A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL AND GOVERNMENT DAY SECONDARY SCHOOL RUNJIN SAMBO SOKOTO ENGLISH LANGUAGE PERFORMANCE.

BY

AKERELE RUTH OMOLADE   1011403121

HAMZA ZAYNAB   1011403029

A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND EXTENSION SERVICES, USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY SOKOTO IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE AWARD OF BACHELOR OF ART IN EDUCATION

SEPTEMBER, 2015.

APPROVAL PAGE

This research work has been read and approved as, meeting the requirement of the Department of Educational Foundations of the Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto for the award of B.A. Ed (Hons).

_____   _____
Dr. A.M Inuwa   Date
Project Supervisor

_____   _____
Prof. Aisha .M. Isah   Date
Head of Department

_____   _____
Prof. M.U. Tambuwal   Date
Dean of Faculty

DEDICATION

We dedicated this research work to Almighty God and our beloved parents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are sincerely grateful to our supervisor Dr. A.M. Inuwa for his guidance, advice and criticisms in the course of undertaking this study.

Our heartfelt gratitude goes to our parents and guidance for their advice, moral and financial support throughout our academic pursuit.

We are indebted to our friends and colleagues, who have in one way or the other contributed to our education, may God Almighty reward them abundantly. Amen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NPE: National Policy on Education

ESL: English as a Second Language

LI: First Language Learning

L2:   Second Language Learning

WAEC: West African Examination Council

NECO: National Examination Council

GDSS: Government Day Secondary School

UDUMSS: Usmanu Danfodiyo University Model Secondary School

ABSTRACT

This research focus on the comparism between Usmanu Danfodiyo University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School Students' Performance in English Language. This is with a view to finding out reasons for the differences in UDUMSS students performance in English Language and GDSS students performance. The study is a descriptive in nature and uses close ended questionnaire tagged student question on performance. The total of 80 students and 20 teachers respondent o the instrument. It was revealed that teachers competency school conducive environment are educators on students academic performance. The study finally recommended that teachers' competency, use of educational technologies, giving students chances of practicing what they learn; establishment of language laboratories and assistance from governments, parents and others will help for better performance of the secondary schools students within Sokoto metropolis.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background to the Study

The school activities which centered on teaching and learning were characterized by means of interaction and association using English Language as the dominant acceptable channel for social interaction or communication. The means of communication has become important for the understanding of all lessons or subject regardless of either it is   language or others. This identifies the concept of teaching language across the subjects or the curriculum. In this respect examining the efficiency of teaching and the level of students understanding remain a center of teachers and planners concern. This implies that there must be a way, means of assessing both teachers and students academic activities in schools. One of this means of assessing schools, students, teachers and policies is the research on existing practices or structure of educational policy implementator. It is in the light of this position that this study want to examined students English Language performance in school of Sokoto metropolis. The schools involved are all government public secondary schools, but one of the schools i.e. is a class preference school going by its nature of preference in society (Mahuta 2007).However these schools are using the same curriculum and they are under the same National Policy on Education (NPE, 2014). Therefore, assessing their students performance in English language will be important to justify if there is performance differences and why in the schools. Considering the facts

The researcher embarks on this study to compare the performance of students from Usmanu Danfodio University Model Secondary School (UDUMSS) and Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo (GDSS) in English language. English language which we know is very important to teaching and learning in Nigeria. It is used as a medium of instruction in Schools. Its standard is usually measured in terms of students' performance in (SSCE) Examinations i.e West African Senior Secondary Certificate Examination (WASSCE) and the National Examination Council (NECO).

It is claimed that student differences could be as a result of poor performance in the language of instruction. Whatever the case might be, it is suggested the situation has accounted for alarming concern by the Teachers, Parents, State Government as well as individuals too.

1.2   Statement of the Problem

It is observed that two public secondary schools can have different students' academic performance in English language subject. This may be attributed to poor physical facilities, inadequate instructional materials, lack of competent teachers and student phobia for second language this is the challenged to find out the reasons for and how these can be affect students' performance.

The table 1 below shows the students performance of university model secondary school and Government Day Secondary School in WAEC from 2012-2014.

Table 1: WAEC Result of Two Schools in Sokoto Metropolis

S/No	Name of school	Year	Total No of students	Passed	Failed
1.	University model secondary school	2012	79	66	13
		2013	59	43	16
		2014	82	58	24
2.	Government Day secondary school Runji Sambo	2012	412	147	265
		2013	650	96	554
		2014	815	128	687

With the above table it is indicated that there are differences between the Students' performance of University Model Secondary School and students performance of Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo. University model Secondary School always from 2012-2014 records more than 70% pass as compared to Government Day Secondary School.

This academic differences are the factors that remain questionable to the research and therefore prompt to see if is all about the school facilities or personnel values that affects educational performance. Therefore, this differences in academic performance is a factor of concern and this study is interested in establishing factors by examing the reasons for English language academic performance which may include teachers' competency, students interest etc.

1.3   Objectives of the Study

Specifically, the objectives of the study are as follows;

1. To find out the differences in English language performance between Usmanu Danfodiyo University Model Secondary School (UDUMSS) and Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo (GDSS).

3

2. To find out the level of teachers competency in Usmanu Danfodio University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo Sokoto.

3. To identify the possible factors that influences students' differences in English language in the two schools.

4. To find out the impact school environment has on students' performance.

1.4   Research Question

The following research questions emanated from the objectives of the study stated above.

1. Is there any differences between students performance in the University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School?

2. Is there any differences between teachers competency in University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School?

3. Is there differences between factors that influences students performance in University Model Secondary School(UDUMSS) and Government Day Secondary School(GSSS).

4. Is there any differences between the impact of school environment of Usmanu Danfodiyo University Model Secondary School (UDUMSS) and Government Day Secondary School (GDSS).

1.5   Significance of the Study

The result of the study will be greatly beneficial to the parents, as it will help them to know reason why their childrens' performance are different from children in other schools, also it will help them to know their childrens' performance in English language compared to other students performance in other schools. Hence they will know the role they can play to help their children to perform more outstanding than any student from other school.

For students, it will also help them to adjust to proper learning of English language and the findings of this research will help to restore their confidence in the classroom and this will sustain their hope for better future.

English teachers will adopt different methods of teaching e.g descriptive method, discussion method, total physical response method etc. and know the reasons for mass failure in external examination. It will also assist teachers to diagnose the students' area of difficulties both in English language and other subjects

Educator, curriculum planner and government of Sokoto State will also benefit from the study.

1.6   Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study is restricted to only formal type of public secondary schools in Sokoto state metropolis i.e. it is specifically limited to these selected secondary schools in Sokoto i.e. Usmanu Danfodiyo University Model Secondary School (UDUMSS), and

Government Day Secondary School (GDSS). The study will however cover 2012 to 2014 academic sessions of University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo Sokoto. Among the major reason or this limitation are: Financial problems, time constraints, School location etc.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1   Introduction

This chapter is on the review of related literature and this will be drive on the following sub-heading. These include Brief history of English language in Nigeria, English language in the National Policy on Education in Nigeria, English language as an instructional tool in secondary schools, English language as L2 in Nigerian Education, Factors affecting student performance, ways to improve students' performance in English language and summary.

