British Journal of Education
Vol. 9, Issue 6, pp.1-13, 2021
Online ISSN: 2054-636X
Print ISSN: 2054-6351

EFFECT OF TEST ACCESSIBILITY ON BIOLOGY STUDENTS' TEST SCORES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA

Eduwem, Joy Dianabasi & Tommy, Udeme Ezekiel
Department of Educational Foundations, Guidance and Counselling
University of Uyo, Uyo, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This study examined the effect of test accessibility on Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. To achieve this purpose, three research questions and three hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. Quasi-experimental research design was adopted for the study. The population of the study consisted of 6,684 senior secondary two students in Akwa Ibom State. A sample size of 643 students was used for the study and they were selected using simple random sampling technique. A Biology achievement test was the instrument used for data collection on test scores of the students. The instrument was duly validated and subjected to reliability analysis which was 0.71 before being used for the study. The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation while the hypotheses were tested using ANCOVA at 0.05 alpha level. The results showed that there was significant difference in the students' test scores in Biology in secondary schools based on test response format, extended time and read aloud accommodations. From the results of the study, it was concluded that test accessibility significantly contributes to Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended that test accessibility should be adopted by teachers and test administrators since it can lead to significant improvement in the test scores of students in schools.*

KEY WORDS*: Test accessibility, test response format, extended time, read aloud, test score*

INTRODUCTION

Test accessibility is an important strategy in the course of developing inclusive assessments for students with broad range of abilities and needs in academics. Test accessibility theory was developed by Beddow, Elliott & Kettler in 2007. A test is designed to collect information on how much a learner acquires or appears to be deficient in the specific trait that is being tested. The trait in a test is usually a domain of skill, an ability, or knowledge. By providing a perspective on the assessment of this target construct in terms of three sets of variables, such as the student, the test, and the test situation, accessibility theory offers a basis for enhancing assessments for all individuals. The interaction between the student and the test is referred to as a test event. The test should produce a test event that encourages the student's engagement with the construct and provides reliable, consistent, concise, and valuable details about how much of the trait the student has. The test event is effective to the degree that a student can communicate with it in such a way that it provides accurate information about his or her level of the target construct. However, if the test event is unsatisfactory, the test may not be the sole cause of the measurement deficit, and the term accessibility to describe this deficit is only appropriate if it can be concluded that the root of the student's failure to communicate with the

test is intrinsic to test demands that are unrelated to the target construct. If this is the case, the problem is one of accessibility.

The degree to which a test event allows a learner to show his or her acquisition of the measured trait is referred to as test accessibility (Beddow, Elliott & Kettler, 2009a). As a result, an accessible test or test item has no construct-irrelevant obstacles that preclude the student from demonstrating his or her mastery of the skills, abilities or knowledge tested by the test. When a test necessitates more physical or cognitive resources than the construct it is intended to assess, inferences drawn from the test's results are more likely to represent the test's accessibility. The consequences of such test accessibility issues are especially important for learners who are unable to demonstrate the ability due to irrelevant test or item requirements. In other words, irrelevant requirement decreases a test's accuracy and precision as a measuring tool for students for whom irrelevant requirement places a hindrance, whereas test accessibility is not expressed in results generated from test scores for learners for whom irrelevant requirement is not a hindrance. In recent years, test accessibility issues have been discussed in a variety of ways, such as the use of testing accommodations (Sireci, Scarpati & Li, 2005) and, quite recently, the use of universal design standards in test construction process (Johnstone, Thurlow, Moore & Altman, 2006). Since accessibility is a feature of test event rather than just the student or test user, it is influenced by both individual learners and conditions under the control of test users. Winter, Kopriva, Chen and Emick (2006) described access as the interaction between construct irrelevant item features and person characteristics that either permits or inhibits student response to the target measurement content of the item. In certain cases, a test can be optimally available to the learners but inaccessible to blind students.

