UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICES OF

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS OF THE CAPE COAST

METROPOLIS

CATHERINE ESSIAM

2011

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICES OF PRIVATE

AND PUBLIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS OF THE CAPE COAST

METROPOLIS

BY

CATHERINE ESSIAM

Thesis submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration of

the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the award of Master of Philosophy Degree in Educational

Administration

JANUARY 2011

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the results of my own original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature: …………………………   Date: ……………

Name: Catherine Essiam

Supervisors' Declaration

We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Principal Supervisor's Signature: ………………………… Date: …………..

Name: Dr. Yaw A. Ankomah

Co-supervisor's Signature: ……………………………… Date: …………...

Name: Mr. Stephen K. Atakpa

ABSTRACT

The development of every nation is contingent on the quality of educational system in place. The study was conducted to find out the supervisory practices of public JHS and private JHS of Cape Coast Metropolis. The sample of the study consisted of 606 respondents. Simple random and stratified sampling procedures were used to select the respondents. Four research questions were formulated to guide the study. Documentary evidence, interview guide and questionnaire were the research instruments used. The internal reliability co-efficient of the teachers' questionnaire and the students' questionnaire were .909 and .924 respectively. The independent sample t-test as well as frequencies and percentages were used to analyse the data.. The study established that both internal supervision and external supervision were emphasized in public JHS and private JHS. Moreover, the study revealed that headteachers, assistant headteachers, teachers on duty, class teachers, and student prefects were all involved in supervision. The recommendations included the following: The need to restructure supervision by incorporating elements of supervision and the need not to overload supervisors with work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In writing this thesis, I have drawn a lot of inspirations from my lecturers at the University of Cape Coast, particularly the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration. They have actually equipped me with both academic knowledge and professional skills that enabled me to accomplish this task. To them, I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation.

A thesis of this type naturally owes much to people who have made the thesis a success. First among them is Dr. Yaw A. Ankomah, a senior lecturer, Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, University of Cape Coast whose guidance and patience encouraged me to complete the study. I also thank Mr. Stephen Atakpa, my co-supervisor sincerely for his support and encouragement throughout the course of the research. His efforts will forever be remembered. I will not also forget Mr. Benjamin Yaw Tachie and Mr. Mumuni Thompson who have made important contributions to improve this work.

I am greatly indebted to all of you, my family members for your moral support. I thank you and love you all.

Finally, I am grateful to Ms. Naomi Davis, who spent her precious time in typing the script.

DEDICATION

To my husband Joseph Asamoah Anyimadu, and children Genevieve, Kelvin and Emmanuel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

For any nation to develop, the provision of relevant and quality education is indispensable. This explains the present high level of interest and concern about the standard of education by all stakeholders. The general consensus seems to be that the standards in education have fallen drastically.

A number of contributory factors are cited for the poor standards of education. Some of these factors are as follows:

1. Lack of effective supervision.

2. Indiscipline among students and teachers

3. Inadequate textbooks and other logistics.

4. Poor performance of teachers.

Several attempts have been made in trying to reverse the downward trends of the standards of education. The government of Ghana through the Ministry of Education engaged experts to undertake analytical work in education and some serious problems were identified. The results were the evaluation of the strategic plan for Basic Education Sector Improvement Programme (BESIP). Some interventions were put in place immediately. For example, there was the Primary School Development Project (PSDP) and the Primary Education Project (PREP)

which focused among other things, on the printing and distribution of a number of textbooks for Basic Schools throughout the country. Pavilions were constructed for schools and teachers' bungalows were also built in some rural areas to boost the morale of teachers and consequently improve pupils' performance.

The expectation was that the cumulative effects of these interventions would lead to an appreciable improvement in learning outcomes at the basic education level. However, the evaluation of the educational inputs on teaching and learning outcomes through Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) of 1987 conducted on primary six pupils in 5% of primary schools in Ghana showed that only 6% of the pupils attained mastery level in English. The situation was worse in Mathematics in which only 2.7% of pupils attained mastery.