2.2   Brief History of English Language in Nigeria

The use of English language in Nigeria dates back to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century when British merchants and Christian missionary settled in the coastal towns called Badagry near Lagos in the present day South Eastern Nigeria. The merchants initially traded in slaves until the slave trade was abolished in 1807. The primary aim of the Christian missionary was not to make their convert spread English; rather it was to make them literate enough to read Bible in their indigenous languages. This must be the reason why Samuel Ajayi Crowder translated the English Bible into Yoruba, the major language in South Western Nigeria.

With the independence English gradually grew to become the major medium for inter ethnic communication. Like most African nations, the country after independence,

had to grapple with multi ethnicity and acute multilingualism. Following independence in 1960, the English language was recommended as core system in the new educational system approved by the British government in 1969 following the national curriculum conference, the English language assumed unique status and continued to be a single lingual franca in Nigeria.

2.3   English Language in the National Policy on Education.

The National Policy on Education (2004) states the general aims of teaching English language in Nigeria secondary schools as follows.

1. That ability to integrate in the Nigerian community, its norms culture, attitude and values
2. Need for consistent interaction with outside world with the ability to interexchange ideas, values and norms for international recognition and understanding
3. Need for research and development to established new ideas and new findings related to development of Nigerian educational system and world at large.
4. Need for value classification and acceptance of new ideas introduced if found relevant and useful to Nigerian community

Senior Secondary School Level

1. Need for spread of ideas, values and technique required for integration into Nigerian community
2. That ability to promote and enhance economic roles consistence to promoted all round development in Nigeria
3. That ability to fight effectively the yearning against integration of Nigerian community as single political entity
4. Promotion of ideas, theories and laws in social perspective to enhance communal development in Nigeria.

2.4   English Language as an Instructional Tool in Secondary Schools

English language is the language of instruction used in secondary school and should not be taken for granted as it prepares students for their future positions in the global society

Tool media both print and electronics can redeem Nigeria's through effective language use, coarse invocative and trade can be replaced with refined diction, polished syntax and semantic finesse columnists, newspaper editors, freelance writers should use language to write on. Odebunmi (2006) accepts that English is the only means open to individuals from different ethnic and linguistic groups for interaction. This shows the colossal status accorded to English language in Nigeria. On international level, English plays a global integrative role and has become the world langue Franca for excellent, and the quest and yearning for science and technology are satisfied through English. This position is supported by Odebunmi (2003) observation that English has transformed into a strong identity symbol in international politics, economy and diplomacy.

English performs a dual role, it is a language of instruction, as well as a course of study in Nigerian universities such vital functions make it so significant that its quantity and quality (Levels) of use have continued to serve as parameters towards evaluating intelligibility and effectiveness in English usage in almost all the space of Nigerian life. However, There was gross general acceptance of English roles in Nigeria and absolutely agree with spotlessly as a working principle.

However the colonial rules refined the importance of house to be used as regional language along with English language in the northern legislative function in order to indirectly control the northern regions, i.e. mainly for the control power to preserve and maintain stability to the society, despite this factor, the status of English monopoly as the official language is unchanged Tradgil (2002) as a quote in Jibril (2007) language shift is thereof inevitable. He say "language shift is the process by which a community more or less systematically abandons its original language and via an intermediate shift or language death. Akande (2008) argued "it could be regarded as a marker of identity and solidarity it is and ethnic code available to Nigerians who have no other common language that will be called their own language. Though the federal government has recognized the vital role that Nigerian pidgin English plays in helping to get close to the masses. Obanya (2002:204) in ideal situation there would be a perfect match between what is prescribed, what is practiced and consequently what is achieved (outcome) one would expect English language as a second language (ESL) learner in Nigeria context after nine or twelve years for those who are going straight for English and using it for instruction at the primary and secondary levels to be academically. Linguistically and commutatively competent in social context goes beyond the school system which is the vital goal of the prescribed English language curriculum at the secondary school level. The socio-linguistic realities according to Obanya (2002:202) are however different in that English is really a restricted code language in the Nigerian setting even in school processes. Therefore the challenge posed in this situation has become one of the greatest concern in our educational system in recent time,

particularly in secondary and tertiary institution which witness remarkable declines in both communicative linguistic competence of the learning English.

Obanya (2002:208) says the interaction which should be in form of multi way and multimedia exchanges (verbal and non verbal) in the conduct of classroom teaching and learning activities is significantly absent. He concludes that what happens in the classroom English languages learning process according to research and anecdotal evidence is frontal teaching characterized by:

1. A heavy reliance on the textbook as the exclusive reaching learning materials
2. Reading aloud by the teacher. Followed by recitation and imitation reading round the class by pupils (learners)
3. Very little respect accorded to the privacy of oracy in language teaching and learning
4. An undue rush to finish the textbooks, a sign of also "converting the syllabus" and
5. Devotion of a considerable amount of time to practicing exam type skill

The situation that arises from the problem about is inimical to be perceived or intended curriculum out of Esl in Nigerian secondary schools and even beyond the academic purpose in the larger society.

2.5   English Languages as L2 in Nigeria Education

In Nigeria English fulfill four functions such as: national official language, language for elite education, language of assimilation, and language for specialized education. But because of the vastness and multiethnic nature of the country. The role of English among Nigerian people varies and sometimes conflicting it significance will depend on the speakers attitude the content and level of competence expected of the

learner, the mode and method of instruction and the time English language is introduced to the child. In Nigeria English coexist with 250 Nigerians indigenous language. This language context and interactions situation has produced reciprocal influences between English language and Nigeria's languages (Akere, 2005:1)

Nigeria is a multilingual nation where English language has acquired the status of a second language (L2) to many people while it is a third language to others, it plays a significant role in education, politics, government administration, the judiciary, economy and legislation. English language today can be regarded as the lamp with which youths can travel through the education tunnel (Igo, 2000).

A Nigerian student learn and eventually use English as a second language (ESL) having acquired at least one of the numerous Nigerian languages as mother tongue (L1) consequently learning English is such an ESL environment must take into consideration or cognizance some useful strategies that are capable of assisting the English language learner in the Nigerians setting. However teachers as well as students usually fail to benefit from the numerous opportunities offered by language learner strategies in the course of either language teaching or learning.

Nigerian learners of English are essentially bilinguals therefore a lot of problems learning the language commenting on the problems of the second language learners of English who do not learn it naturally as nature speaker (Varghese, 2000). (Bamisaye, 2004) observes that the problem of a systematic and smooth transition from the home to school is always lacking in the Nigerians situation. The language of the home is what

the child is familiar with. The language of the school is entirely new and different it takes the learner some considerable time to transit from the home language to the school language.

When student embark on the study of an L2 they are not merely vassals that will need to be filled by the wise words of the teachers instead they carry a considerable personal baggage to the language course that will have a significant bearing on how learning proceeds. Cohen and Donyai (2002) conclude that a student own active and creative participation in the learning process via the medium of application of individualized learning techniques and not just a high degree of language aptitude and motivation usually make a learner to excel.