Some other test could be fully accessible to learners, but relatively inaccessible to those who are not able to grab a writing tool or type on a computer keyboard. In each of these situations, test constructors and users (that is, test administrators) would improve the test's accessibility by changing the test's administration or answer conditions to accommodate the needs of learners who are unable to complete the test under the standard conditions. In certain instances, if test users choose utilise accommodations correctly, resulting conclusions derived from test scores do not indicate error caused by the relationship between the student's individual needs and the test itself.

Prior to the passage of legislation allowing students to enrol in alternative tests dependent on updated academic achievement criteria, the movement for universally structured assessments gained popularity. Currently, accessibility issues are largely resolved by the use of test accommodations (Beddow, Elliot & Kettler, 2008). Accommodations are usually characterized as modifications to a test's administration procedures to meet the needs of learners (Hollenbeck, 2012). Testing accommodations are techniques that increase access while testing and involve changes in test administration processes, while test modifications happen before the test event and involve alterations to the test itself, specifically in the course of development of test items and test forms. Although when tests are developed or altered to address accessibility issues, it is possible that some students will continue to receive scores that represent the intended measurement. Changing test administration or response features for students is essential to guarantee fairness and inferential validity for students. These are known as testing accommodations, and they are a popular way to make tests more accessible to students on an

individualized basis. As a result, they fall somewhere in the spectrum of accessibility improvement techniques. The Testing Standards have proposed that non-standardized modifications to tests should indeed be discouraged wherever possible based on the individual nature of their use; in particular, Sireci et al., (2005) argue that the concept of a "accommodated standardized test" is itself oxymoronic. Despite this, testing accommodations have long been commonly utilized with the purpose of removing construct-irrelevant variation caused by individual students' access ability deficits.

To assess students' knowledge and abilities, accountability reforms rely on standardized and high-stakes tests. Test scores are also used to make decisions about student graduation and grade advancement, as well as the distribution of educational resources in certain situations. There is a strong push currently to develop strategies for standardized and non-standardized assessments to include a fair and valid measure of all students' abilities (Lehr & Thurlow, 2013). Testing accommodations are often offered in modern practice to enable students to access test material and effectively participate in high-stakes assessments (Bolt & Thurlow, 2014). Changes to the test presentation, setting, or answer format are examples of accommodations. Accommodations are designed to make it easier for students to access test items without modifying the test's complexity or the test's measurement. The body of information on the impact of accommodated test scores is growing, but there are few definitive reports on whether they help to assess student knowledge and ability fairly and accurately (Abedi, Hofstetter & Lord, 2014; Bolt & Thurlow, 2014). The type of accommodation, the quality of the students, the test material, and even the authors' conceptualization of test validity can all affect the results. The findings show that accommodations are advantageous, that they have little impact, or that they may often give students that use them an unfair advantage (Tindal & Fuchs, 2010; Tindal, Heath, Hollenbeck, Almond & Harniss, 2008).

Testing accommodations, according to Hollenbeck, Rozek-Tedesco, & Finzel (2010) and Sireci et al., (2005), usually include adjustments in the presentation of a test (for example, oral delivery, paraphrasing, Braille, sign language, encouragement, permitting the use of manipulatives), the timing of a test (for example, extended time, delivering the test over several days), and the mode of response (for example, permitting students to respond in the test booklet instead of on the answer sheet, transcription) or environment (example, separate room, elimination of distractions).

Unchanged constructs, individual need, differential effects, and sameness of inference are four characteristics of suitable testing accommodations defined by Hollenbeck et al. (2010). In particular, the researchers argue that adequate accommodations, when used individually to meet the needs of particular students, must not compromise with the test's assessment of the intended attribute and therefore should allow for similar validity of inferences drawn from test results as those drawn from unaccommodated students. Furthermore, the authors proposed that the use of accommodations ought to have a different impact on test outcomes for those who require accommodations than those who do not need accommodations.

