lyons. (1994). Maintaining a portfolio-based writing assessment:Research that informs program development. In L. Black, D. A. Daiker, J. Sommers & G. Stygall (Eds.), *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment: Reflective practices, criticaltheory, and large scale assessment* (pp. 277-85). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Coombe, C. (2004). The reflective portfolio: Two case studies from the United Arab Emirates.*English Language Forum.*

Cohen, E. G. (1994a). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Chan, Yat Hung. (2000). *The assessment of self-reflection in special education students through the use of portfolios*. Doctoral dissertation University of California, Berkeley.

Chan Yuen Fook,& Gurnam Kaur Sidhu. (2010). School-Based Assessment Among ESL Teachers in Malaysian Secondary Schools. Retrieved from http://www.medc.com.my/medc/journals/volume9/chan20yuen.pdf

Chan Yuen Fook, Gurnam Kaur Sidhu, Teti Rozi Ariffin, & Natasha Aishah Mohd Zamer. (2010). Portfolio assessment: A frontier educational method in ESL classroom. International Conference on Science and Social Research (CSSR 2010), December 5 - 7, 2010, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Chan Yuen Fook, Gurnam Kaur Sidhu, & Hazadiah. (2008). "Authentic assessment for internationalisation in higher education: A case study". in Sidhu, S.K., Morshidi Sirat, Norzaini Azman, *Globalisation and internationalisation of Higher Education in Malaysia.* Pulau Pinang: Penerbit Universiti Sains Malaysia,

Charanjit Kaur Swaran Singh,& Arshad Abdul Samad. (2013). The use of portfolio as an assessment tool in the Malaysian L2 classrooms. *International Journal of English Language Education,1*(1), 94-108.

Chen, Y. M. (2006). *EFL Instruction and Assessment with Portfolios: A Case Study in Taiwan.*

Chan Yuen Fook & Gurnam Kaur Sidhu. (2011). Students' Reactions to School Based Oral Assessment: Bridging the Gap in Malaysia.Retrieved from http:// asian-efl journal.com/.../2011/.../students'-reactions-to-school-based

Chan Yuen Fook, Gurnam Kaur Sidhu (2011). School-Based Assessment among ESL Teachers in Malaysian Secondary Schools, Malaysian Education Deans' Council Journal , Vol. 9, December 2011, ISSN 1511-8959 (published in 2012).

Chiam, H.K. (1984). *The elite, exam oriented education system: A socio-psychological critique.* Paper presented in Seminar on Education and Development: Key Questions on Malaysian Education. November 18–22, to Consumers Association of Penang, Malaysia.

Clough, P. & Nutbrown, C. (2007) *A student's guide to methodology : Justifying enquiry,* **(**2nd edn) London, SAGE Publications

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating qualitative and quantitative research* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pearson Education.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design:Choosing among fiveapproaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks,CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of Social Research*. London: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998).*The foundations of Social Research: Meaning and perspective in theresearch process*. London, UK: Sage.

Czura, A. 2013.Implementing portfolio assessment in lower-secondary school. English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries (ELOPE) Journal: 83-94.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K., (2007)*Research Methods in Education* (6thEdition), London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Curriculum Development Centre. (2003). *The Malaysian English Language Syllabus: FormFour*. Ministry of Education.

Darling-Hammond, L. and A. Wise (1985).*Beyond standardization: state standards and school improvement*. Elementary School Journal, 85.

Davies, A. (2000). *Making Classroom Assessment Work*. Courtenay, BC: Connections Publishing.www.connectionspublishing.ca.

Davies, M. H., Friedman Ben- Davies, M., Harden, R.M., Howie, P., Ker, J., McGhee, C.Pippard, M.J. & Snadden, D. (2001).*Portfolio Assessment in Medical Students' Final Examinations*, Medical Teacher,23: 357-366.

Davies, A.,& Le Mahieu, (2003). Assessment for Learning: Reconsidering Portfolios and Research Evidence.Assessment for learning: reconsidering portfolios and research evidence. In M. Segers, F. Dochy, & E. Cascallar (Eds.), *Innovation and change in Professional Education: Optimising New Modes of Assessment - In search of qualities and standards* (p. 141-169). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Danielson, Charlotte,& Abrutyn, Leslye. (1997). *An introduction to using portfolios in theclassroom*. Virginia:ASCD.

Davis, H., & Ponnamperuma, G. (2005).Portfolio Assessment. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19141002

Davis, M. G., & Ponnamperume, G. G. (2005).Portfolio Assessment. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net/publication/.../file/9fcfd50c2f3f1836b9.pdf

Denscombe, M. (2001).*The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects.*Buckingham: Open University Press.

Denscombe, M., (2007).*The Good Research Guide: For Small-scale Social Research* (3rdEdition). Buckingham: Open University Press.

deMarrais, K. (2004). Qualitative interview studies: learning through experience. In K. deMarrais,& S. D. Lapan (Eds), *Foundationsfor Research: Methods of Inquiry inEducation and the Social Sciences*(pp. 51–68). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dean, J., Eichorn, R. & Dean, L. (1967).Observation and interviewing. In J. T. Doby (Ed). *An introduction to social research* (pp. 284-286). New York, NY: Meredith.

De Fina, A. (1992). *Portfolio assessment: Getting started.* New York, NY: Scholastic Professional Books.