Like production strategies they serve communication needs they however differ in that they are used by L2 learners who lock appropriate linguistic knowledge to say what they want to say. Communications strategies are verbal and non verbal first and techniques used by learners to deal with problems or break downs in communication (Cohen and Donyai, 2002). Varghese (2007) concludes thus the total of learning a second language involves far more than simple learning the forms of the language it also involves knowledge of the culture of those who speak the language.

2.6   Factors Affecting Students' Performance

Students' performance can either be positive or negative, good or poor. Students performance is often measured with the aid of their results in external examinations,

such as, SSCE, NECO etc so whatever could be responsible for the staggering performance of students in the aforementioned examination remains a source of heightened anxiety for the stakeholders, this anxiety could be responsibility for the varied reactions from students, teacher and administrators. They pointed at over bearing tendency for syllabus bound instruction by teachers with little attention paid to teaching understanding and real life application. In addition, teachers' competency in English language affects the students, the availability of learning materials available for learning in schools is limited in public schools, provision of quality teachers is overlooked. In addition, the interest and the ability of the learners are given little consideration in the design and assessment.

2.7   Ways to Improve Students' Performance in English Language

Evidence have been given to support views on poor performance of students in Nigerian schools including Sokoto state as also exposed by the WAEC officials. They lamented upon the drastic decline in the English language competence and performance, particularly, not only because it is mostly failed yearly by students, but also because of its dual role in education as a subject and a medium of instruction across the curriculum in Nigeria. From studies review, it has been made clear that the general performance of students in secondary schools depends on several factors including teachers' experience.

However student performance has been determined by certain basic variables in education such as teacher, the learner (student),the environment, teaching methodology

and the teaching materials or teaching techniques, if these factors are adequately improved upon much improvement would have as well been made in students performance. The curriculum is between the teacher (the helper) and the learner (the helped), the way the help is tendered determines the extent to which the needs of learners are satisfied.

The above exposition reflects the way English is taught in Nigerian secondary schools and the ineffective teaching of English language has great consequences for the future education in Nigeria generally and Sokoto in particular.

Other strategies that could help to improve on students' performance in English language include; purposefulness of the learning task, diligent and creative application of the contemporary teaching methods such as:

1. Loop input model: which are student centered, based on teach me I teach you technique and for English language especially

2. Community language approach and communicative language teaching methods are imperative for students' language and communicative competence and performance. This it is hoped will enhance students' ability to freely express themselves, their ideas, information etc.

3. Using English language appropriately according to context situation as usually demanded by the WAEC and NECO examinations.

2.8   Summary

The root of English as a language was traced briefly to late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, the role of English language. In the National Policy of Education was looked into, on the performance of student generally, it could be seen from the literature reviewed that opinions were divided, the contention between these that blamed the language of instruction in schools i.e. English and hence advocated for mother tongue education and the pro-English language medium was exposed while the former implicated English as responsible for students mass failure. In examination the latter blamed it on the haphazard teaching as well as the ineffective learning of the language by teachers and students respectively.

Good and conducive environment, adequate teaching materials and aids, purposefulness of task, varied method among others, could improve the performance of students in academics. Since the study is mainly concerned with the comparative study of university model secondary school and government day secondary school Runji Sambo Sokoto. The researcher opines that however randomly English is been taught, however ineffective it is learned, with or without good environment and materials, however purposeless the task might be and in fact, however strongly related is performance and the curriculum, one obvious and undeniable. Factor for learning is students' attitudes to learning. So an intelligent and clever student's attitudes to learning. All the above, not withstanding, a poor understanding of the language of instruction is most likely to have a negative impact on student performance.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1   Introduction

This chapter includes the research design, population of the study, sampling techniques, instrumentation, validity of the instruments, reliability of the instruments and method of data analysis.

3.2   Research Design

A research design is the blue print of the study. The design of a study defines the study type. Descriptive method shall be used. Descriptive method which means the research that is devoted to the gathering of information about prevailing conditions or situations for the purpose of description and interpretation (Aggarwal, 2008). This study sought to source the status of students' performance in English language at University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo Sokoto.

3.3   Population of the Study

Population are subjects of study, these can be human, items or more to, Best (2007) "A population is any group of individual who have   more characteristics in common that are of interest to the researcher. The population may be of all individuals of a particular type or a more restricted part of that group".

The population of this study comprise of two secondary schools in Sokoto state metropolis, both are public school. The number of final year students of both schools i.e. University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo is two hundred and thirty (230). However the sum total of the SS III students of the two selected secondary school put together from which the sample is drawn as shown below in table 3.1

3.4 Sampling Technique

Kulbir (2005) states that sampling is the process of drawing a sample from the population for this purpose, the population is divided into part called sampling units. A total of eighty (80) students and twenty (20) teachers were randomly selected from two purposively chosen secondary schools in Sokoto metropolis for the study. Fifty students and ten teachers were selected from Government Day Secondary School, while thirty students and ten teachers were selected from university model secondary school a total of hundred (100) which constituted the sample size of the study. The reason for the size is because the researchers hopes to generalize the result obtained to the total number of students and teachers which total two hundred and thirty (230).While the random sampling technique allows for equal chances of variable selection, the purposive or deliberate selection is suitable if within a population, certain elements are believed by the researcher to be very crucial to her study. The sample for the study as shown below is drawn with regards to size of schools, students, age, sex and language.

Table 3.1: Table for selected sample school

S/N	Secondary school in Sokoto	Sampled teachers	Sampled students
1.	University Model Secondary School	10	30
2.	Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo	10	50
	Total	20	80

3.5   Instrumentation

Instrumentation plan is composed of a number of decisions that need to be made before beginning the study. This decision are made to determine what data are needed to answer the research questions, how to gather the data, when to gather the data, where to gather the data and how to analyze the data.

The instrument used for collection of data for this study was a carefully structured closed ended questionnaire for students in the two selected secondary schools and their teachers. The questionnaires administered to eighty (80) students and twenty (20) teachers contained ten (10) items. The items were carefully deliberated to illicit unbiased responses from students on issues mostly burdening English language and academic performance

Twenty (20) teachers had a set of questionnaires administered to them, teacher questionnaires used comprised questions about teaching and the consequent effect on student learning and performances generally the questionnaire were designed to opt for responses that would help the researcher have answer to some research questions of the study.

3.5.1   Validation of Instruments

The closed ended structured questionnaires for the students and teachers were carefully structured and passed to a language expert in the faculty of education. It was first passed to the course supervisor. During the process most of the questions were moderated, altered or completely deleted and reframed at last all the necessary corrections were affected by the researcher.

Finally the questionnaire was submitted to the supervisor, who ascertained and accepted it as capable of measuring the variables it was designed to measure. Thus the validity of the questionnaire was ensured.

