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ABSTRACT
The study examined teachers’ writing and reading assessment practices and comment pattern for appropriateness to the process nature of writing and reading. Four research questions were answered and four hypotheses were tested. Students in Secondary schools in Jalingo town, Taraba State formed the population for the study, a total of 40 students and four teachers were selected through purposive sampling. A twenty-four term, observational checklist tagged ‘TWRAPOC’ was used to elicit information from teachers, while a seventeen-item questionnaire tagged ‘SWRAPOC’ was used to gather information from students. The researcher, also interacted with some of the students’ writings and notes, asked verbal questions from teachers to confirm or nullify their claims. After data analysis using simple percentage and t-test statistic it was discovered that Teachers’ assessment practice has no significant effect or process nature of students’ writing and reading, teachers’ of English Language should as a result awake from their sleeping posture and utilize effective strategies to enhance the effectiveness of the teaching of these basic language skills.

INTRODUCTION
Reading and Writing are two of the four basic language skills. Reading is a form of communication during which the contents, challenges and claims made by a writer are gone over by the reader who attempts to capture the substance of the written material (Aliyu, 2010). Reading is particularly problematic for children within the school system. Oyetunde and Muodumogu (1999) further stated that, reading is not being taught in any meaningful sense in many Nigerian classrooms, how much more assessing it. Writing is an attempt to record thoughts and ideas in acceptable graphic symbols. It is creating meaningful texts such as stories descriptions, invitations or informative pieces. It involves putting down impressions, statements or declaration, the English Language student is often faced with the difficulty of putting his ideas or thoughts in writing (Aliyu 2010). As complex as the writing process, it is hardly taught in Nigerian schools and when it is taught, it is taught as a product and not as a process (Oyetunde and Muodumogu 1999).

Quality assessment will provide opportunity for students to demonstrate the ways they can write, display the
various strategies or skills taught in their relevant environment. It can be used for a variety of purposes both inside and outside the classroom. (CCCC Position statement, 2009). Against this background, this study therefore attempts to examine the effectiveness or otherwise of the assessment pattern of English language teachers on secondary students’ process nature of acquisition of these two language skills.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
Generally, this study seeks to analyse teachers writing and reading assessment practice and comment pattern for appropriateness to the process nature of writing and reading, but specifically, the objectives of this study are to find out.

1. The frequency English Language teachers assess students’ writing.
2. To what extent does the comment pattern of English Language teachers affect the process nature of students’ writing?
3. How often do English Language teachers assess students’ writing?
4. To what extent does the comment pattern of English Language teachers affect the process nature of students’ reading?

HYPOTHESES
The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested in the study.

HO1: Teachers’ Assessment practice has no significant effect on process nature of students’ writing.

HO2 Teachers’ comment pattern has no significant effect on process nature of students’ writing.

HO3: Teachers’ assessment practice has no significant effect on process nature of students’ reading.

HO4: Teachers’ comment pattern has no significant effect on process nature of students’ reading.

METHODOLOGY
The secondary schools in jalingo township, Taraba State formed the population for the study, while a total of forty students and four teachers from two secondary schools
were selected, through purposive sampling. A twenty-four item questionnaire tagged Teachers’ Writing and Reading Assessment practices Observational Checklist (TWRAPDC) was used to elicit information from teachers while a seventeen-item questionnaire tagged students’ Writing and Reading Assessment Practices Observational Checklist was used to gather information from students. The researcher also interacted with some of the students’ writings, notes and asked verbal questions from teachers to confirm or nullify their claims. All questionnaires given out were retrieved for analysis. The researcher and/or with the assistance of English language teachers in the respective schools, collected data. The data collected was analyzed using simple percentage for the Research Questions and t-test statistic to test the hypotheses.

RESULTS:

Table 1: Summary of Analysis of Teachers’ Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Favourable Response %</th>
<th>Unfavourable Response %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 show that quite often teachers of English Language do assess students’ writing and reading and their comment pattern affects the process nature of students’ writing and reading.

Table 2: t-test Analysis of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-critical</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Accept null hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

at = 0.05 level of significance.

At 0.05% level of significance as shown in Table2, it was discovered that t-critical value was greater than t-calculated, thus leading to the acceptance of the null hypotheses H0 that says Teachers’ Assessment Practice has no significant effect on process nature of students’ writing.

Table 3: t-test Analysis of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-critical</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 4: t-test Analysis of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-critical</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Accept null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = 0.05 level of significance.

Table 4: Since the t-critical value is higher than t-calculated value, at 0.05% level of significance, the null hypothesis Ho3 that stipulates that Teachers’ assessment practice has no significant effect on the process nature of students’ reading is therefore accepted.

Table 5: t-test Analysis of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-critical</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Accept null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = 0.05 level of significance.

Table 5: At 0.05% level of significance, it is discovered that t-critical value is greater than t-calculated, thus the null hypothesis Ho4 that says, Teachers’ comment pattern has no significant effect on the process nature of students’ reading is accepted.
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS
The findings of this study show that teachers of English Language do not carry out quality assessment, and in agreement to what Oyetunde and Muodumogu (1999) say no conscious effort is made to develop specific writing skills and in ‘...’ there is no reading on the time-table, hence teachers do not seem to emphasize reading.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Since Best assessment practice uses multiple measures and includes assessment by peers, instructors and the student writer (CCCC Position Statement, 2009), it is recommended that

1. English language teachers should engage in quality assessment
2. Textbooks should be made available for students at all levels in the secondary schools
3. Students learning environment should be made rich with multiple experiences.
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