

**EFFECTS OF THINK-PAIR-SHARE STRATEGY ON NIGERIAN CERTIFICATE IN EDUCATION STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN EXPOSITORY COMPOSITION WRITING IN FEDERAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PANKSHIN, PLATEAU STATE, NIGERIA**

**Dr. Onakpo-Fure Christine Chinyere**  
School of Education, Department of GSE,  
Federal University of Education Pankshin, Plateau state, Nigeria.  
07031830382, Email: [christinefure@gmail.com](mailto:christinefure@gmail.com)

&

**Dr. Lukden, Rinret Winniefred**  
Faculty of Education, Department of Adult and Continuing Education  
Federal University Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria.  
07039315033, Email: [rinret@fuwukari.edu.ng](mailto:rinret@fuwukari.edu.ng)

&

**Daudu, Nelly Kanayo**  
Faculty of Education, Department of Adult and Continuing Education  
Federal University Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria.  
08060921929, Email: [rinret@fuwukari.edu.ng](mailto:rinret@fuwukari.edu.ng)

**ABSTRACT**

*This study investigated the effects of the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) cooperative learning strategy on Nigerian Certificate in Education II (NCE II) students' achievement in expository composition writing at Federal College of Education (FCE) Pankshin, Plateau State, Nigeria. A quasi-experimental, non-equivalent pre-test post-test control group design was adopted. Simple random sampling was used to select 143 NCE II students from schools within the Pankshin Local Government Area; 85 were assigned to the experimental group (TPS instruction) and 58 to the control group (lecture method). The Composition Writing Achievement Test (CWAT) was used for data collection; content validity was established by experts from the English Education and Research, Measurement and Evaluation units of the University of Jos, and reliability was determined via the test re-test method ( $r = 0.86$ ). The study explored student performance in five sub-domains: idea generation, organisation, paragraphing, punctuation, and editing. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) addressed the research questions; Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) tested the hypotheses at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Findings showed that TPS-taught students achieved significantly higher post-test scores ( $\bar{x} = 68.93$ ) than control-group peers ( $\bar{x} = 52.47$ ),  $F(1, 140) = 45.52$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . No significant gender differential was found among TPS students ( $p > 0.05$ ). Based on these findings, it is recommended that community-based literacy programmes be compared with TPS and other cooperative interventions, and that TPS be adopted in NCE English Language Education programmes.*

**Keywords: Think-Pair-Share, Cooperative Learning, Expository Composition Writing, CWAT, NCE II, Paragraphing, Punctuation, ANCOVA, Nigeria**

**INTRODUCTION**

Written communication is a cornerstone of academic and professional competence for pre-service teachers enrolled in Nigeria's Certificate in Education programme. Among the rhetorical modes featured in the NCE II English Language curriculum, expository composition writing commands particular importance because it demands that students demonstrate the ability to organise ideas clearly, structure paragraphs logically, punctuate accurately, and edit effectively for a purely informational purpose (Federal Ministry of Education, 2019; NCCE, 2012). These sub-skills

idea generation, organisation, paragraphing, punctuation, and editing collectively determine students' overall composition writing achievement and their readiness to teach written communication in secondary schools.

Despite this centrality, NCE II students at Federal College of Education, Pankshin, continue to perform poorly in expository writing assessments. Internal academic records (FCE Pankshin, 2023) show that fewer than half of NCE II students meet the minimum pass mark in written composition. Musa and Yakubu (2022) attribute this pattern partly to the dominance of the lecture method a teacher-centred instructional approach that restricts peer interaction, denies students structured writing practice, and provides little formative feedback on drafts. Cooperative learning strategies, by contrast, have been widely supported as more effective alternatives for developing writing competence (Johnson & Johnson, 2009; Slavin, 2015).

The Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy, developed by Lyman (1981), is a three-phase cooperative routine in which students first think independently about a task, then discuss in pairs, and finally share synthesised responses with the class. It is grounded in Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory particularly the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and in Kagan's (1994) structural cooperative learning framework. Despite growing evidence of TPS effectiveness at the secondary school level in Nigeria (Owolabi & Adeleke, 2021; Suleiman, 2020), no study has specifically examined its impact on NCE II students' expository composition writing achievement in Plateau State, particularly across the sub-domains of paragraphing and punctuation. This study fills that gap.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The persistent underachievement of NCE II students at FCE Pankshin in expository composition writing evidenced by five consecutive sessions of below-average scores in paragraph structure, punctuation accuracy, and idea development (FCE Pankshin, 2023) is rooted in an instructional approach that denies students active, interactive writing practice. The lecture method neither provides the structured peer scaffolding nor the immediate formative feedback necessary for writing skill development. This study therefore investigated whether the TPS strategy could produce measurable improvement in students' expository composition writing achievement.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The study sought to: (i) determine the effect of TPS on NCE II students' mean achievement scores in expository composition writing; (ii) examine whether gender significantly differentiates achievement among TPS-exposed students; and (iii) assess students' specific performance in the five CWAT sub-domains under both instructional conditions.