3.5.2   Reliability of the Instruments

The reliability for students' instrument was ascertained using Alpha Cronbach and the value was 7.05, while that of the teachers was 7.02 reliable. This indicated that the instrument is reliable for the research work. English Language teachers from secondary schools across Sokoto metropolis. The data collected was comprised using SPSS package and the results indicated a strong reliability as shown above

The instruments was administered to thirty (30) students and ten (10) teachers of university Model Secondary School and fifty (50) students and ten (10) teachers of government day secondary school Runji Sambo on 20th of march, 2015.

3.6   Method of Data Collection

The research data was collected using two types of questionnaire, questionnaires for student performance and teachers competency. This was done in two schools of the research GDSS & UDUMSS.

3.7   Method of Data Analysis

For the purpose of these findings, responses to the questionnaires were analyzed by means of simple statistical frequencies and percentages the responses were thus presented in tables, with detailed interpretation and explanation. This is because sample frequency and percentages will give a clearer picture of the differences that will exist in the English language academic performance between the two schools of study.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This study examined the secondary school students' performance in English language. This chapter therefore presents the data collected with the aid of the designed instruments. Thus, responses from eighty (80) students and twenty (20) teachers of both University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School Runji Sambo Sokoto are presented on tables making it one hundred (100) accompanied with analysis.

4.2 Demographic Information

This study was conducted to examine the difference of two secondary schools in sokoto metropolis. The population of the study was: students 80(34.8%), teachers 20(13%).

4.3 Data Presentation and Analysis

In order to find out the performance level of students in English language of University Model Secondary School and Government Day School Runji Sambo Sokoto, data has been collected with the aid of questionnaires. Responses to the options are shown on simple statistical tables.

Table 4.3.1 On which of the following do students prefer to learn often

S/No	Content	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Writing	4	1.2%	24	12%
2.	Oral	11	3.3%	5	2.5%
3.		15	4.5%	21	10.5%
	Vocabulary development	-	-	-	-

In the table 4.3.1 above shows that UDUMSS in writing had 4(1.2%), oral 11(3.3%), vocabulary development 15(4.5%). while GDSS had 24(12%), in writing 5(2.5%) in oral and in Vocabulary development 21(10.5%). Going by the presented percentages GDSS had high percentage in writing (12%) compared to UDUMSS with (1.2%). This shows that GDSS respondents indicated high interest in learning using writing. In oral the differences between the two schools is five 5% with UDUMSS having 3.8% and GDSS 2.8%. The value of the percent is low but indicated that UDUMSS students like using oral skills for learning than GDSS. With respect to vocabulary development UDUMSS had 4.5% very high than GDSS with 10.5%. This is regardless of the differences in respondent variation in number of retrieved questionnaire. The UDUMSS prefer using vocabulary development than the students of GDSS.

Table 4.3.2   How often do they prefer the following methods to be used for their assessment?

Method	Alternatives responses								School
	Very often	%	Often	%	Rarely	%	Seldom	%	
Test	23	6.9%	6	1.8%	1	0.3%	-	-	UDUMSS
Class work	20	6.6%	8	2.4%	2	0.6%	-	-	
Home work	14	4.2%	13	3.9%	3	0.9%	0	-	
Test	19	9.5%	26	13%	5	2.5%	-	0.5%	GDSS
Class work	14	7%	33	16.5%	1	1%	1	0.5%	
Home work	26	13%	15	7.5%	8	4%	1	-	

In the table, 4.3.2 above, shows that UDUMSS students responded as follows: Test 25(6.9%) responded as very often, 6(1.8%) responded to often, 1(0.3%) responded to rarely. Class work: 20(6.6%) responded as very often, 8(2.4%) responded to class work as often and 2(0.6%) responded to class work as rarely. For home work: 14(4.2%) responded as very often, 13(3.9%) responded as often and only 3(0.9%) responded to as rarely. While GDSS had 19(9.5%) respondents to test as very often, 26(13%) responded to test as often, 5(2.5%) responded to test as rarely in class work 14(7%) responded to class work as very often, 33(16.5%) responded to class work as often, 1(1%) responded to class work as rarely, 1(0.5%) responded to class work as seldom. For homework 26(13%) responded to homework as very often, 15(7.5%) responded to homework as often, 8(4%) responded to homework as rarely and 1(0.5%) responded to homework as seldom.

The above indicates that, very often and often alternatives has a very high responses than rarely and seldom because the students realized the importance of test, class work and Homework in assessing them in both schools.

Table 4.3.3 On which of the following materials do they often use most for learning English language.

S/No	Materials	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	English test	5	1.5%	45	22.5%
2.	Library	24	7.2%	5	2.5%
3.	English laboratory	1	0.3%	-	-

Table 4.3.3 informs us that UDUMSS had 5(1.5%), library 24(7.2%), English laboratory 1(0.3%). while, GDSS had 45(22.5%) in English text, 5(2.5%) responded to library.

The above indicates that library seems to be very important to the students in UDUMSS, with (7.2%) and GDSS with 2.5%, while English test is more important to GDSS with 2.5% respondents, while UDUMSS 1.3% because library is not in their school. UDUMSS students have great access to both English text and library, so that is why library is found more important to them.

Table 4.3.4 On how effective are the following instructional materials to the learning of English language.

Instructional materials	Alternatives responses								School
	Very effective	%	effective	%	In effective	%	Practically effective	%	
English text	25	7.5%	5	1.5%	-	-	-		UDUMSS
Library	9	2.7%	17	5.1%	4	1.2%	-		
English laboratory	3	13%	13	3.9%	13	3.9%	-		
English text	34	17%	10	2.5%	6	3%	-		GDSS
Library	-	-	-	-	50	25%	-		
English laboratory	-	-	-	-	50	25%	-		

The data above indicates that respondents from UDUMSS had English text very effective by 25(7.5%), 5(1.5%) responded to effective and no response on ineffective

and partially effective in library 9(2.7%) responded to very effective 17(5.1%) responded to effective, 4(1.2%) responded ineffective. English laboratory 2(0.6%) responded to very effective 13(3.9%) responded to effective 13(3.9%) also responded to partially effective. GDSS had 34(17%) very effective to English text, 10(2.5%) effective to English text and 6(3%) ineffective. Respondents from GDSS does not responded to library as very effective and effective, 50(25%) responded to ineffective and so also in English laboratory 50(25%) responded to ineffective.   The   above results made us to realized that the respondents from GDSS does not know the value of library because they had none, while 2.7% and 5.1% responded to library as they effective and effective in UDUMSS none responded in GDSS. As English teacher in training, library is very important to the learning of English because dictionaries and other English textbooks suppose to be accessible to the students.

Table 4.3.5 On how can they relate themselves in English language competency

S/No	Competency	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Highly competent	7	2.1%	18	9%
2.	Competent	20	6%	23	11.5%
3.	Average	3	0.9%	8	4%
4.	Incompetent	-	-	1	0.5%

The information above tells us that in UDUMSS; highly competent 7(2.1%), competent 20(6%) and average 3(0.9%). In GDSS highly competent 18(9%), competent 23 (11.5%), average 8(4%), incompetent 1(0.5%).

GDSS had 9% respondents to highly competent, UDUMSS had 2.1% respondents. While GDSS had 11.5% to competent UDUMSS had 6% and also 4% responded to average in GDSS and only 0.9% responded to average in UDUMSS.