Research conducted by the International Institute of Education Planning (IIEP) in 1989 stated among other things that "improving quality education is not simply a matter of injecting more resources into the education system but the management of these resources efficiently at the school level…" (p.16).

The Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education (fCUBE) document was evolved which contained essentially the key issues addressed by the Basic Education Sector Improvement Programme (BESIP). The fCUBE is a comprehensive programme designed to provide good quality education for all children of school going age in Ghana at Basic Education level. The programme focuses on three major areas;

1. Improving quality of teaching and learning;
2. Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of management performances

3.   Increasing access and participation.

The Ministry of Education (MOE) started running a number of courses and workshops for Headteachers, teachers, circuit supervisors, district directors and assistant directors in charge of supervision and also School Management Committees (SMC) and Parent Teacher Associations (PTA). This was done with the aim of improving academic standards of pupils and to manage all the schools well in order to achieve the desired objectives.

In spite of all the interventions, academic standards have not been improved significantly. Some stakeholders contend that things are hardly changing because the teachers' problems have not been adequately addressed. Poor performance of teachers is often attributed to a number of reasons among which are the following:

1.   Lack of academic qualification: This reflects in lack of mastery of subject matter and poor pedagogical skills needed to impart knowledge.

2.   Indiscipline on the part of the teacher. This results in laziness, absenteeism, alcoholism.

3.   Poor conditions of service for the teacher. There is therefore lack of motivation leading to low morale.

A good number of people (including the author of this work) hold the view that the missing link in all the attempts at raising the falling standards of education is vigorous and effective supervision. Effective supervision is one mechanism which can ensure that after all the inputs have been provided and interventions have been made, the two main key players in the educational

enterprise-teachers and students, would be made to do what is expected in order to achieve the desired results. Effective supervision would ensure that curriculum implementation by the teacher is kept on course and that students are kept engaged enough to be able to reap maximum benefits of whatever goes on.

Unfortunately, supervision in Ghanaian schools has not received the vigorous attention required even though admittedly some progress has been made. Supervision should not be seen merely as classroom visits, individual teacher conferences, rating of teachers and writing of reports. According to Knezevich (1983), "supervision as an administrative activity is a controlling and coordinating device. It is not an end in itself hence; it may be viewed as a strategy to stimulate others toward greater effectiveness and productivity" (p.35).

Elsbree and Harold (1967) argue that "supervision has grown to include the curriculum, materials for instruction, the school community and other administrative functions" (p.11). They contend that these administrative functions include: curriculum organization, policies on pupils' progress, method of pupil assessment and reporting to parents, allocation of funds for materials and equipment and morale of staff. All these administrative functions affect the teaching/learning process and cannot be omitted from supervision. Supervision therefore becomes an integral part of administration. Any leadership function concerned with improvement of instruction in the school is considered supervisory.

Supervision is needed to launch and coordinate efforts to ensure maximum achievement. Supervision of instruction may enhance the quality of learning by

working with and through classroom teachers. The purpose of supervision is to improve personnel. Subordinates deserve specific information (or instruction) on what is expected and recommendations as to preferred modes of operation. Supervision is based upon mutual understanding and agreement between the supervisor and the person being supervised.

One aspect of supervision commonly spoken about is control. In its broadest sense it is a means of assuming that the organization is not straying too far off course from previously agreed upon goals. Control of organizational direction and outcomes should not be confused with negative control on individual behaviour. Control requires an understanding of what is to be accomplished and the quality level desired. It is achieved by means of observation and reporting. Appraisal which is another aspect of supervision may trigger in-service development of personnel, allocation of special resources to those being supervised and similar activities. Appraisal should not be seen as first step to personnel reprimand or even dismissal.

Instructional supervision has come a long way since the early days of inspection and compliance demands. It has become a specialized body of knowledge within education in general as well as educational administration.

Eye, and Netzer (1972) and Kimbel (1967) identify the following as factors of instructional supervision:

1.   As a planned programme for the improvement of instruction.

2. All efforts of a designated school and official toward providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction.