For learners who require accommodations, the resulting scores may be better than without, however for learners who do not require accommodations, the scores may be similar under both situations. Interaction principle has been coined to describe this scenario (Sireci et al.,

2005). This interaction is otherwise known as a differential boost is an integral element of an adequate accommodation for Hollenbeck and colleagues, as well as others (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2010). Equity for all students is an issue. It could be argued that inferences drawn from the scores of unaccommodated students are negatively biased if evidence suggests that testing accommodations can improve not only the test scores of students who are qualified for accommodations but also the scores of ineligible students. This is especially concerning for students who have not been recognized as needing special education and/or do not currently receive accommodations.

Test accessibility can be provided to students through test response accommodation. Test response can be use as an accommodation in order to provide test accessibility. Students might be required to provide answers to test items on the same sheet of paper that contains the questions or given a separate answer sheet entirely. When students provide answers to test items on the question paper, accessibility is reduced and there are a lot of limitations like insufficient space for them to express themselves (Tindal *et al*., 2008). Again, the teacher might be unable to see clearly all that a student has written because of space management while marking. These can hinder the students' from obtaining the maximum score they are supposed to score. Conversely, students who are given separate answer sheets are able to write all that they know satisfactorily and the teacher while marking can clearly see everything students have written. These can in turn make the students to score all the marks their ability can reach. Tindal et al., (2008) investigated the impact of oral accommodation and response format on learners' test scores using an experimental design. Allowing students to write their responses in the test booklet rather than on an answer sheet was the unique response format examined. The response format condition had no impact on the outcome. Furthermore, students without disabilities (SWD) outperformed SWDs in both normal and oral accommodation conditions. However, the oral accommodation condition resulted in a substantial increase in scores for SWD (effect size of.76), but not for the other student community (negative effect size of .20). This result confirmed the interaction theory, leading Tindal et al., (2008) to conclude that when SWD had test read to them, more valid inferences of math performance were possible.

Timing is very crucial in testing as it can increase or reduce test accessibility. Hence enough time should be allowed for a student to complete a test. Students can be given extended time as an accommodation to ensure access and make sure students complete their work. Read aloud can be used as an accommodation to increase test accessibility for learners with differential reading abilities. The test item is read aloud to examinees as part of this accommodation, which removes the challenge of reading the test item from the testing process. The read aloud accommodation may take the form of an oral presentation of test items by the test administrator, a computer or a recording. Regardless of the different in presentation agent, there is no proof that various read aloud accommodations varying test scores (Calhoun et al., 2010). Tindal et al., (2008) discovered that learners with disabilities who received a read aloud accommodation performed better on math tests than students who did not receive any accommodations, suggesting a differential boost.

Many research indicates that both examinees with and without disabilities benefit from oral presentations (Elbaum, 2007; Johnson, 2010; Meloy et al., 2012). While assessing the effects of read aloud, examinees' variables can interfere with test material. The reading ability of a

learner can play a major role in assessing the effect of a read aloud accommodation. According to research, students with poor reading proficiency made more progress by using oral presentations than those who are proficient readers (Meloy et al., 2012). Furthermore, it has been suggested that read aloud accommodations can support only a subset of students with reading disabilities (Bielinski et al., 2010). The relative complexity of the item for low and high performing students, as well as item difficulty, can influence the results of a read aloud accommodation. Bolt & Thurlow (2006), for example, discovered that the read aloud accommodation improved student grades on difficult-to-read objects. In conclusion, the read aloud option may not be useful for experienced readers who already have access to the written version of the exam, but it may be useful for poor readers or on more challenging test pieces.