The above result may not be devoid of the fact that most of the respondents simply don't know the meaning of highly competent and incompetent which made them to respond to both very well at the expense of average and incompetent

Table 4.3.6   On do they often learn English language from other subjects taught by other teachers

S/No	Responses	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Very often	22	6.6%	29	14.5%
2.	Often	8	2.4%	17	8.5%
3.	Rarely	-	-	4	2%
4.	Seldom	-	-	-	-

Table 4.3.6 above tells us that in UDUMSS very often 22(6.6%), often 8(2.4%) and no response on rarely and seldom. while in GDSS; very often 29(14.5%), often 17(8.5%) and rarely 4(2%) no response on seldom.

The information above indicates that respondents realized that English language is the major language of instruction in schools, unless four (4) GDSS respondent that choose rarely, this may be because some subjects like Arabic and French does not use English language as the language of communication in class, because 14.5% of GDSS responded to very often while 6.6% responded in UDUMSS; meaning that GDSS students learn English language easily from other subject.

27

Table 4.3.7   On how conducive is there classroom environment for learning English Language

S/NO	Responses	Frequency		Q	
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Highly conducive	21	6.3%	28	14%
2.	Conducive	7	2.1%	22	11%
3.	Partially conducive	2	0.6%	-	-
4.	Unconducive	-	-	-	-

Table 4.3.7 shows us that in UDUMSS highly conducive 21(6.3), conducive 7(2.1%) and partially conducive 2(0.6%). In GDSS; highly conducive 28(4%), conducive 22(11%).

The information above shows that both the students from UDUMSS and GDSS enjoy their school environments and see it as very conducive for learning. Although 14% GDSS students saw their school as highly conducive, while 6.3% UDUMSS students saw their school as highly conducive. In conducive, 11% GDSS while 2.1% UDUMSS and only 0.6% UDUMSS for partially conducive

Table 4.3.8   On how do they observe the level of the teachers commitment to teaching

S/No	Level	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Very high	12	3.6%	27	13.5%
2.	High	18	5.4%	23	11.5%
3.	Low	-	-	-	-
4.	Very low	-	-	-	-

The table above indicates that, in UDUMSS; very high by 3.6%, 5.4%, responded to high 12(3.6%), While in GDSS; very high 22(13.5%), high 23(11.5%).

The above shows the commitment of GDSS teachers to the teaching and learning of English language unlike the UDUMSS students with 3.6% very high and 5.4% high to GDSS with 13.5% very high and 11.5% high.

Table 4.3.9   On how effective is the school leadership contribution to their English Language performance

S/No	Effectiveness	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Highly effective	9	2.7%	14	7%
2.	Effective	10	3%	30	15%
3.	Partially effective	10	3%	2	1%
4.	Ineffective	1	0.3%	4	2%

The information above indicates that in UDUMSS highly effective 9(2.7%), effective 10(3%), partially effective 10(0.3%) and ineffective 1(0.3%) In GDSS highly effective 14(7%), effective 30(15%), partially effective and ineffective 4(2%). Its indicates that the students of GDSS have the contribution of their school leadership to their English language performance more than the students of UDUMSS with 2.7% highly effective, 3% effective, 3% partially effective and 0.3% in effective to GDSS with 7% highly effective, 15% effective, 1% partially effective and 2%$ ineffective.

Table 4.3.10 On how relevant do they see their parents commitment to the development of their English language.

S/NO	Relevancy	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Highly relevant	25	2.5%	47	4.7%
2.	Relevant	5	0.5%	3	0.3%
3.	Partially relevant	-	-	-	-
4.	Irrelevant	-	-	-	-

The above table 4.3.10 shows that in UDUMSS highly relevant 25(2.5%), relevant 5(0.5%), while in GDSS highly relevant 47(4.7%) and 3(0.3%).

This indicates that respondents from UDUMSS and GDSS realized the importance of their parents commitment towards the development of their performance on English language because 4.7% GDSS for highly relevant but 2.5% in UDUMSS, while 0.5% UDUMSS responded to relevant and 0.3% GDSS.

Below are the responses to the options collected from the teacher's questionnaires:

Table 4.3.11   On which of the following method of assessment do students respond to often

S/No	Method	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Writing	8	0.8%	6	0.6%
2.	Oral	2	0.2%	4	0.4%
3.	Vocabulary development	-	-	-	-

The table above informs us that in UDUMSS writing 8(0.8%), Oral 2(0.2%), While in GDSS Writing 6(0.6%), Oral 4(0.4%) but both school teachers does not respond to vocabulary development. UDUMSS teachers see the necessity of using both oral and writing to assess their students than that of the GDSS teachers but teachers from both schools does not see the importance of vocabulary development. While UDUMSS had 0.8% in writing, GDSS had 0.6%. In oral UDUMSS 0.2%, GDSS 0.4%.

Table 4.3.12   On how often do they use the following method to access students performance in English language

Method	Alternatives responses								School
	Very often	%	Often	%	Rarely	%	Seldom	%	
Test	6	0.6%	4	0.4%	-	-	-		UDUMSS
Class work	4	0.4%	5	0.5%	1	0.1%	-		
Home work	7	0.7%	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	-		
Test	3	0.3%	4	0.4%	3	0.3%	-		GDSS
Class work	7	0.7%	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	-		
Home work	3	0.2%	2	0.2%	6	0.6%	-		

The information above tells us that in UDUMSS Test: very often 6(0.6%), often 4(0.4%),class work: very often 4(0.4%),often 5(0.5%),rarely 1(0.1%).homework: very often 7(0.7%),often 2(0.2%),rarely 1(0.1%).

In GDSS Test: very often 3(0.3%), often 4(0.4%),rarely 3(0.3%).class work: very often 7(0.7%),often 2(0.2%),rarely 1(0.1%). For homework: very often 3(0.3%), often 2(0.2%) and rarely 6(0.6%).

This indicates that UDUMSS teachers see the need for test, class work and homework as highly important to the assessment of students' performance in English language but very few saw it as not often needed. GDSS teachers see test, class work and home work as rarely important and that is why they hardly assess students with them. Which means that, UDUMSS teachers use test, class work and home work more often than GDSS teachers.

Table 4.3.13 On how often do they use the following instructional materials in teaching English language

Instructional materials	Alternatives responses								School
	Very often	%	Often	%	Rarely	%	Seldom	%	
English text	7	0.7%	3	0.3%	-	-	-		UDUMSS
Library	2	0.2%	4	0.4%	4	0.4%	-		
English laboratory	-	-	1	0.1%	4	0.4%	5	0.5%	
English text	-		-		3	0.3%	7	0.7%	GDSS
Library	-		1	0.1%	3	0.3%	6	0.6%	
English laboratory	-		-		3	0.3%	7	0.7%	

In the above table respondents from UDUMSS responded as follows English text: very often 7(0.7%), often 3(0.3%). Library; very often 2(0.2%), often 4(0.4%) and rarely 4(0.4%). English laboratory; rarely 1(0.1%), seldom 5(0.5%). In GDSS, English text: rarely 3(0.3%), seldom 7(0.7%), while library: often,1(0.1%), rarely 6(0.6%), seldom 7(0.7%). In terms of English laboratory 3(0.3%) rarely, seldom 7(0.7%). The information available on table 4.1.13 above indicates that UDUMSS teachers often use English text and library at their instructional materials but not so in the case of GDSS because rarely and seldom was the ones responded to by the GDSS teachers.