3. A programme of in-service education and corporate group development.

4. The efforts to stimulate, co-ordinate and guide continued growth of teachers in school both individually and collectively.

5. A means of maintaining existing programme of instruction as well as improving them.

6. Assistance in the development of a better teaching-learning situation.

All the above imply that supervision sees the diagnosing of ineffective instruction as only the beginning of its task. The most important phase involves generating the strategies and programmes to help the individual teachers to become effective instructors. Supervision can assist in collecting performance data and interpreting the significance of such information. Supervision hence does more than help maintain the status quo at efficient levels. It also keeps abreast with new development to be able to manage the introduction of instructional changes.

Supervision in the Gold Coast began around 1900. Inspectors were appointed whose reports led to the enforcement of payment by results. Teacher's salaries depended on satisfactory work done as recorded in reports by inspectors. The inspector was a terror!

Actual school visits are said to have started around 1940. This was the time mission schools appointed visiting teachers to assist large number of

untrained teachers in their schools especially in the rural areas. They were to visit schools, help in provision of timetables and teach the teachers how to prepare lesson notes. They also gave demonstration lessons. The Accelerated Development Plan of 1951 saw the appointment of Assistant Education Officers. They assisted in the training of untrained teachers in the course of their supervision.

By 1963, Principal Teachers were appointed as Supervisors. Their main duty was to improve teachers standards of teaching and through that raise standards of the pupils in the schools assigned to them. By 1974, the Ghana Teaching Service (now Ghana Education Service) had two types of supervisors – The Assistant Education Officer and Principal Teacher. They were both visiting offices with responsibilities of raising standard of teachers. Even, the GES basic aim of supervision did not change from giving professional guidance and advice to the teachers in order to raise standard of teaching and through that raise academic standards.

With the 1987 Educational Reforms, Circuit Monitoring assistants called District Monitoring Assistants were appointed. Their task was to provide feedback to the MOE on the instructional process, availability of teaching materials, textbooks and equipment. Their tasks included the following;

1. Regularity and punctuality among teachers and pupils.

2. Regular preparation of lessons notes, paying particular attention to the statement of instructional objectives and how to evaluate lessons.

3. Number of visit of a particular school by the district officers.

4. Number of times teachers attended in-service training course organized by MOE.

Of late, community and other stakeholders in education are called upon by MOE to exert some influence by way of supervision in the school in their localities. Even though they may not be professionally competent enough to supervise, they could still check certain unprofessional conducts like lateness, absenteeism and drunkenness among teachers. Hence, supervision of teaching and learning process has been part of the educational system. The aim has been the same – ensuring the achievement of school objectives particularly curriculum and instructional objectives.

All the foregoing constitutes external supervision since the supervisor came from outside the schools. But equally important is internal supervision which is undertaken by people who are part of the school system itself. This involves the headmaster and his assistants, supervising students. Even students' prefects are engaged in peer supervision. Internal supervision involves areas like: checking teachers/students class attendance, completion of scheme of work by teachers, effective use of instructional time, and also measurement and evaluation of work. It is thus observed that supervision has always been undertaken in the school system. What is of concern is the kind of supervision being undertaken at the public and private JHS level and this is the concern of the present research.

Statement of the Problem

There has been a near public outcry about the state of the public Junior High Schools as compared to the private Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis with respect to poor academic results and indiscipline among students. The summary of the analysis of 2007 BECE results for Cape Coast Metropolis revealed that out of the nine schools in which all students were able to obtain aggregates between 6 and 30, only one was a public school (Wesley Girls JHS).

The fortunes of public schools in Cape Coast Metropolis worsened in 2008 as no public JHS in the Cape Coast Metropolis was able to obtain aggregates between 6 and 30. Out of the 12 schools which obtained between aggregate 6 and 30, there was no public school representation. Many parents and other stakeholders have blamed this state of affairs on lack of commitment by administrators of the schools and also performance of teachers.