Other research, on the other hand, reported that learners without learning disabilities benefit from extra time as well, but not as much as students with learning disabilities (Zuriff, 2010; Sireci, Scarpati & Li, 2005; Stretch & Osborne, 2015). According to these researchers, this minor differential boost is insufficient to conclude that the accommodation eliminates obstacles to students with learning disabilities on test content. Another research looked at the impact of extra time on the SAT, which is also a standardized achievement test (Mandinach, Bridgeman, Cahalan-Laitusis & Tripani, 2015). The results of this study showed that students in the middle math ability level, both with and without disabilities, gained more from the math segment accommodations. Students with low math abilities did not benefit from extra time in any of the studies listed, demonstrating the importance of individual abilities in determining the effects of accommodations.

Elliot, Kratochwill, and McKevitt (2011) adopted an alternating treatment design (ATD) to assess the impact of various types of accommodations on students with and without disabilities' test scores. Verbal support, additional time, individual test administration, read directions to student, read subtask directions, paraphrase directions, restate directions or vocabulary, read questions and content, restate questions, spelling assistance, mark task book to maintain position, and manipulatives were among the accommodations used. Accommodations had a substantially higher impact on SWD (63.7%) than on students without disabilities receiving teacher-recommended accommodations (42.9%) or regular accommodations (42.9%), according to effect size criteria (20 percent). More than 75 percent of students with disabilities benefited from testing accommodations, but more than 55 percent of students without disabilities benefited as well. Accommodations had a negative impact on 17 percent of students with disabilities and 7% of students without disabilities.

McKevitt, Marquart, Mroch, Schulte, Elliott, and Kratochwill (2010) investigated the impact of a number of accommodations on the achievement of 58 SWD and 20 non-disabled learners on Wisconsin Student Assessment System fourth-grade math and science items. The study's primary goals were to track and explain the test accommodations described on learners' IEPs, as well as to record accommodations that were frequently used in testing and to investigate the impact of accommodations on test scores for learners with disabilities. For 47 (81%) of the SWD and 26 (51%) of the non-disabled learners, the accommodations had a moderate to high significant outcome. For 3 (5%) of the SWD and 21 (41.2%) of the learners, small to no effects were discovered. Negative results were observed in 8 (14%) of the SWD and 4 (7.8%) of the non-disabled students. SWD had a.94 effect size when accommodated test scores were

compared to non-accommodated test scores, a.44 effect size for learners who received the "normal" (only one) accommodation, and a.55 effect size for learners who received teacher-recommended accommodations. The validity of the interaction hypothesis was once again questioned by the progress of learners in the accommodation situation.

Each student approaches a test event with specific abilities and limitations. The purpose of a test is to measure one of these, or a set of these, to the exclusion of the rest. The degree to which a student characteristics other than the student's amount of the measured construct interact with aspects of the test results in test scores which may yield invalid inferences about the student's level of the targeted construct. In the light of this background, this study therefore, examined the effect of test accessibility on test scores of students in secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the effect of test accessibility on Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Specifically, the objectives of the study were to assess the difference in Biology students' tests scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format, extended time and read aloud accommodations.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide this study:

1. What is the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation?
2. What is the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on extended time accommodation?
3. What is the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses guided this study:

1. There is no significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation.
2. There is no significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on extended time accommodation.
3. There is no significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation.

METHODOLOGY

The research design adopted for this study was quasi-experimental design of the pre-test post-test non-equivalent group design. The design is often used in classroom experiments where experimental and control groups are assembled as intact classes and no possibility of randomization. Hence, intact classes were used and there was no random assignment of research subjects into the experimental and control groups. The research area of this study was Akwa Ibom State. Only one state was chosen for this study since the students in the

experimental and control groups share common environment. A sample of 668 SS II students was drawn using stratified random sampling technique for the study. The instrument used for data collection was Biology Achievement Test (BAT) developed by the researchers. The BAT was a 50-item instrument made up of multiple choice items with a correct option four distracters. The items on the BAT were validated by three experts in Biology and three experts in Biology, Measurement and Evaluation. The content validity of the instruments was established using Lawshe validity ratio and it was .73. In order to establish the reliability of the BAT, it was trial-tested on randomly selected 60 SS II students who were not to be involved in the main study. The reliability index was determined using Kuder-Richarson 20 formula and it was 0.71. Because of the high validity and reliability indices of the BAT, the instrument was adjudged reliable and appropriate for the main study. The BAT was administered to the sampled students in the respective sampled schools and intact classes with the permission of the school principals. It was administered to the students with the assistance of the class teachers. Out of the 668 copies of the instruments administered, 642 copies of the instruments were properly responded to and were used for the study. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to analyse the collected data. Alpha level of .05 was the basis for not rejecting or rejecting the null hypotheses tested.