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the effect of the TPS strategy on NCE II students' mean achievement scores in expository composition writing at FCE Pankshin?
2. Is there a significant difference in the mean post-test achievement scores of male and female NCE II students taught using the TPS strategy?

### **Research Hypotheses**

1. HO<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference in the mean post-test achievement scores of students taught expository composition writing using TPS and those taught via the lecture method, controlling for pre-test scores.
2. HO<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference in the mean post-test achievement scores of male and female NCE II students taught using the TPS strategy, controlling for pre-test scores.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Expository Composition Writing and Its Sub-skills

Expository writing is a non-fiction prose mode that aims to explain, inform, or clarify a subject for the reader in a direct, organised, and evidence-based manner (Troyka & Hesse, 2012). In the NCE II curriculum, expository tasks include cause-and-effect essays, process writing, classification, and comparison-contrast compositions (NCCE, 2012). Mastery of this mode demands proficiency in two foundational skills: paragraphing and punctuation. These are not cosmetic features of text; they are the structural and semantic instruments through which ideas are organised and communicated. The following tables present the key conventions in each skill area and their direct application within TPS instruction.

**Table 1: Principles of Paragraphing in Expository Writing: Definitions, Student Skills, and TPS Application**

Element	Definition	Expected Student Skill	TPS Phase Application
<b>Topic Sentence</b>	Introduces and controls the central idea of the paragraph.	Write one clear, specific topic sentence per paragraph.	THINK: students draft topic sentences independently before peer review.
<b>Supporting Details</b>	Sentences that explain, exemplify, or provide evidence for the topic sentence.	Supply minimum three relevant supporting facts or examples.	PAIR: partners verify each detail directly supports the controlling idea.
<b>Paragraph Unity</b>	All sentences relate exclusively to the controlling idea.	Delete or relocate any sentence that strays from the topic.	SHARE: class-wide feedback identifies unity breaks in shared drafts.
<b>Coherence</b>	Logical flow via transitions and pronoun reference between sentences.	Use transitions (however, furthermore, therefore) to link sentences.	PAIR: partners flag incoherent transitions and suggest replacements.
<b>Development</b>	Adequate depth and elaboration — no padding, no underdevelopment.	Apply the fact-explanation-example structure per point.	SHARE: teacher scaffolds depth during whole-class discussion of drafts.
<b>Concluding Sentence</b>	Closes the paragraph by reinforcing (not repeating) the topic sentence.	Write a clincher that synthesises rather than copies the opening.	PAIR: partners evaluate whether the clincher adds or merely echoes.
<b>Paragraph Length</b>	NCE academic paragraphs: 5–10 sentences aligned with scope.	Avoid one-sentence paragraphs and over-long blocks of undivided text.	THINK: self-check checklist; PAIR: partner counts sentences and assesses scope.

<b>Indentation</b>	First line indented 0.5 inches; consistent line spacing throughout.	Format every paragraph uniformly with proper indentation.	THINK + PAIR: mechanical editing checklist applied at individual and partner stages.
--------------------	---	---	--

*Note. TPS = Think-Pair-Share. Skills aligned with the NCE II English Language Education curriculum (NCCE, 2012).*

As Table 1 shows, every dimension of paragraph construction maps directly onto a phase of TPS. The Think phase develops individual metacognitive planning; the Pair phase enables peer identification of unity and coherence failures; the Share phase provides teacher-mediated scaffolding for adequate development. Together, the three phases address all eight paragraphing elements systematically.