The questions many may ask are these: Who is responsible for ensuring that teachers do their work effectively and that students attend classes and do their assignments? Who ensures that the schools administration is focused on its duties in order to guarantee the achievement of set goals? These questions burden on supervision. Supervision is one important way of ascertaining how well assigned responsibilities are being discharged effectively. Supervision of classroom instruction is intended to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. Is it really the case then that supervision is lacking in the public schools in the Metropolis? If so how serious is the problem? We would want to believe generally that some form of supervision would be going on in the schools. What kind of supervision is

being undertaken in these schools? What are the impressions of teachers and students about the level of supervision in these schools? Who are involved in the supervision internally and externally? Do we have any serious appraisal of classroom performance of teachers? Much of the evidence to these questions is anecdotal hence the need to investigate the supervisory practices between public and private JHS in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

Purpose of the Study

This study was to find out the supervisory practices between public and private JHS at Cape Coast Metropolis. Specifically, the objectives of the study were to:

1. Examine the types of supervision carried out in the public and private Junior High Schools.

2. Determine whether those responsible for supervision in both the public and private JHS in the Cape Coast Metropolis are actually up to the task.

3. Find out the existing problems that hamper supervision in the schools.

4. Explore the views and suggestions as to how to enhance and promote supervision in the Basic Schools in the Metropolis.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used for the study:

1. What are the types of supervision carried out in the Public and Private Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

2. How are those responsible for supervision in both public and private JHS actually doing what is expected of them?

3.   What are the challenges confronting supervisors in conducting their work at the Private and Public junior high schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

4.   How can supervisory practices be enhanced in junior high schools in the Cape Coast metropolis.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in the fact that it would hopefully contribute to the research literature on the subject of supervision in Basic Schools. It will particularly contribute to the existing knowledge in school administration.

Again, since the study is a descriptive survey, it would provide a situation profile as far as supervision in the basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis is concerned. Also, policy makers who care to bring general improvements in schools will discover that supervision is a priority area.

The findings will also enable Headteachers, Circuit Supervisors, District Monitoring Assistants and other practitioners in the field of education to adopt the acceptable supervisory practices that will enhance effective teaching and learning in both public and private Junior High Schools in Ghana. The study will also help the Ghana Education Service and the Ministry of Education to be aware of the problems associated with supervision in both public and private Junior High Schools so as to help manage them.

Delimitation

The study examined the supervisory practices of public and private Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis of Ghana. The study was confined to

only headteachers, assistant headteachers, teachers, student prefects and circuit supervisors within the Cape Coast Metropolis.

The findings of the study are therefore limited to the Cape Coast Metropolis. It is however likely that places which have similar characteristics as the Cape Coast metropolis may adopt the findings in trying to solve their educational problems.

Limitations

Restrictive weakness in the data collection may affect the study: Issues raised in the questionnaire and the interview guide might not be well understood by the respondents and this might affect the quality of the study.

The study was supposed to have covered the whole of Cape Coast Metropolis in the Central Region of Ghana. It requires enough time and adequate resources to be able to cover the whole Metropolis. Since the researcher did not have enough time and resources, only a segment of the population which was easily accessible was studied. Covering the whole Metropolis might probably reveal other additional issues, which might have improved the quality of the study.

Organization of the Study

The study was grouped into five chapters. Chapter one gave the focus of the study. This included the background to the study, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitation and limitations. Chapter two dealt with the review of related literature. Documents both published and unpublished including books, journals, newspapers were reviewed.

Chapter three dealt with methodology. This involved the research design, description of the population, sample and sampling technique, instrumentation, the procedures for the administration of the instruments. It also included the analytical strategies used in treating the data collected. Chapter four focused on results and discussion. Chapter five dealt with summary, conclusions and recommendations.

CHPATER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of literature examines the theories and concepts of supervision and some related studies under the following headings: historical and Current Concepts of Supervision; types of Supervision; factors relating to effective Supervision; the role of the School Head in Supervision; qualifications and Duties of a Supervisor; practical issues in school supervision; the role of motivation in supervision; monitoring and evaluation; processes involved in supervision; and local work on supervision.