Delett, J. S., Barnhardt, S., & Kevorkian, J. A. (2001). A framework for portfolio assessment in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals,34*(6), 559-568.

Deveci, H., Ersoy, A. F. & Ersoy, A. (2006). The views of prospective elementary school teachers on the use of portfolio assessment in teacher education. *Educational Sciences:Theory and Practice, 6*(1), 193-199.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000).*Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) London: Sage.
Dickinson, L. (1987*). Self-instruction in language learning*. London: Cambridge UniversityPress
Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). *Vygotsky in the classroom: Mediated literacy instruction and assessment*. New York, NY: Longman.
Educational Technique Department.(1996). *Authentic assessment.* Bangkok, Thailand: Office of National Education Commission. Edward W. Said, "Islam Through Western Eyes," *The Nation* April 26, 1980, first posted online January 1, 1998.
Elahinia, H. (2004). *Assessment of writing through portfolios and achievement tests*. Unpublished M.A thesis, Teacher Training University, Iran.
Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ely, M., Vinz, R., Downing, M., & Anzul, M. (1997). *On writing qualitative research: Living bywords*. London: Routledge/Falmer.
Epstein, A. (2001). The portfolio process.Retrieved June 4, 2002, from http://www. teachervision.fen.com/lesson-plans/lesson-4537.html/
Erdogan, T. (2009). The effects of portfolio assessment on reading, listening and writing skills of secondary school prep class students. *The Journalof International Social Research, 2*(9), 526-538.
Erdogan, T. & Yurdabakan, I., (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.
Erdogan, T.,& Yurdabakan, I. (2011).Secondary School Students' Opinions On Portfolio Assessment In EFL. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 2(3).
Ersoy, F. (2006).Opinions of Teacher Candidates as to the Portfolio Assessment. *Elementary Education Online*, 5 (1), 85-89.
Fahed Al-Serhani, W. (2007).*The effect of portfolio assessment on the writing performance of EFL secondary school students in Saudi Arabia.* Unpublished M.A thesis, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia.
Farr, R.,& Tone, B. (1994).*Portfolio and performance assessment: Helping studentsevaluate their progress as readers and writers*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.
Fernsten, L, & Fernsten, J. (2005). Portfolio assessment and reflection: enhancing learning through effective practice. *Reflective practice: Conference Proceedings "Reflections as a Catalyst of Change"6*(2), 303-310.
Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005).*Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process andpractice* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Fina, D. (1992). *Portfolio assessment: Getting started*. New York: Scholastic Inc.
Fontana, D., & Fernandes, M. (1994). Improvements in mathematics performance as a consequence of self-assessment in Portuguese primary school pupils. *British Journal ofEducational Psychology, 64*(3), 407-417.
Fosnot, C. (1989). *Enquiring teachers enquiring learners: A constructivist approach for teaching.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Fosnot, C. (1996). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives and practice*. New York:

Teachers College Press.
Franklin, J. (2002). *Assessing assessment: are alternative methods making the grade?* Curriculum Update ASCD.
Frederiksen, J.R., & White, B.J. (1997).*Reflective assessment of students' research within an inquiry-based middle school science curriculum*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL
Fernsten, L. & Fernsten, J. (2005). Portfolio assessment and reflection: Enhancing learning through effective practice. *Reflective Practice, 6*(2), 303-309.
Friedman, B.D., Davies, M. H. Harden, R.M. Howies, P. W., Ker, J. & Pippard, M.J. (2001). AMEE Medical Education Guide No.24: *Portfolios as a Method of Student Assessment*, MedicaTeacher,23:535-551.
Finch, H., & Lewis, J. (2003).Focus groups. D. J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice.A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 170-198).London : Sage.
Fritz, C. A. (2001). *The level of teacher involvement in the Vermont mathematics portfolioassessment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Hampshire.
Gardner, H. (1991). *The unschooled mind: How children think and how schools should teach.*New York, NY: Basic Books.
Gardner, R. C, & MacIntyre, P. (1991). Motivational variables in second language acquisition.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 57-72.
Garcia, Y.,& Montes, F. (1992). Authentic Assessment for Limited-English-Proficient Students. *IDRA Newsletter*, April, 9-11.
Gay, L. R. & Airasian, P. (2000).*Educational Research, Competencies for Analysis and Application.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Gearhart, M., Herman, J., Baker,E. L., & Whittaker,A. K. (1993). Whose work is it? (CSE TechRep No. 363). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing.
Gearhart, M., Herman, J., & Novak, J. (1994).*Toward the instructional utility of large-scalewriting assessment: Validation of a new narrative rubric*. (CSE Tech Report No. 389). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing.
Genesee, F.,& Upshur, J. (1996).*Classroom-based evaluation in second language education.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ghoorchaei, B., Tavakoli, M., & Nejad Ansari, D. (2010). The impact of Portfolio Assessment on Iranian EFLStudents's Essay Writing: A Process-Oriented Approach. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 10*(3), 35-51.
Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analysing qualitative data*. London: Sage. Part of the Qualitative Research Kit, ed. U.Flick.
Gilman, D.A., Andrew, R. & Rafferty, C.D. (1995). Making Assessment a Meaningful Part of Instruction.*NASSP Bulletin*, 79 (573), 20-24.
Gillham, B. (2000). *The research interview*. New York, NY: Continuum.
Glen, S. & Hight, N. F. (1992). Portfolios: An 'affective' assessment strategy? *Nurse EducationToday* 12: 416-423.
Genesee, F. & Upshur, J. (1996).*Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gorden, J. (2003). *Assessing Students' Personal and Professional Development: Using Portfolios and interviews*,Medical Education, 37: 355-340.