**Table 2: Punctuation Conventions in Expository Writing: Rules, Common NCE Errors, and TPS Corrective Strategies**

Mark	Rule	Common NCE Error	TPS Corrective Strategy
<b>Full Stop (.)</b>	Ends every declarative sentence; placed inside closing quotation marks.	Run-on sentences with two clauses fused without terminal punctuation.	PAIR: partners read aloud to locate and correct all run-on sentences.
<b>Comma (,)</b>	Separates items in a series, introductory clauses, and coordinate adjectives.	Comma splice — joining independent clauses with a comma alone.	THINK: underline every comma; PAIR: test each against the applicable rule.
<b>Semicolon (;)</b>	Joins closely related independent clauses without a coordinating conjunction.	Using a comma instead of a semicolon between independent clauses.	SHARE: teacher models correct semicolon placement on shared student text.
<b>Colon (:)</b>	Introduces a list or explanation following a grammatically complete clause.	Placing a colon after a verb or preposition (e.g., consists of: ...).	PAIR: partners confirm the clause before each colon is complete.
<b>Apostrophe (')</b>	Marks possession (student's essay) and contraction (it's = it is).	Confusing its (possessive) with it's (contraction); plural apostrophes.	THINK: circle all apostrophes; PAIR: classify each as possessive or contraction.

<b>Quotation Marks (" ")</b>	Encloses exact words of a source; commas and full stops placed inside.	Omitting marks around direct citations; misplacing terminal punctuation.	SHARE: teacher reviews citation punctuation with whole class on the board.
<b>Question Mark (?)</b>	Terminates a direct question only; not used after indirect questions.	Adding ? to indirect questions (He asked if it was correct?).	PAIR: label each sentence as direct or indirect question during editing.
<b>Hyphen (-)</b>	Joins compound modifiers before a noun (well-structured argument).	Omitting the hyphen in pre-nominal compound modifiers.	PAIR: apply the compound-modifier test to every adjective pair in the draft.
<b>Dash (—)</b>	Sets off a parenthetical remark or a sudden break in thought for emphasis.	Substituting a single hyphen for an em dash, altering sentence rhythm.	SHARE: teacher displays correct dash usage on a sample student sentence.
<b>Exclamation Mark (!)</b>	Reserved for strong commands or exclamations; rare in academic writing.	Overuse in expository essays, weakening formal register.	THINK: self-editing flag — remove or replace every ! in expository text.

*Note. Documented NCE errors drawn from diagnostic script analysis in FCE Pankshin Academic Records (2023)*

Table 2 identifies ten punctuation marks, their academic rules, common NCE II error patterns, and concrete TPS corrective strategies for each. The Pair phase is particularly powerful for punctuation remediation: students must articulate their punctuation decisions to a partner, which activates conscious rule application rather than guessing. The Share phase consolidates learning through whole-class error analysis of authentic student-generated text.

### The Think-Pair-Share Strategy

Lyman (1981) developed TPS as a structured classroom discussion technique ensuring every student, not only the most vocal, has protected time to formulate thinking before public exposure. The three phases function sequentially: the Think phase (2–3 minutes) activates individual prior knowledge and composition planning; the Pair phase (4–5 minutes) facilitates dialogic negotiation of meaning and peer correction; and the Share phase provides the teacher with formative data and exposes the class to diverse writing approaches. McTighe and Lyman (1988) argued that this progression activates retrieval (Think), co-construction (Pair), and metacognitive consolidation (Share) — three cognitive processes directly implicated in writing development.

### Theoretical Framework

The study draws on two frameworks. Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory holds that higher cognitive functions, including literacy, originate in social interaction before being internalised.

The ZPD tasks achievable with scaffolded assistance but not independently is operationalised in TPS through the Pair phase, where a less proficient writer receives scaffolded peer support, and the Share phase, where the teacher scaffolds at the class level. Kagan's (1994) Structural Approach identifies four cooperative learning conditions positive interdependence, individual accountability, simultaneous interaction, and equal participation all of which TPS satisfies.

### Empirical Review

Owolabi and Adeleke (2021) found TPS significantly improved paragraph organisation and mechanics scores among secondary school students in Oyo State (mean difference = 14.7 points,  $p < 0.05$ ). Suleiman (2020) reported significantly higher composition writing achievement for TPS-treated students in Kano State ( $\bar{x} = 66.4$  vs. 51.8). At the tertiary level, Audu and Garba (2021) found cooperative learning strategies, including TPS, produced better academic writing outcomes at Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. Graham and Perin (2007) identified collaborative writing as among the eleven strongest evidence-based practices for writing improvement. Despite this evidence base, no study has examined TPS effects on NCE II students' expository writing achievement in Plateau State, particularly using ANCOVA-controlled quasi-experimental methods.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

The study adopted the quasi-experimental, non-equivalent pre-test post-test control group design. Intact classroom groups were used because random individual assignment was impracticable in FCE Pankshin's institutional setting. Pre-test scores were used as covariates in ANCOVA to statistically control for initial group differences. Table 3 presents the design schematic.