Table 4.3.14 On how effective are the following instructional materials to the teaching of English language.

Instructional materials	Alternatives responses								School
	Very effective	%	Effective	%	In effective	%	Practically effective	%	
English text	6	0.6%	4	0.4%	-	0.2%	-		UDUMSS
Library	3	0.3%	5	0.5%	2	0.5%	-		
English laboratory	-	-	-	-	5		5	0.5 %	
English text	4		5	0.5%	1	0.1%	-		GDSS
Library	-	0.4%	3	0.3%	5	0.5%	2	0.2 %	
English laboratory	-	-	2	0.2%	5	0.5%	3	0.3 %	

Table 4.3.14 simply shows that respondents from UDUMSS responded thus; English text: very effective 6(0.6%), effective 4(0.4%), library: very effective 3(0.3%), effective 5(0.5%) and ineffective 2(0.2%) for English laboratory: ineffective 5(0.5%) and partially effective 5(0.5%). In GDSS, English text: highly effective 4(0.4%), effective 5(0.5%), ineffective 1(0.1%), library effective 3(0.3%), ineffective 5(0.5%) and partially effective 2(0.2%). English laboratory: effective 2(0.2%) to ineffective 5(0.5%) and partially effective 3(0.3%).

The information above curtails to us that English text and library are seen as most effective instructional materials by the UDUMSS teachers and GDSS teachers. While English laboratory is seen as less effective which is not even available in the two schools.

Table 4.3.15 On how can they rate the level of student improvement in English competency.

S/No	Level	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Very high	1	0.1%	-	
2.	High	6	0.6%	3	0.3%
3.	Low	3	0.3%	7	0.7%
4.	Very low	-	-	-	-

The table above tells us that in UDUMSS, very high 1(0.1%), high 6(0.6%) and low 3(0.3%). while in GDSS, high 3(0.3%) and low 7(0.7%). In UDUMSS 0.1% very high but nill in GDSS also 0.6% high in UDUMSS but 0.3% in GDSS, while 0.3% in UDUMSS, 0.7% in GDSS

The above indicates that in UDUMSS students are improving but in GDSS the students'

level of improvement is low.

Table 4.3.16: On how do they see the ideal of teaching language across the curriculum as relevant to the development of student English language performance

S/NO	Relevancy	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Relevant	9	0.9%	7	0.7%
2.	Readily	1	0.1%	-	-
3.	Reluctantly	-	-	2	0.2%
4.	Indifferently	-	-	1	0.1%

The table above indicates that in UDUMSS: relevant 9(0.9%), readily 1(0.1%),

reluctantly and indifferently were not responded to. While in GDSS relevant 7(0.7%),

reluctantly 2(0.2%), and indifferently 1(0.1%).

The interpretation of the data presented above show the level of the relevant of

teaching language across the curriculum to the development of students English

language performance and that is why among ten (10) teachers selected form the two

(2) schools, 0.9% responded to relevant in UDUMSS and 0.7% in GDSS

Table 4.3.17: On how conducive is the classroom environment for teaching English language performance.

S/No	Conduciveness	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Highly conducive	3	0.3%	-	-
2.	Conducive	4	0.4%	5	0.5%
3.	Unconducive	3	0.3%	5	0.5%
4.	Partially conducive	-	-	-	-

The information presented in the table above shows us that in UDUMSS highly conducive 3(0.3%), conducive 4(0.4%), unconducive 3(0.3%). In GDSS conducive 5(0.5%) and unconducive 5(0.5%) while 0.3% highly conducive in UDUMSS, nill in GDSS and 0.4% conducive in UDUMSS, 0.5% in GDSS

The interpretation depicted from the presentation on table 4.1 above shows us that, there is need for a conducive learning environment for the students most especially in GDSS.

Table 4.3.18: On how do they observe their level of commitment to teaching in the school

S/No	Level	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Readily	3	0.3%	3	0.3%
2.	Manageable	2	0.2%	4	0.4%
3.	Highly committed	5	0.5%	3	0.3%
4.	Not committed	-	-	-	-

The information above indicates that UDUMSS respondents responded thus: readily 3(0.3%), manageable 2(0.2%) and highly committed 5(0.5%). In GDSS response, readily 3(0.3%) manageable 4(0.4%), highly committed 3(0.3%).

There exist a crystal clear wide rift between highly committed and not committed because no teacher choose not committed since they know the importance of teachers commitment to teaching of English language. So therefore, both schools teachers take their jobs very important.

Table 4.3.19: On how effective is their school leadership to the development of students English language performance

S/Mp	Effectiveness	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Very effective	5	0.5%	2	0.2%
2.	Effective	4	0.4%	7	0.7%
3.	Partially effective	-	-	1	0.1%
4.	Ineffective	1	0.1%	-	-

The information given above indicates in UDUMSS very effectives 5(0.5%), effective 4(0.4%), ineffective 1(0.1%). While in GDSS, very effective 2(0.2%), effective 7(0.7%), partially effective 1(0.1%).

The above indicates that very high number of teacher saw the effectiveness of their school leadership to the development of students most especially UDUMSS with 0.5. because leaders in their school play a serious role to both the success or failure or the school goals and objectives.

Table 4.3.20: On how relevant do they see parent commitment to the development of students English language performance

S/No	Relevancy	Frequency			
		UDUMSS	%	GDSS	%
1.	Highly relevant	3	0.3%	4	0.4%
2.	Relevant	4	0.4%	1	0.1%
3.	Partially relevant	3	0.3%	4	0.4%
4.	Irrelevant	-	-	1	0.1%

Table 4.3.20 above presents responses to questions asked above. In UDUMSS highly relevant 3(0.3%), relevant 4(0.4%), partially relevant 3(0.3%). In GDSS 4(0.4%), highly relevant 4(0.4%), relevant 1(0.1%), partially relevant 4(0.4%), irrelevant 1(0.1%). By implication what the above finding presents before us is that, the

parents commitment are been observed in their students, that is the reason why in both schools highly relevant and relevant are higher than partially relevant.

Conclusively, with the data presentation and analysis presented above, it is clear to us that both schools despite that they are both public secondary schools are not the same, because the mechanism used which is the questionnaire shows their differences, thus; their level of academic performance in English language cannot be the same most especially in their external examinations; i.e. WAEC, NECO etc

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1   Introduction

This research focus on the comparism between Usmanu Danfodiyo University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School students performance in English Language with a view to finding out reasons for the differences in students performance in English Language .This chapter therefore presents a comprehensive summary of the entire work including Discussion of the findings, Recommendations and conclusion drawn from the research findings as they relate to problems and objectives.