Goncalves, M. L. S. (2007). Connecting languages: The use of the portfolio as a means of exploring and overcoming frontiers within the curriculum. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 30*(2), pp.195-213.

Gonzalez, J. A. (2009). Promoting student autonomy through the use of the European Language Portfolio. ELT Journal 63, no. 4: 373-382.

Goodman, K. S., Goodman, Y. M., & Hood, W. J. (Eds.). (1989). *The Whole Language Evaluation Book*.Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gottlieb, M. (1992).Contents of a Portfolio (training packet). Des Plaines, IL: Illinois Resource Center.

Gottlieb, M. (1995). Nurturing student learning through portfolios: *TESOL Journal*, *5*(1), 12-14.

Gottlieb, M. (2000). Portfolio practices in elementary and secondary schools. In G. Ekbatani & H. Pierson (Eds.), *Learner directed assessment in ESL* (pp. 89-104). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Graves, D. (1992). Portfolios: Keep a good idea growing. In D. H. Graves, & B. S. Sunstein (Eds.), *Portfolio portraits*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gnensee, F. & Upshur, John, A. (2000). Second Language Teaching Assessment, Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Publishing House.

Ghoorchaei, B, Tavakoli, M, & Nejad Ansari, D. (2010). The impact of portfolio assessment on Iranian EFL students'essay writing: a process oriented approach. GEMA online journal of language studies, 10(3). 35-51.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness ofevaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. San Francisco,CA: Jossey-Bass.

Guard, N., Richter, U., & Waller, S. (2003). Portfolio assessments.

Gurnam Kaur Sidhu, Chan Yuen Fook,& Hazadiah Mohd.Dahan. (2007). Authentic assessment in higher education: Towards internationalization and Globalisation. In Morshidi Sirat, Sarjit Kaur & Norzaini Azman (Eds.).*Globalisation and internationalisation of Higher Education in Malaysia*. Pulau Pinang: The National Higher Education Research Institute Malaysia & Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Ghassan, H. (2012). Integrating Portfolios into the L2 Arabic Classroom.*L2 Journal*, *4*, pp. 269-282.

Green, J. L., & Nixon, C. N. (2002). Exploring differences in perspectives on microanalysis of classroom discourse: Contributions and concerns. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 393-406.

Hall, B. W.,& Hewitt-Gervais, C. M. (1999). The application of student portfolios in primary/intermediate and self-contained/multi-age team classroom environments: Implications for instruction, learning, and assessment. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED432598).

Hamayan, E.V. (1995). Approaches to alternative assessment.*Annual Review of AppliedLinguistics, 15*, 212-226.

Hammersley, M.,& Atkinson, P. (1995).*Ethnography: Principles in practice*(2nd ed.). New York, NY:Routledge.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (1995). *Portfolios with ESL writers: What the research shows*. Paper presented at The annual convention of Teachers of English as a Second Language, Long Beach, CA.

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

Hamzah, M.O. and Sinnasamy, P. (2009). Between the ideal and reality: teachers' perceptionof the implementation of school-based oral English assessment. In *The English Teacher*, Vol 38, pp. 13 – 29.

Haney, W., & Madaus, G. (1989).*Searching for alternatives to standardized tests: Whys, whats, and whatever.*Phi Delta Kappan, 70.

Hancock, M. (1995).*Pronunciation Games.*Cambridge University Press.

Hansen, J. (1992). Literacy portfolio: Helping students to know themselves. *Educational Leadership, 49*, 66-68.

Hansen, R. E. (1995). Teacher socialization in technological education. *Journal of Technology Education, 6*(2), 34-45.

Hanson, M. F., & Gilkerson, D. (1999). Portfolio assessment: More than ABCs and 123s. Early Childhood Education Journal, 27(2), 81-86.

Hashemian, M. & Azadi, G. (2011, May). Arguing for the Use of Portfolio in L2 Classrooms.*Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(5), pp. 501-506.

Hassaskhah, J & et al., (2011). The role of portfolio assessment and reflection on process writing. *Asian EFL Journal, 13*(1).

Harris, M. (1997).Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings.*ELT, 51*(1), 1-8.

Haughton, G., & Dickinson, L. (1988). Collaborative assessment by masters' candidates in atutor based system. *Language Testing*, 5, 233-246.

Hsu, (2010).The 'A's Mentality – UPSR & PMR. June 25, 2010.

Hebert, E. (1998). Lessons learned about student portfolios. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79*(8), 583-585.

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

Heller, J. I., Sheingold, K., & Myford, C. M. (1998). Reasoning about Evidence in Portfolios: Cognitive Foundations for Valid and Reliable Assessment. Educational Assessment, 5(1), 5-40.

Herman, J., & Golan, S. (1991). *Effects of Standardised Testing on Teachers' and Learning.Another Look.*CSE.Technical Report 334. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Herman, J. L., &Winters, L. (1994). Portfolio research: A slim collection. *Educational Leadership, 52*(2), 48-55.