**Table 3: Non-Equivalent Pre-test Post-test Control Group Design**

Group	n	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental (TPS Strategy)	85	O <sub>1</sub>	TPS Instruction	O <sub>2</sub>
Control (Lecture Method)	58	O <sub>3</sub>	Conventional Lecture	O <sub>4</sub>
<b>Total</b>	<b>143</b>	—	—	—

*Note.* O<sub>1</sub>, O<sub>3</sub> = pre-test; O<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>4</sub> = post-test; TPS = Think-Pair-Share instruction; Lecture = conventional lecture method.

### Population and Sample

The target population comprised all NCE II students in English Language and Literature programmes within the Pankshin Local Government Area of Plateau State during the 2022/2023 academic session. Simple random sampling (balloting method) was used to select two intact class streams from FCE Pankshin: one stream (n = 85) was assigned to the experimental condition and one (n = 58) to the control condition, yielding a total sample of 143 NCE II students. The unequal group sizes reflect intact class enrollments. Equivalence of the two groups was confirmed by comparable pre-test means (Exp.  $\bar{x} = 38.74$ ; Ctrl.  $\bar{x} = 38.12$ ;  $t = 0.32$ ,  $p = 0.75$ ).

### Instrument — Composition Writing Achievement Test (CWAT)

The CWAT, a researcher-developed instrument, comprised two components. Component A contained twelve short-answer items testing declarative knowledge of expository writing conventions (paragraph elements, transitions, punctuation rules), scored out of 40. Component B required a 450-word expository composition assessed with a holistic rubric adapted from Jacobs et

al. (1981) across five sub-domains. Content validity was established by experts from the English Education and the Research, Measurement and Evaluation units of the University of Jos. Reliability was established using the test re-test method with a two-week interval on a pilot group of 30 NCE II students not in the main study, yielding a Pearson reliability coefficient of 0.86. Table 4 presents the CWAT rubric.

**Table 4: Composition Writing Achievement Test (CWAT) Scoring Rubric**

Writing Domain	Max Score	Weight	Scoring Descriptors
Idea Generation / Content	30	30%	Depth and relevance of ideas; use of supporting evidence and examples; originality of thinking.
Organisation & Paragraphing	25	25%	Logical sequencing; clear topic and clincher sentences; paragraph unity, coherence, and development.
Punctuation & Mechanics	20	20%	Accurate use of full stops, commas, semicolons, apostrophes, and other marks; correct sentence boundaries.
Vocabulary & Diction	15	15%	Appropriate academic register; varied and precise word choice; avoidance of ambiguity.
Editing & Grammatical Accuracy	10	10%	Subject-verb agreement; tense consistency; spelling; overall grammatical correctness.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>	

### Procedure

Both groups received twelve 70-minute instructional periods over six weeks on the same NCE II expository writing topics (cause-and-effect, process analysis, and comparison-contrast). The experimental group followed the TPS protocol: (i) teacher presents a writing prompt; students think independently for three minutes; (ii) students pair with a seat-neighbour and discuss for five minutes, applying the paragraphing and punctuation checklists from Tables 1 and 2; (iii) three pairs share responses for teacher-mediated feedback. The control group received teacher-delivered lectures, chalkboard demonstrations, and individual writing exercises without structured peer interaction. The CWAT was administered as pre-test and post-test.

### Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations answered the research questions. ANCOVA, with pre-test scores as the covariate, tested both null hypotheses at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . ANCOVA was preferred over ANOVA because it controls for pre-existing differences in non-equivalent groups, isolating the treatment effect. Analyses were conducted in SPSS Version 26.0.

## RESULTS

### Research Question 1 — Effect of TPS on Achievement (Descriptive Statistics)

Table 5 presents the pre-test and post-test means, standard deviations, and mean gains for both groups.

**Table 5: Pre-test and Post-test Descriptive Statistics for Experimental and Control Groups**

Group	n	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Mean Gain	SD (Post-test)
Experimental (TPS)	85	38.74	68.93	30.19	9.21
Control (Lecture)	58	38.12	52.47	14.35	10.34

Both groups began with comparable pre-test means (Exp. 38.74; Ctrl. 38.12; difference = 0.62), confirming initial equivalence. After the six-week intervention, the experimental group achieved a post-test mean of 68.93 (SD = 9.21) compared with 52.47 (SD = 10.34) for the control group. The experimental group's mean gain of 30.19 points was more than double the control group's gain of 14.35 points — a differential mean gain of 15.84 points. TPS instruction produced substantially higher expository writing achievement than the lecture method.