RESULTS

Research Question 1

What is the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation? Mean and standard deviation was used in answering research question 1 as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary data showing the mean and standard deviation of the difference in Biology students' test scores in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation.

Test response format	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference	Remark
Experimental group	318	69.18	0.38		
				11.29	Great difference
Control group	325	57.89	0.37		

To answer research question 1, the result in Table 1 reveals that there is a great difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation. Students in the experimental group scored better with a mean of 69.18 than students in the control group with a mean of 57.89.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation. Analysis of covariance was employed in testing hypothesis 1 as indicated in Table 2.

Table 2: Analysis of covariance of the difference in Biology students' test scores in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square
Corrected Model	51523.963[a]	2	25761.981
Intercept	3551.840	1	3551.840
PRETEST	23649.883	1	23649.883
Test response format	20003.285	1	20003.285
Error	28312.311	640	44.238
Total	2670351.000	643	
Corrected Total	79836.274	642	

*Significant at P < .05 alpha level, N = 643, df = 1, 642

The result in Table 2 reveals that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores based on test response format accommodation (F-cal = 452.174, P = .000, P < .05) with degree of freedom of 1 and 642 at 0.05 alpha level. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected which means that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation.

Research Question 2

What is the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on extended time accommodation? Mean and standard deviation was used in answering research question 2 as presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary data showing the mean and standard deviation of the difference in Biology students' test scores in the experimental and control groups based on extended time accommodation.

Extended time	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference	Remark
Experimental group	318	70.05	0.38		
				12.47	Great difference
Control group	325	57.58	0.38		

To answer research question 2, the result in Table 3 indicates that there is a great difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on extended time accommodation. Students in the experimental group performed better with a mean of 70.05 than their control group counterparts with a mean of 57.58.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on extended time accommodation. Analysis of covariance was adopted in testing hypothesis 2 as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4: Analysis of covariance of the difference in Biology students' academic achievement in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	54123.773[a]	2	27061.886	585.331	.000
Intercept	4642.860	1	4642.860	100.422	.000
PRETEST	21150.980	1	21150.980	457.482	.000
Extended time	24361.589	1	24361.589	526.926	.000
Error	29589.412	640	46.233		
Total	2696746.000	643			
Corrected Total	83713.185	642			

*Significant at P < .05 alpha level, N = 643, df = 1, 642

The result in Table 4 shows that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores based on extended time accommodation (F-cal = 526.926, P = .000, P < .05) with degree of freedom of 1 and 642 at 0.05 alpha level. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected which means that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on extended time accommodation.

Research Question 3

What is the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation? Mean and standard deviation was used in answering research question five as indicated in Table 5.

Table 5: Summary data showing the mean and standard deviation of the difference in Biology students' test scores in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation.

Read aloud	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference	Remark
Experimental group	318	69.79	0.38		
				12.12	Great difference
Control group	325	57.67	0.37		

To answer research question 3, the result in Table 5 reveals that there is a great difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation. Students in the experimental group scored higher with a mean of 69.79 than students in the control group with a mean of 57.67.