5.2 Discussion of the Findings

The purpose of this research was to study the comparism between University Model Secondary School and Government Day Secondary School Runjin Sambo English Language performance. Findings have been conducted and this is what we come up with:-

RQ1: Is there differences between student performance in English language in GDSS and UDUMSS?

Both schools are public secondary school with,though UDUMSS is a type of secondary school known as a public school with a class preference according to sociologist of

Education(Inuwa, 2014). Its is under the supervision of the university. From the research conducted it was discovered that teachers and students of both schools placed high interest in learning using writing, while students GDSS prefer classwork to test and homework, with the question raised the students' choose higher percentage in classwork which means most them do not value test. GDSS placed so much importance English textbook neglecting other important materials used for teaching and learning of English, In UDUMSS English text and Library are both utilized by the students and teachers. Both schools do not have an English laboratory which is also paramount to the teaching and learning of English language. While their teachers prefer to use writing and oral for their assessment ignoring vocabulary development. Teachers in GDSS use more of classwork as their means of assessment more than home work and test. Teachers UDUMSS use more of home work than class work and test. This is according obanya (2000) who says " there would be a perfect match between what is prescribed, what is practiced and consequently what is achieved(outcome) one would expect English language as a learners' second language(ESL).

RQ2: Is there any differences between teachers competency in UDUMSS and GDSS?

On how they can relate themselves in English language competency students opted for competent and a few opted for average. Student in UDUMSS choose a higher percentage in competent a few opted for average, while in GDSS more than half of the population choose competent rating themselves experts in English usage. Most terchers in UDUMSS rated their students competency as high while a few other rated their

students as low in English competency and a few other rated them as high. This simply means that the teachers in UDUMSS have confident in the knowledge they have impacted on their students, while those in GDSS rated their students' competency as low, English language can only be perfected when practiced on a regular basis, while this is a school where English language is not the only medium of communication. Obanya (2002) says the interaction which should be in form of multi way and multimedia exchanges (verbal and non verbal) in the conduct of classroom teaching and learning activities is significantly absent. He concludes that what happens in the classroom English language learning process according to research and anecdotal evidence is frontal teaching characterized by:

a. A heavy reliance on the textbook as the exclusive reaching reaching learning materials.

b. Reading aloud by the teacher. Followed by recitation and imitation reading, round the class by pupils (learners)

c. Very little respect accorded to the privacy of oracy in language teaching and learning.

d. An undue rush to finish the textbook, a sign of also "converting the syllabus" and

e. Devotion of a considerable amount of time to practicing exam type skill.

RQ3. Is there any differences between factors that influence students performance in UDUMSS and GDSS?

The most vital factors that influence students' performance are parents, teachers, environment, and commitment and from the questions raised in the questionnaires submitted to the school it was observed the students choose very high and high in both schools as the level of their teachers' commitment, which means the teachers are fully committed to their work. In the respects to commitments, its indicates that the students of GDSS have the contribution of their school leadership to their English language performance more than students of UDUMSS, because GDSS rated their leadership level as high in terms of commitment. In terms of parents' commitment the students realized the importance of their parent's commitment towards the development of their performance in English language almost the entire student choose the level of their parents commitment as highly relevant. There exist a crystal difference between highly committed and not committed because no teacher in either school choose not committed because they know the importance of teachers' commitment to the teaching of English language. Bamisaye (2004) observes that the problem of a systematic and smooth transition from the home to school is always lacking in the Nigerian situation. When student embark on the study of an L2 there are not merely vassals that will need to be filled by the wise words of the teachers instead they carry a considerable personal baggage to the language course that will have a significant bearing on how learning proceed.

RQ4: Is there any difference between the impact of school environment on UDUMSS students and GDSS students.

The teachers in UDUMSS and GDSS rated their classroom environment as highly conducive and conducive, this shows that environment is considered in teaching and learning. Students from UDSSMSS and GDSS enjoy their school environment and see it as very conducive for learning, they both saw their school as highly conducive and conducive. Verghese (2007) concludes thus the total of learning a second language involves far more than simple learning the forms of the language it also involve knowledge of the culture of those who speak the language.

5.2.1   Summary of Findings

From the foregoing discussion of data analyzed and in consideration of the reason for the study, the following findings, as summarized below are inherent;

1. Teachers are never a problem to students performance this is disputed by this study given the over reliance of teachers on test, class work and home work
2. That teaching aids are very essential for both teaching and learning
3. It is equally found by this study that other subjects teachers neglect the use of English while teaching their subjects.
4. That students learn English language from other subject taught by other teachers

5.2.2 Implication of the Study to Education and English Teachers

The findings of this study seem to have exposed some implications for language education generally and language teaching particularly for both UDUMSS and GDSS. These implications include.

1. It will help the teachers to know that competency in English language is a step to the understanding of other subject area.

2. The study also implied that teaching aids and others class enrichment materials, such as laboratory, library, English test etc should be made available to secondary schools and used to the fullest. However, teachers should be careful in the selection and utilization of teaching aids.

3. Another implication is that teachers in secondary schools should allow students to engage in activity that will make them contribute immensely to their own learning thus, teachers should constantly be aware of the learners needs and give much attention to such needs this way, the students will make use of English language functionally and for academic purposes.

4. This study equally implies that the teaching of English as the language of instruction in secondary schools be made more purposeful and effective.

5.3 Recommendations

In the light of the findings of this study and the implication for education and teaching given above the following suggestions are imperative

1. Teachers from UDUMSS and GDSS should motivate secondary school students to realize that the language of instruction i.e. English is instrumental to their ultimate performance. This will help the students pay better attention to the teaching of English language

2. If teaching aids and educational technology are applied to teaching and learning in secondary schools, great improvement would be witness both in English and in other subjects in the SSS curriculum that make use of the language. Especially provision of library and English laboratory.

3. When students have opportunities to practice what they learn in English and other subjects, they could do better in their daily academic tasks.

4. Parents, ministries of education and government should assist education generally and the language teachers. In particular for necessary upgrading. These set of people should develop more meaningful and andragogy (i.e. teaching strategies) for language treating as well as encouraging the teachers to vary their methods of and approaches to teaching in secondary schools.

5. Government should try as much as possible to make school environment conducive for teaching and learning as much as they can.

5.3.1 Suggestions for Further Study

1) A study of factors responsible for the poor performance of student in English Language and the Possible solutions

2) Research on English teachers competency

3) Guidelines on addressing poor performance in English Language

5.4 Conclusion

Based on the data analyzed leading to subsequent findings of the study the following conclusion were arrived at they were reached with adequate consideration of the statement of problems and the objectives set at the beginning of the chapter.

1. Teachers and students realize the interrelationship between English language and other subjects taught by other teacher.

2. Teacher often over depend on written or pointed text at all times during lessons, and thus could be impediments to students communicative competence skills

3. Teaching aids if available are not sufficiently adequate or they are not appropriately and judiciously used in teaching.

4. That other subject teacher should not neglect English language when teaching so as to improve student competency

REFERENCES

Adebayo, A.J. (2003). *Language national integration and the Nigerians*

Adegbite,W. (2004). *Bilingualism* – biculturalism and the utilization of African.