Herman, J. L., Aschbacker, P. R., & Winters L.. (1993). A practical guide to alternative assessment. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Huerta-Macias, A. (1995). Alternative assessment: Responses to commonly asked questions. *TESOL Journal,5*, 8-10.

Huang, Z. (2012). The Implementation of Portfolio Assessment in Integrated

© COPYRIGHT UPM

English Course.Journal of English Language and Literature Studies.Canadian Center of Science and Education.
Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
Hung, S. (2006). *Alternative EFL assessment: Investigating electronic portfolios into theclassroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University
Hung, S., & Huang, H. (2010). E-portfolio-based language learning and assessment. The *International Journal of Learning*, *17*(7), 313-336.
Huitt, W., & Lutz, S. (2004). Connecting cognitive development and constructivism: Implications from theory for instruction and assessment. *Constructivism in the HumanSciences, 9*(1), 67-90.
Hunt, J., Gow, L., & Barnes, P. (1989). Learner self-education and assessment: A tool for autonomy in the language learning classroom. *Language teaching and learning styles within and across cultures* (pp.207-217).
Hoepfl, M. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: a primerfortechnology education researchers.*Journal of Technology Education*, *9*(1), 47-63.
Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon. (First published 1979, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.)
Holt, D. G., & Willard-Holt, C. (2000). "Let's get real – students solving authentic corporate problems". *Phi Delta Kappan*, *82*(3).
Husseinali, Ghassan. (2012). Integrating Portfolios into the L2 Arabic Classroom. *L2 Journal*, 4(2). ucclt_l2_13333. Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4cr0b1qh
Hosseini, H. &Ghabanchi, Z. (2014).The Effect of Portfolio Assessment on EFL Learners' ReadingComprehension and Motivation.*English Language Teaching*; Vol. 7, No. 5; 2014.
Izadi, E., &Hakhverdian, A. (2014). The effect of portfolio assessment versus peer-assessment on writing ability of Iranian Intermediate English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW). 6 (3), July 2014; 76-95
Jackson, P. (1986). *The practice of teaching*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Jarvis, P. (1998). *From practice to theory*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
Jenkins, C. B. (1996). *Inside the writing portfolio*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Johnson, C. (2006). The analytic assessment of online portfolio in undergraduate technicalcommunication: A model. Journal of Engineering Education, 95, 279–287.
Johnson, R.S., Mims-Cox, J.S. & Doyle-Nichols, A. (2006). *Developing portfolios in education:A guide to reflection, inquiry, and assessment. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*
Jongsma, K. (1989, December). Portfolio assessment.*TheReading Teacher*, pp. 264-265.
Joyce, C. C.& Spiller, C. (2009). Self -assessment: What Teachers think. New Zealand: Wellington.
Kang Hsuan Education Magazine.*Central Daily News*, Jan. 17, 2002.
Karababa, C. & Suzer, S. S. (2010). Practitioners' evaluation on The Procedural

Aspects of An English Language portfolio.*Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, *7*(3).

Kemboja Ismail. (2009).*Portfolios for students' learning in a Malaysian classroom: A Case Study*.Unpublished doctoral dissertation.Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Kemp, J. & Toperoff, D. (1998). Guidelines for Portfolio Assessment in Teaching English. http://www.anglit.net/main/portfolio/default.html.

Khodadady, E. & Khodabakshzade, H. (2012). The Effect of Portfolio and Self Assessment onWriting Ability and Autonomy.*Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol 3, No. 3. Pp. 518-524.

Khoo Kay Kim, New Sunday Times, July 16,2006.

Khodashenas, M, R., Kishani Farahani, S & Amouzegar, E. (2013). The effect of keeping portfolios on writing abilityof advanced EFL learners. International journal of language learning and applied linguistics world, 4 (2), .80-88.

Klenowski, V. (1998) 'The use of portfolios for assessment in teacher education: A perspective from Hong Kong' Asia Pacific.' *Journal of Education, 18*(2), 74-86.

Klenowski, V. (2000). Portfolios: Promoting Teaching. *Assessment in Education, Police & Practice*, 7(2), 215-236.

Kohonen, V. (2000).Authentic assessment in affective foreign language education.In V. Kohonen et al. *Experiential learning in foreign language education*. London: Pearson Education.

Koretz, D., Stecher,B. & Diebert,E. (1992). The Vermont Portfolio Assessment Program:Interim report on implementation and impact 1991-92 school year (CSE Tech Report No. 350). Los Angeles, CA: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing.

Korkmaz, H.,& Kaptan, F. (2002). An investigation on using portfolio for assessing students' development in science education. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *23*, 167-176.

Krigere, G., & Sardiko, L. (2000).*Portfolio assessment in a young learners' classroom*. Retrieved http: //www.1.vasa.1v/portfolio.php

Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. London: Sage.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kuhs, T. (1994). Portfolio Assessment: Making it Work for the First Time. *The Mathematics Teachers*, 87 (5), 332-335.

Kumaradivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom Discourse.*TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453-484.

Kvale, S. (1996).*Interviews*: *An Introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. ThousandOaks, CA: Sage.

Leedy, P. & Omrod, J. E. (2004).*Practical research: Planning and design*, 8th ed. Upper SaddleRiver, N J: Prentice Hall.