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation. Analysis of covariance was used in testing hypothesis five as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Analysis of covariance of the difference in Biology students' test scores in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	54040.604[a]	2	27020.302	609.749	.000
Intercept	4245.806	1	4245.806	95.812	.000
PRETEST	22014.640	1	22014.640	496.790	.000
Read aloud	22979.280	1	22979.280	518.558	.000
Error	28360.836	640	44.314		
Total	2688554.000	643			
Corrected Total	82401.440	642			

*Significant at P < .05 alpha level, N = 643, df = 1, 642

The result in Table 6 indicates that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores based on read aloud accommodation (F-cal = 518.558, P = .000, P < .05) with degree of freedom of 1 and 642 at 0.05 alpha level. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected which means that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation.

FINDINGS

The objective of research question one was to assess the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation. The result revealed that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on test response format accommodation. Students do better on tests which require them to give answers on a separate answer script because they have enough space to write all their answers compared to tests which they are to write the answers on the same sheet with the questions. This finding is not supported by the finding of Tindal *et al.,* (2008) because in their study, response format had insignificant effect on students' achievement. The finding is also in line with the finding of Mckevitt *et al.,* (2010) because they reported that accommodated test scores of students were significantly higher compared to non-accommodated scores of students in terms of response format. The objective of research question two was to ascertain the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on extended time accommodation. The result showed that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on extended time. Extended time gives students the opportunity to complete all items on a test and this make them to perform better because some students are slow writers than in test situations where sufficient time is not given to them. This finding collaborates with the finding of Mandinach *et al.,* (2015) as the finding of their study demonstrated that students both with and without disabilities benefited more from extended time accommodation. Also, the finding

agrees with the finding of Zuriff (2010) and Sireci *et al.,* (2005) that extended time significantly improves academic performance of students.

The objective of research question three was to determine the difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation. The result indicated that there is a significant difference in Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in the experimental and control groups based on read aloud accommodation. The implication of this result is that some students find it difficult to pronounce certain words correctly which leads to lack of understanding of the questions asked. Thus, this makes them to give wrong answers or not too precise answers to such items. But when questions are read for them, they are able to understand and know what to write which leads to higher achievement. This finding is supported by the finding of Meloy *et al.,* (2010) because they reported that read aloud accommodation significantly lead to students' performance because they were able to understand the questions and gave accurate answers. This finding also agrees with the finding of Elliot *et al.,* (2011) as they found out in their study that reading questions aloud to students improve their understanding and performance.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effect of test accessibility on Biology students' test scores in secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. The findings of this study showed that there is significant difference in the dependent variable- students' test scores in Biology based on the independent sub-variables used (test response format, extended time and read aloud) in secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Thus, it was concluded that test accessibility contributes significantly to Biology students' test scores in secondary schools.

Recommendations and Implications

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Teachers and other test administrators should ensure that students are given separate answer scripts which they can provide answers to test items on and avoid pattern of telling students to provide write answers on the question paper as this would enable students to write and explain their ideas exhaustively which leads to good academic achievement.
2. During the course of test administration, after the expiration of the stipulated time, extended time should be given to students by teachers or test administrators so that students who had not finished can complete their work as some of them are slow writers. This would make for better academic achievement on the part of the students.
3. In the course of testing, teachers or test administrators should read the instructions and test items for students who do not know how to read so that they can get the questions clearly and provide accurate answers which would lead to better achievement.

References

Abedi, J. Hofstetter, C. & Lord, C. (2014). Assessment accommodations for English Language learners: Implications for policy-based empirical research. *Review of Education Research, 74*(1), 1-28.

Beddow, P. A., Kettler, R. J. & Elliott, S. N. (2008). *Test Accessibility and Modification Inventory*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University. Available at http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/tami.xml

Beddow, P. A., Elliott, S. N. & Kettler, R. J. (2009a). *TAMI Accessibility Rating Matrix.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University. Available at http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/tami.xml

Bielinski, J., Ysseldyke, J. E., Bolt, S., Friedebach, J. & Friedebach, M. (2010). Prevalence of accommodations for students with disabilities participating in a statewide testing program. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 26*(2), 21-28.