**Hypothesis 1 — ANCOVA: Group Achievement Difference**

Table 6 presents ANCOVA results testing  $H_{O1}$  — that no significant group difference exists when pre-test scores are controlled.

**Table 6: ANCOVA Results: Effect of TPS Instruction on Post-test Expository Writing Achievement ( $H_{O1}$ )**

Source	SS	df	MS	F-cal	F-crit	P	Dec.
Covariate (Pre-test Score)	4821.36	1	4821.36	63.14	3.92	0.000	<b>S</b>
Treatment (TPS vs Lecture)	3476.92	1	3476.92	45.52	3.92	0.000	<b>S</b>
Error	10706.80	140	76.48	—	—	—	—
<b>Total</b>	<b>19005.08</b>	142	—	—	—	—	—

Note. *S* = Significant; *NS* = Not Significant; *df* = degrees of freedom; *F*-critical at  $df(1,140)$ ,  $\alpha = 0.05$  is 3.92.

The covariate (pre-test) was significant,  $F(1, 140) = 63.14$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , confirming its relevance as a control variable. Critically, the treatment effect was also significant,  $F(1, 140) = 45.52$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ .  $H_{O1}$  is therefore rejected: students taught with TPS achieved significantly higher post-test scores than those taught via the lecture method, even after controlling for pre-existing writing ability.

**Research Question 2 and Hypothesis 2 — Gender Differences**

Table 7 presents adjusted post-test means by gender and the ANCOVA results for  $H_{O2}$ .

**Table 7: Adjusted Post-test Means by Gender: Experimental and Control Groups ( $H_{O2}$ )**

Group / Gender	N	Adj. Post-test Mean	SD	F-cal	p-value	Dec.
Experimental – Male	39	67.84	9.45	1.26	0.264	NS

Experimental – Female	46	69.82	8.97	1.26	0.264	NS
Control – Male	28	51.19	10.82	0.88	0.351	NS
Control – Female	30	53.67	9.87	0.88	0.351	NS

*Note.* NS = Not Significant; Adj. = adjusted for pre-test covariate;  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

Within the experimental group, female students (adj.  $\bar{x} = 69.82$ ) marginally outperformed males (adj.  $\bar{x} = 67.84$ ), but the difference was not significant,  $F(1, 83) = 1.26, p = 0.264 > 0.05$ . Within the control group, the gender gap was similarly negligible and non-significant ( $p = 0.351$ ).  $H_0$  is retained: TPS instruction benefits male and female NCE II students equally, with no significant gender differential in achievement.

## DISCUSSION

The findings confirm that TPS is a significantly more effective instructional strategy than the lecture method for developing NCE II students' expository composition writing achievement at FCE Pankshin. The experimental group's post-test mean of 68.93 versus 52.47 for the control group, and the ANCOVA F-value of 45.52 ( $p < 0.05$ ), provide robust, covariate-controlled evidence for the superiority of TPS. These results extend the findings of Owolabi and Adeleke (2021) and Suleiman (2020) from the secondary to the pre-service teacher education level, and corroborate Audu and Garba's (2021) tertiary-level evidence. The present study's methodological strength — ANCOVA with a verified pre-test covariate, validated instrument, and University of Jos expert review — distinguishes it from prior Nigerian studies that relied on unadjusted t-tests.

The theoretical account for TPS effectiveness is compelling. The Pair phase creates a miniature ZPD in which a less proficient writer receives immediate, personalised feedback from a peer on paragraph structure and punctuation accuracy precisely the two skill areas in which FCE Pankshin students are diagnostically weakest. By having to articulate punctuation decisions to a partner, students transition from guessing to conscious rule application. The Share phase further consolidates learning by exposing all students to the teacher's formative correction of authentic drafts, creating a shared reference point for writing norms (Vygotsky, 1978; Kagan, 1994).

The gender-neutral outcome (both hypotheses:  $p > 0.05$ ) is consistent with Audu and Garba (2021) and with international evidence (Amponsah et al., 2019). TPS is inherently equitable because the structured dyadic Pair phase reduces the social anxiety that can disenfranchise less confident students both male and female in whole-class lecture settings. Equal participation is structurally built into the protocol, not left to chance or teacher judgment.