Leung, C. (2007). Dynamic Assessment: Assessment*for* andasTeaching? In *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4:3. pp257-278.

Lincoln, Y. S, & Guba, E. A. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions,

and emergingConfluences. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & E. G. Guba (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Little, D. (2002). The European language portfolio: Structure, origins, implementation andchallenges. *Language Teaching, 35,* 182-189.

Little, D. (2005). The common European framework and the European language portfolio: involving learners and their judgments in the assessment process. *Language Testing,22*(3), 321-336.

Little, D. (2009). Language learner autonomy and the European language portfolio: Two L2English examples.*Language Teaching*, *42*, 222-233.

Liu, Y. (2003). *A case study of selected ESL students' experiences with writing portfolios in college composition classes*. (UMI No: 3115767)

Linn, R. L., & Miller, M. D. (2005).*Measurement and assessment in teaching (9th ed.).* Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lo, Y. (2010). Implementing reflective portfolios for promoting autonomous learning among EFL college students in Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research*, *14*(1), 77-95.

Love, T., & Cooper, T. (2007). Electronic portfolios in e-learning. In N. Buzzetto-More, *Advanced principles of e-learning* (pp. 267-292). Santa Rosa, CA: Informing Science Press.

Lu, Z. D. (2005). *Developing Portfolios with Young English Learners,* Beijing: English Teaching & Research Notes,184: 52-55.

Lynch, B. & Shaw, P. (2005). Portfolio, power and ethics.*Tesol Quarterly, 39*(2), 263-297.

Marlin Abd.Karim. (2002). Pentaksiran berasaskan sekolah: Pentaksiran untuk pembelajaran. *Prosiding Persidangan Kebangsaan Penilaian Kemajuan berasaskan Sekolah 2002*. Anjuran bersama Unit Penyelidikan Asas, Pusat Pengajian Ilmu Pendidikan, Universiti Sains Malaysia dan Bahagian Perancangan dan Penyelidikan dasar Pendidikan, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.

Marimuthu, T., (1984) *Student development in Malaysian universities*. Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development, Singapore, RIHED Occasional Paper, No19.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1995).*Designing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, C. B. (1999).*Designing qualitative research*, 3rded. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Martin, J.R. (2000). Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL systems in English. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction ofdiscourse* (pp. 142–175). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994).*Beginning qualitative research: A Philosophic andpractical guide*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.

McCurdy, B. L., & Shapiro, E. S. (1992). A comparison of teacher monitoring, peer monitoring, and self-monitoring with curriculum-based measurement in reading among students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education, 26*(2), 162-180.

Merriam, S. H. (1998). *Case study research in education.A qualitative approach*.

SanFrancisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Mertens, D. M. (1998).*Research methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Sage
Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing. *Language Testing, 13*, 241-256.
Ministry of Education Malaysia.(1997). Education in Malaysia. KL: Ministry of Education Malaysia.
Miineishi. (2002). *A study of student- developed portfolios as an instructional toolin Japanese University English classrooms*. Hiroshirna, Japan: Keisuisha.
Miles, M. B., & Huberman A.M. (1984).*Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of NewMethods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.).
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Ministry of Education.(2007). *The Blueprint of educational development*.
Ministry of Education.(1998). *National Education Philosophy.*
Miccoli, L. (2003). *English Through Drama for Oral Skills Development*, ELT Journal,57:122-129.
Morin, A. (1995). Portfolio: An e!ective tool used by prospective teachers to encourageself-evaluation and improvement. Doctoral dissertation, California State University,Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 391806).
Moonkum, S. (2000). Portfolio (13th ed.). Bangkok, Thailand: Parppim Publishing.
Morgil, İ., Çingör, N., Erökten, S., Yavuz, S. & Özyalçın Oskay, Ö. (2004). Portfolio studies in computer assisted chemistry education. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET*, *3*(2), 105-118.
Moya, S., & O'Malley, M. (1994, Spring). A portfolio assessment model for ESL. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 1-16.
Mullin, J.A. (1998). Portfolios: Purposeful Collections of Student Work. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 74 (summer), 74-87.
Murat, H., & H. Sibel. (2010). The European Language Portfolio in ESP classes: A case study of learner reflection and self-assessment. European Journal of Social Science, 12(4), 671-684.
Musa, M. (2003). "Malaysian education system to be less examoriented". New Straits Time, 8 May 2003.
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.
McNamara, M., & Deane, D. (1995). Self-assessment activities toward autonomy in languagelearning. *TESOL Journal*, 5, 18-23.
Myford, C. M. & Mislevy, R. J. (1995). Monitoring and Improving a Portfolio Assessment System. National Center for Research and on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) Graduate School of Education & Information Studies University of California, Los Angeles.
Nezakatgo, B. (2011). The effect of Portfolio Assessment on Writing of EFL