Bolt, S. E. & Thurlow, M. L. (2014). Five of the most frequently allowed testing accommodations in state policy. *Remedial and Special Education, 25*(3), 141-152.

Calhoon, M. B., Fuchs, L. S. & Hamlett, C. L. (2010). Effects on computer based test accommodations on mathematics performance assessments for secondary students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 23,* 271-282.

Elbaum, B. (2007). Effects of an oral testing accommodation on the mathematics performance of secondary students with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education, 40* (4), 218-229.

Elliott, S. N., Kratochwill, T. R. & McKevitt, B. C. (2011). Experimental analysis of the effects of testing accommodations on the scores of students with and without disabilities. *Journal of School Psychology, 39,* 3-24.

Fuchs, L. S. & Fuchs, D. (2010). Helping teachers formulate sound test accommodation decisions for students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 16,* 174-181.

Hollenbeck, K. (2012). Determining when test alterations are valid accommodations or modifications for large-scale assessment. In G. Tindal & T. Haladyna (Eds.), *Large scale assessment programs for all students* (pp. 109-148). Mahwah, NJ: LEA.

Hollenbeck, K., Rozek-Tedesco, M., & Finzel, A. (2010). *Defining valid accommodations as a function of setting, task, and response.* Presentation at the annual meeting of the Council of Exceptional Children, Vancouver, BC.

Johnson, E. S. (2010). The effects of accommodations on performance assessments. *Remedial & Special Education, 21,* 261-268.

Johnstone, C., Thurlow, M., Moore, M. & Altman, J. (2006). *Using systematic item selection methods to improve universal design of assessments* (Policy Directions 18). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Koretz, D. & Hamilton, L. (2010). Assessment of students with disabilities in Kentucky: Inclusion, student performance, and validity. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22,* 255-272.

Lehr, C., & Thurlow, M. (2013). Putting it all together: Including students with disabilities in assessment and accountability systems (Policy Directions No. 16). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Mandinach, E., Bridgeman, B., Cahalan-Laitusis, C. & Tripani, C. (2015). *The impact of extended time on SAT test performance.* New York: The College Board.

McKevitt, B. C. & Elliott, S. N. (2013). Effects and perceived consequences of using read aloud and teacher recommended testing accommodations on a reading achievement test. *School Psychology Review, 32,* 583-600.

McKevitt, B. C., Marquart, A. M., Mroch, A. A., Schulte, A., Elliott, S. & Kratochwill, T. (2011). *Understanding the effects of testing accommodations: a single-case approach*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans.

Meloy, L. L., Deville, C. & Frisbie, D. A. (2002). The effects of a read aloud accommodation on test scores of students with and without a learning disability in reading. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(4), 248-255.

Sireci, S. G., Scarpati, S. E. & Li, S. (2005). Test accommodations for students with disabilities: An analysis of the interaction hypothesis. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(4), 457-490.

Stretch, L. S. & Osborne, J. W. (2015). Extended time test accommodation: Directions for future research and practice. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7*, 1-6.

Tindal, G. & Fuchs, L. (2010). A summary of research on test changes: An empirical basis for defining accommodations. Report for Mid-South Regional Resource Center, University of Kentucky. Available at http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/content/view/526/463/

Tindal, G., Heath, B., Hollenbeck, K., Almond, P. & Harniss, M. (2008). Accommodating students with disabilities and large scale tests: An empirical study of student response and test administration demands. *Exceptional Children, 64,* 439-450.

Winter, P. C., Kopriva, R. J., Chen, C. & Emick, J. E. (2007). Exploring individual and item factors that affect assessment validity for diverse learners: Results from a large-scale cognitive lab. *Learning and Individual Differences, 16*, 267-276.

Zuriff, G. E. (2000). Extra examination time for students with learning disabilities: An examination of the Maximum Potential Thesis. *Applied Measurement in Education, 13*, 99-117.