The recommendation that community-based literacy programmes be compared with TPS and other cooperative interventions follows logically from these findings. If structured peer interaction produces significant writing gains in formal institutional settings, there is good theoretical and practical reason to investigate whether adapted TPS models can achieve comparable results in informal community literacy environments, where motivation, demographics, and resource availability differ. Such comparative research would extend the evidence base for cooperative learning in Nigerian language education beyond the college classroom.

## CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated, through a rigorous ANCOVA-controlled quasi-experimental design, that the Think-Pair-Share cooperative learning strategy significantly improves NCE II students' achievement in expository composition writing at Federal College of Education, Pankshin, Plateau State. Using a sample of 143 NCE II students, a validated CWAT instrument ( $r = 0.86$ ), and expert-reviewed content validity from the University of Jos, the study found that TPS-instructed students outperformed their lecture-method counterparts by a mean gain differential of 15.84

points, with benefits distributed equitably across gender. The structured TPS framework — Think, Pair, Share — directly addresses the paragraphing and punctuation deficiencies that are the primary drivers of poor expository writing performance among NCE II students, as comprehensively documented in Tables 1 and 2. These findings argue for systematic TPS adoption in NCE English Language Education programmes as both an instructional and modelling tool for future teachers.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. English Language lecturers at Nigerian colleges of education should integrate TPS as the default interactive structure for expository composition writing lessons, using the Think (3 min.) / Pair (5 min.) / Share (5 min.) protocol with the paragraphing and punctuation checklists in Tables 1 and 2.
2. The National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) should incorporate TPS and cooperative learning methodologies into the Minimum Standards for NCE English Language Education, with explicit application guidance for composition writing instruction.
3. Community-based literacy programmes in Plateau State should be designed and rigorously evaluated in comparison with TPS and other cooperative learning interventions, to determine the relative effectiveness and cost-efficiency of formal versus community-based writing instruction.
4. The Plateau State Ministry of Education should fund in-service training workshops equipping English Language teachers in Pankshin LGA and beyond with TPS implementation skills, using the CWAT rubric as a standardised assessment tool.
5. Future research should investigate: the long-term retention effects of TPS on expository writing; TPS applicability to argumentative and narrative modes; and the replicability of present findings across other Plateau State colleges of education.

## REFERENCES

- Amponsah, K. D., Mu, M., & Ernest, A. (2019). Gender and cooperative learning in university education: Insights from Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(6), 15–25.
- Audu, B., & Garba, S. A. (2021). Effects of cooperative learning on undergraduate academic writing performance at Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 6(3), 10–24.
- Federal College of Education, Pankshin. (2023). Annual academic performance report 2018–2023. Office of the Academic Board.
- Federal Ministry of Education. (2019). National policy on education (7th ed.). NERDC Press.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Newbury House.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057>
- Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning*. Kagan Publishing.

- Lyman, F. (1981). The responsive classroom discussion. In A. S. Anderson (Ed.), *Mainstreaming digest* (pp. 109–113). University of Maryland Press.
- McTighe, J., & Lyman, F. T. (1988). Cueing thinking in the classroom: The promise of theory-embedded tools. *Educational Leadership*, 45(7), 18–24.
- Musa, A. T., & Yakubu, R. S. (2022). Analysis of common errors in expository composition writing among NCE II students in North-Central Nigeria. *Confluence Journal of Education*, 10(1), 33–47.
- National Commission for Colleges of Education. (2012). *Minimum standards for Nigerian Certificate in Education: Languages* (4th ed.). NCCE.
- Okonkwo, C. E. (2020). Teacher-centred instruction and student passivity in Nigerian higher education: Implications for language learning. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Research*, 19(2), 1–15.
- Owolabi, O. T., & Adeleke, T. A. (2021). Think-Pair-Share strategy and secondary school students' writing skills in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(9), 55–63.
- Slavin, R. E. (2015). Cooperative learning in elementary schools. *Education 3–13*, 43(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2015.963370>
- Suleiman, A. M. (2020). Effects of Think-Pair-Share on composition writing achievement of secondary school students in Kano State. *Kano Journal of Education*, 8(2), 21–35.
- Troyka, L. Q., & Hesse, D. (2012). *Simon & Schuster handbook for writers* (10th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Walshaw, M., & Anthony, G. (2008). The teacher's role in classroom discourse: A review of research into mathematics classrooms. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 516–551. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308320292>