students. *English LanguageTeaching, 4*(2), 231-241. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p231
Neuman, W. L. (2000). Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches(4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
Newman, Carole; Smolen, Lynn. (1995). Promoting Learning for English Language Learners with Portfolios Four Case Studies.*Ohio Reading Teacher* , Vol. 38, No. 1
Nitko, A.J. & Brookhart, S.M. (2007). Educational Assessment of Students (5th edition). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
Nunes, A. (2004). Portfolios in the EFL classroom: disclosing an informed practice. *ELT Journal, 58*(4), 327-35.
Nitko, A. J. (2007).*Educational Assessment of Students* (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
Norman, K.M. (1998). Investigation of the Portfolios as an Alternative Assessment Procedure.*Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,*The University of Memphis.
Nowruzi, K. M., & Nafisi, Z. (2010). Promoting EFL learners' Academic Motivation and ReadingComprehension via Portfolio Development of Concept Maps. Journal of English Learning Studies, 1(2),59-82.
Ocak, G. (2009). The Application Of Portfolio Technique In English Lesson At The Student Centered Education. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal, 41*(1)
O'Malley, J.M., & Valdez, P. L. (1996).*Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley.
O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). Authentic assessment for English language learners.Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
Oran, G. (2009). Preparing teachers for culturally relevant pedagogy characteristics of a culturally responsive classroom. The influence of the teacher in the classroom. A thought for education: A kaleidoscope effect.
Oscarson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: Rationale and applications.*Language Testing*, 6, 1-13
Packer, M.J. & Goicoechea, J. (2000). Sociocultural and constructivist theories of learning: ontology not just epistemology. *Educational Psychologist,35*(4), pp. 227-242.
Pal, R., Kar, S., Zaman, F.A., Jha, D. K., & Pal, Shrayan. (2012).Assessment of impact of small group teaching among students in community medicine. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine, Vol. 37, No. 3, July-September, 2012, pp. 170-173*
Paulson, L. F., & Paulson. P. R. (1990). How do portfolios measure-up? A cognitive model for assessing portfolios. Union, \Vk An-nual bleeting of the Northwest Evaluation Association.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 324 329)
Patton, M. (1990).*Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (pp. 169-186). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research, 34*(5), 1189-1209.
Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and Research Methods* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
Paulson, F.L, Paulson, P.,& Meyer. (1991). What Makes a Portfolio? *Educational Leadership, 48,* 60-63.

© COPYRIGHT UPM

Penta, M. Q. (2002). Student Portfolios in a standardised world.*Kappa Delta Pi Record, 38 (2)*.77-81.

Pettis, J. (2010).*Portfolio-Based Language Assessment (PBLA) best practices guide for programs andteachers: Field test working document*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Pearson Education Development Group. (2001). Portfolio assessment. Retrieved January,6, 2005, from http://www.teachervision.com/lesson-plans/;esson-5942.html

Piaget, J. (1929). *The child's conception of the world*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Piaget, J. (1955). *The language and thought of the child*. Cleveland, OH: World.

Piaget, J. (1970). *Genetic epistemology*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Pillay, H. D. (1995). *Fragments of a vision: A Case Study of the Implementation of English Language Curriculum in Five Malaysia Secondary Schools*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis East Anglia University:

Peirce, B. M., Swain, M., & Hart, D. (1993). Self-assessment, French immersion, and locus ofcontrol. *Applied Linguistics*, 14, 25-42.

Pollari, P. (2000). This is my portfolio: Portfolios in upper secondary school English studies. Retrieved on April 28, 2012, from http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED450415.pdf

Poowipadawat, S. (2001). Child-centered learning and authentic assessment (2nded.). Chiangmai, Thailand: Knowledge Press.

Popp P.J. (1999). Research and theory for practitioners. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana State University.

Porter, C., & Cleland. (1995). *The portfolio learning strategy*. Postmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook Publishers.

Punngam, A. (2000). A development of portfolio evaluation process and utilization of portfolio evaluation result: An application of meta-evaluation. *Unpublisheddoctoral dissertation*, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Prawarnpruek, K. (1997). Portfolio. Bangkok, Thailand: O!ceof Private Education Commission.

Radnor, H. (2001). *Researching your professional practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Rea, S. (2001). Portfolios and process writing: A practical approach. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *7*(6), 9.

Resnick, L. B. (1986*). Cognition and instruction: Recent theories of human competenceand how it is acquired*. Pittsburgh, PA: Learning Research and Development Center University of Pittsburgh.

Rhodes, L., & Shanklin, C. (1994).*Windows into literacy: Assessing literacy k-8*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Richard-Amato, P. & Snow, M.A. (2005). Instructional strategies for k-12 mainstream teachers. In R, A. & S, M.A. (ed), Academic success for English language learners: Strategies for k-12 mainstream teachers (pp. 197-224). New York, NY: Longman.

Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2003).Qualitative research practice.*A guide for Social Science Students and Researchers.* London: Sage.

Rivers, W. P. (2001) Autonomy at all costs: An ethnography of metacognitive self-