Akande (2008). "Investigating Dialected Variation in the English of Nigerian University Graduate: Methodology and Pilot." Studia Anglica Posnaniensia 44, 431-456. (Adam Miciewicz University, Pozanan)

Aliyu,J.S. (2001). "Moss failure in WAEC conducted senior secondary English Examination in Nigeria; Grammar as Roadblocks to candidates' success. In Nigerian Educational Forun" *A journal of the institute of Education,* Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. Vol. 5 (8) p.25-27.

Best, John, W. and Kahn J.V. (2007). Research in Education, New Delhi Prentice Hall of India Private.

Cohen and Donyai, (2002). Young Learners' Language Strategy use Survey Oxford, R.L.

Cohen and Donyai, (2007). Language Learner Strategies: 30 Years of Research and Practice. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J.N. (2012). *Educational research planning conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research upper Saddlerive,* N.J prentice hall.

Equare. S.O. (2006*).* Establishing the policy of English language across the curriculum: aspects of teachers distrust of theory *Sokoto educational review 8 April,2006.96-105.*

ESL, (2007).*Curriculum in secondary schools in Nigeria*: Issues and challenges towards communicative competence. Sunday Adejimola Amusegan

Federal Government of Nigeria.(2004).*The national policy one Education*: Lagos NERDS

Government Day Secondary school Runji Sambo Sokoto.2015.WAEC Information.

Grace, O. Imoh.(2013). *Bilingual Communication in a Multi Lingual Society:* Problems of English Language Learning and use in Nigeria.

Kulbir, S. (2005). Methodology of Research in Education.

Mahuta, M.G. (2007). An Introduction to Sociological Foundations of Education Sokoto Education Services Biga.

Muhammed, M. (2002). Causes of poor performance in English language at WASSCE/NECO in selected secondary schools in Sokoto. Unpublished BA (Ed) projects, Bayero University Kano.

Neeru, S. (2012). Meaning of the term descriptive survey.

Obanya, P. (2002). Revitalizing Education in Africa. Ibadan: Stirling Horden.

Odebunmi, A. (2003). Semantic Calculus and the Language of Poetry Science Focus. Ogbomosho: Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences.

Odebunmi, A. (2006). Expression of Meaning in Some English Registers. Ife Studies in English Language 6: 20-30.

Ogundare, M.A. (2004). The role of language teaching in national development, language, literature and education for a better society 60-63.

Olajide, S.B. (2009). Strategies for effective instruction in large BSL classes

Olaoye, A.A. (2004). Modern Approach to classroom learning anandragogical exploration. An unpublished education tax fund workshop paper, July Argungu Kebbi state, college of education.

Sanusi, L.S. (2007). Unpublished M.ed dissertation, UDUS, Sokoto.

Yemi, O. (2012) The challenges and prospects of hybriding aspects of L1 and L2 in the teaching of language and literature in Nigeria:.

Shaibu, S.D. (2013). Language policy: Nigeria and the rule of English Language in the 21st century.

Usmanu Danfodiyo University Model Secondary School.2015 Waec information 2012-2014.

Varghese, (2007). A Study of the Language Learner Strategies Adopted by Nigerians.

West Africa Examination Council, (2012-2014).

USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY, SOKOTO
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND EXTENSION SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INFORMATION

This questionnaire is confidential and it's mainly for the purpose of research, it is not meant for promotion. It is strictly for academic use.

SECTION A: respond personal information please tick (   ) as appropriate

i.   Name of school:
        UDUMSS (   )GDSSR (   )
ii.   Subject taught English
        Physics   (   ) Economics (   ) Mathematics (   ) other (   )

SECTION B:

iii.   Year of teaching of experience:
        1-5   (   )   6-10   (   )   10-15 (   )
        15-20 (   )   20-25 (   )
iv.   Level OF qualification:
        NCE   (   )   ND   (   )
        HND   (   )   BA/Bsc   (   )
        Msc/MA   (   )
Q1.   Which of the following method of assessment do students respond to often?
        Writing   (   )
        Oral   (   )
        Vocabulary development (   )

Q2.   How often do you use the following method to access students' performance in English language?

	Very often	Often	Rarely	Seldom
Test				
Class work				
Home work				

Q3. How often do you use the following instructional materials in teaching English language?

	Very often	Often	Rarely	Seldom
English text				
Library				
English laboratory				

Q4. How effective are the following instructional material to the teaching of English language?

	Very effective	Effective	Ineffective	Not Used
English text				
Library				
English laboratory				

Q5. How can you rate the level of student improvement in English competency?

　　　Very high (   ) High ( ) Low (   ) Very low (   )

Q6. How do you see the idea of teaching language across the curriculum as relevant to the development of student English language performance?

　　　Relevant (   ) Readily (   ) Reluctantly (   ) Indifferently (   )

Q7.   How conducive is the classroom environment for teaching English language performance?

Highly Conducive (   ) Conducive (   ) Unconducive (   ) Partially conducive (   )

Q8. How do you observe teachers level of commitment to teaching in the school.

　　　Readily (   ) Manageable (   ) Highly committed (   ) Not committed (   )

Q9. How effective is the school leadership to development of students English language performance.

Very effective (   ) Effective (   ) Partially effective (   ) Ineffective (   )

Q10. How relevant do you see parent commitment to the development of students English language performance?

Highly Relevant (   ) Relevant (   ) Partially relevant (   ) Irrelevant (   )

USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY, SOKOTO
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND EXTENSION SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION
STUDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE ON PERFORMANCE

General information:

i.   Name of school:

UDUMSS (   ) GDSS (   )

ii.   Gender:

Male (   ) Female (   )

iii.   Type of school:

Public (   ) Private (   )

Ql. Which of the following do you prefer to learn often?

Writing (   ) Oral (   ) Vocabulary development (   )

Q2. How often do you prefer the following methods used for your assessment?

	Very often	Often	Rarely	Seldom
Test				
Class work				
Home work				

Q3. Which of the following material do you often use for teaching?

English text (   ) Library (   ) English laboratory

Q4. How effective are the following instructional material to the teaching of English language?

	Very effective	Effective	Ineffective	Partially effective
English text				
Library				
English laboratory				

Q5. How can you rate yourself in English language competency?

Highly competent ( ) Competent ( ) Average ( ) Incompetent ( )

Q6. Do you often learn English language from other subjects taught by the teachers?

Very often ( ) Often ( ) Rarely ( ) Seldom ( )

Q7. How conducive is your classroom environment for learning English language?

Highly conducive ( ) Conducive ( ) Partially conducive ( ) Unconducive

Q8. How do you observe the level of your teachers' commitment to teaching in the school?

High ( ) Very high ( ) Low ( ) Very low ( )

Q9. How effective is the school leadership contribution to your English language performance?

Highly effective ( ) Effective ( ) Partially effective ( ) Ineffective ( )

Q10. How relevant do you see your parent commitment to the development of your English language?

Highly relevant ( ) Relevant ( ) Partially relevant ( ) Irrelevant ( )