assessment and self-management among experienced language learners. *The Modern LanguageJournal*, 85, 279-290.
Robson C (2002). *Real World Research* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
Routman, R. (1991). *Invitations: Changing as teachers and learners.*K-12. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Rudd, T.J., & Gunstone, R.F. (1993). Developing self-assessment skills in grade 3 science and technology: The importance of longitudinal studies of learning. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching and the American Educational Research Association. Atlanta, GA.
Sam, L. C. (2009). *Assessment in Malaysian School Mathematics: Issues and Concerns.*
Saereerat, C. (1997). Portfolio assessment. Bangkok, Thailand: The master group management.
Samnaingdee, S. (2003). A study of interrelationships between knowledge and attitudetoward using portfolio assessment of teachers under the jurisdiction of Suphan Buri's Song Phi Nong District. *Unpublished master thesis*, Ramkhamhaeng University, Bangkok, Thailand.
Sawyer, R. J., Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1992). Direct teaching, strategy instruction, and strategy instruction with explicit self-regulation: Effects on the composition skills and self-efficacy of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 340-352.
Schwandt, T. (1994). Constructivist, Interpretivist Approaches to Human Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, pp. 118–37. London: Sage.
Schwandt, T.A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism.In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 189-213). Sage.
Shanusi Ahmad. (2007). An Investigation of Teachers' Readiness Towards School-based Assessment Scheme In Selected Malaysian Teacher Training Institute
Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research.*Qualitative Inquiry, 5*(4), 465-478.
Sewell, M., Marczak, M. & Horn, M. (2002). The Use of Portfolio Assessment in Evaluation.http://ag.arizona.edu./fcr/fs/cyfar/portfolio3.htlm.
Shafiq Hizwari, Irma Ahmad, Ahmad Hifzurrahman, & Wan NorHaizar. (2008). Second Language Anxiety among Diploma Students in Technical University (Universiti Malaysia Perlis). Retrieved from http://dspace.unimap.edu.my/.../..
Sharifi, A. (2011). The Role of Portfolio Assessment and Reflection on Process Writing.Asian EFL Journal. Retrieved from www.asian-efl-journal.com/PDF/March-2011-as.pdf
Shepaz, L. (1991). Will national tests improve student learning? *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(3), 232-238.
Sigel, I. (1978). Constructivism and teacher education.*The Elementary School Journal, 78*, 333-38
Siladech, C. (1997). The development of mathayomsuksa 3 english portfolio assessment.Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand.
Silverman, D. (2001). *Methods for Analysing Talk, Text, and Interaction:*

Interpreting Qualitative Data (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
Silverman, D. (1998). The quality of qualitative health research: The open-ended interview and its alternatives. *Social Sciences in Health: International Journal of Research & Practice,4*(2), 104-118.
Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
Slavin, R. (2003). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
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.
Smolen, L., Newman, C., Wathen, T., & Lee, D. (1995). Developing student self-assessment strategies. TESOL Journal, 5 (1), 22–27.
Stake, R. E. (2000).The case study method in social inquiry.In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley, & P. Foster (Eds.), Case study method: Key issues, key texts (pp. 20-26). London: Sage. (Original work published 1978 Educational Researcher (7), 5-8).
Starck, T. L. (1996). Portfolio Analysis: A Survey of Teacher Attitudes and Knowledge. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the College Reading Association (November 1996).
Steffe, L. P., & Gale, J. (1995).*Constructivism in Education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
Slater. T. F., Ryan, J. M. & Samson S. L. (1997). The impact and dynamics of portfolio assessment and traditional assessment in a college physics course. Retrieved from http://solar.physics.montana.edu/tslater/publications/#jrst1
Sliogeriene, J. (2012).Students' Reflection Analysis In Portfolio – Based Learning. *Santalka**:** Filologija, Edukologij*.
Smart School Project Team. (1997a). *Smart School flagship application: The Malaysian Smart School – A conceptual blueprint*. Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education.
Smith, K. (2002). Learner portfolios, English Teaching Professional Issue, 22: 39-41.
Smith, J. B., & Yancey, K. B. (2000). Self-assessment and development in writing: A collaborative inquiry. Cresskill, N. J. : Hampton Press.
Smolen, L., Newman, C., Wathen, T., & Lee, D. (1995). Developing student self-assessmentstrategies. TESOL Journal, 5(1), 22-27. Retrieved from http:// www.criced.tsukuba.ac.jp/math/.../apec2009/
Snavely, Loanne L., & Wright, Carol A. (2003). Research portfolio use in undergraduatehonors education: Assessment tool and model for future work. *The Journal of AcademicLibrarianship, 29*(5).
Spencer, D. M. (1999).*An exploration of portfolio assessment and its influence on children'swriting*. Unpublished master's thesis, Regina University, Canada.
Spradley, James P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Stake, R. E. (1994).Case studies. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.),*A handbookof qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Staehler, Elizabeth A. (1994). A Guide to *Portfolio Assessment* in Adult Education Programs. Retrieved fromelib.uum.edu.my/kip/Record/ED359352
Stiggins, R. (1991). Assessment literacy.*Phi Delta Kappan, 72,* 534-539

Stiggins, R.J. (2005). *Student involved assessment for learning*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Suzieleez Syrene Abdul Rahim. (2009). Classroom Assessment: Juxtaposing Teachers' Beliefs with Classroom Practices.Australian Association For Research In Education: International Education Research Conference. 29th-3rd December.

Sweet, D. (1993). *Performance assessment.* Washington, DC: Office o Educational Research Consumer Guide.

Tabatabaei, (2012). The effect of portfolio assessment technique on writing performance of EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 5*(5).

Tahriri, A., Sabet, M. K., & Aeineh, A. (2014).The Effect of Portfolio Assessment on Learning Idioms in Writing. International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies.2(2).http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.2n.2p.53.

Taras, M. (2005).Assessment – Summative and Formative – Some Theoretical Reflections.*British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 53,(4), pp 466–478

Taylor, C.S., & Bobbitt-Nolen, S. (2005). *Classroom assessment:Supporting teaching andlearning in real classrooms* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Taylor, E. W., Beck, J., & Ainsworth, E. (2001). Publishing qualitative adult education research: A peer review perspective. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 33*(2), 163-179.

The Star Online. January 7, 2014.

Tsagari, D. (2004). Is there life beyond language testing: An introduction to alternative language assessment.*Grile Working Papers, 58*.

Thomson, C.K. (1996). "Self-assessment in self-directed learning: issues of learner diversity". In Pemberton, R.; Li, E.; Or, W.; Pierson, H. (Eds.), *Taking control:Autonomy in language learning*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press

Tierney, R.J., Carter, M.A.,&Desai,L. E. (1991). *Portfolio assessment in the reading-writingclassroom.* MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Tiwari, A. (2003). From process to outcome: The effect of portfolio assessment on student learning. *Nurse Education Today, 23*(24), 269-277.

Todd, R. W. (2002, January). Using self-assessment for evaluation.*English Teaching Forum*, 16-19.

Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centredness as language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tunku Mohani Tunku Mohani, (2010). *The use of alternative assessment to sustain Teaching and learning*. Tanjung Malim: Penerbit Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.

Udoukpong, B.E. & Okon, C. P. (2012). Perception of formative evaluation practices and students' academic performance in junior secondary certificate examination in social studies. *International Journal of Business and Social Science,* 3(15), 204-212.

Utusan Malaysia, 29 September, 2005.

Valencia, S. W. (1990). *A Portfolio Approach to Classroom Reading Assessment, The Whys, Whats, and Hows.* The Reading Teacher,1(43):338-340.

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

Valencia, S. W. (1990b). Alternative assessment: Separating the wheat from the chaff. *TheReading Teacher,43,* 60-61.

Valencia, S., & Bradley, S. (1998). Engaging students in self-reflection and self-evaluation. In S. Valencia (Ed.), *Literacy portfolios in action* (pp. 174-218). Forth Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Valdez Pierce, L. & O'Malley, J. (1992, Spring). *Performance and portfolio assessment for language minority students (Program Information Guide, Series).* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience. Human Science for an Action: SensitivePedagogy*.The University of Western Ontario, Ontario.

Von Glasersfeld, E. (1989). Cognition, construction of knowledge, and teaching. *Synthese, 80,* 121-140.

Vrasidas, C. (2000). Constructivism versus objectivism: Implications for interaction, course design, and evaluation in distance education. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications, 6*(4), 339-362

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Intercation between learning and development. From mind and society (pp.79-91). Cambridge,MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wade, A., Abrami, P. C., & Sclater, J. (2005).An electronic portfolio to support learning.*Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology,31*(3).

Wang, Y. H., & Liao, H. C. (2003). The application of learning portfolio assessment for students in the technological and vocational education system. *Asian EFLJournal, 10*(2), 132-154.

Webb, N. L. (1993). Assessment for the Mathematics classroom. In N. L., Webb & A. F. Coxford (Eds.), *Assessment in the Mathematics classroom*. Reston, VA: NCTM.

Weeden,P., Winter, J., & Broadfoot, P. (2002).*Assessment (What's in it for schools?),* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

White, A. (2007). Assessment in School Mathematics. In Noraini Idris (Ed.), *Classroom Assessment in Mathematics education* pp. 43-58. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw Hill Education.

White, E. M. (1994b). Portfolios as an assessment concept. In L. Black, D. A. Daiker, J. Sommers & G. Stygall (Eds.), *New directions in portfolio assessment: Reflective practices, critical theory, and large scale assessment* (pp 25-39). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

White, E. M. (1995). *Teaching and assessing writing*. San Francisco, CA: Sage.

Widiatmoko.(2005). *Authentic assessment in EFL*. Jakarta: Pusat Pengembangan Penataran Guru Bahasa.

Willis, D. J. (2000).*Students perceptions of their experiences with Kentucky's mandated writingportfolio*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville.

Winsor, J. L., Carr, K. S., Curtis, D. B., & Odle, C. (1995, April).*Assessment as a Unifier of Teachingand Research*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Communication Association, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Wolf, D. (1989). Portfolio assessment: Sampling student work. *Educational Leadership, 46,* 35-39.

Wolf, K, Dietz, M. (1998). Teaching portfolios: Purposes and possibilities. *Teacher EducationQuarterly,* 9-22.

Woods, P. (1996) *Researching the Art of Teaching: ethnography for educational use*. London, Routledge.
Worthen, B., Borg.,& White, K. (1993). *Measurement and evaluation in the schools*. New York, NY: Longman.
Wiggins, G. (1993). Assessment: Authenticity, context and validity. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *75*(3), 200–214.
Yang, N. D. (2003). Integrating portfolios into learning strategy-based instruction for EFL college students. IRAL, *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*,*41*(4), pp.293-295.
Yin, R. K. (1984).*Case study research: Design and methods* (1st ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Yin, R. K. (1993).*Applications of case study research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Yin, R. K. (1994).*Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Yin, R. K. (2003).*Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.), Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning:Relating grade, sex and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology,82,* 51-59.
Zubizarreta, John. (2004). *Thelearning portfolio: Reflective practice for improving studentlearning*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
Zhang, S. (2009). Has Portfolio Assessment Become Common Practice in EFL Classrooms?Empirical Studies from China.English Language Teaching Journal.98-118.