Historical and Current Concepts of Supervision

Supervision has evolved from a function emphasizing inspection, monitoring and enforcement to one emphasizing curriculum development training and formative evaluation. Thus supervision has been given many interpretations by various writers but it appears they all seem to agree to the view that it is a service provided, which aims primarily at improving all factors that go into ensuring growth and development in the teaching and learning process. According to Musaazi (1985) supervision is concerned with actions taken to ensure the achievement of instructional objectives. He therefore defines supervision as "all

actions taken to improve or ensure the achievement of instructional objectives when teaching and learning are in progress" (p.6).

Wiles (2000) is another writer who sees supervision as an activity. He describes supervision as "consisting of all the activities leading to the improvement of instructions, activities related to morale, improving human relations, in-service education and curriculum development" (p.4). Moorer (1998) on his part describes supervision as "all those activities which are primarily and directly concerned with studying and improving the conditions which surround the learning and growth of pupils and teachers" (p.7).

Neagley and Evans (2001) see supervision as a positive dynamic and democratic action designed to improve instruction through the continued growth of all concerned individuals, children, teachers, supervisors, administrators and parents or any other lay person" (p.2). According to Burton and Bruckner (1995) supervision is an expert technical service primarily aimed at studying and improving co-operatively all factors which affect child growth and development. Burton and Bruckner view modern supervision as entailing the following:

i.   it directs attention toward the fundamentals of education and orients learning and its improvement within the general aim of education.

ii.   The aim is to improve the total teaching and learning process, the total setting for learning, rather than the narrow and limited aim of improving teachers in service.

iii.   The focus is on the setting for learning not on a person or group of persons. All persons are co-workers aiming at the improvement of a

situation; one group is not superior to another operating to 'improve' the inferior group.

iv.   The teacher is removed from his embarrassing position as the focus of attention and the weak link in the educational process. He assumes his rightful position as a co-operating member of a group concerned with the improvement of learning.

Other writers see supervision as part of school administration. Eye and Netzer (1972) maintain that "supervision is that phase of school administration which deals primarily with the assessment and achievement of the appropriate selected instructional expectations of educational service" (p.12). Good (1945) also sees supervision as part of school administration as he writes "supervision could be seen as all efforts of designated school officials towards providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction in classroom" (p.8). Supervision has also been described by some writers as a form of evaluation of the instructional process in the school.

According to Enus (2000), supervision performs the following functions:

1.   The staffing function: This includes recruitment, selection and placement, promotion and dismissal of teachers and other non-teaching staff.

2.   The motivation and stimulation function. Enus contends that because even well qualified and efficient teachers could lose some of their effectiveness through professional frustration, inappropriate assignment of duties and inept administration practice, supervision as a facilitating function should be used to help remove obstacles to good teaching and at the same time

provide the stimulus for creative work. The motivation function of supervision is therefore concerned with providing a challenging environment, giving professional leaderships, creating job satisfaction and boosting morale as well as ensuring teacher participation in formulating policies which enhance their own task performance.

3.   The Consultation Function: This function according to Enus concerns providing for continuous professional development i.e. in-service training.

4.   The Programme Development Function: This deals with adaptation for local situations, variations in subject content and modification in order and method of presentation.

The foregoing are evidence that the scope of supervision has broadened considerably and all the factors that affect the learning and growing of pupils are in the province of supervision. The view of Burton and Bruckner (1995) that "administrative and supervision cannot be separated, is quiet popular. Merchoir (1950) contends that "supervision is mainly concerned with the oversight of the instructional programme in the school to ensure achievement of teaching and learning objectives" (p.19). Neagley and Evans (2001) are of the view that "Education Administration is the comprehensive generic category which includes supervision as one of the major functions" (p.13). According to them, other key areas of administration are finance and facility development.

Neagley and Evans conclude that "if primary aim of an act is the improvement of the teaching and learning situation, then that act may well be considered as supervisory" (p.31). Beeby (1977) also sees supervision as a

method of evaluation when he contends that "supervision is an example of evaluation which deals with the systematic collection and interpretation of evidence in the school system, leading as part of the process, to a judgement of value with a view to action" (p.21).

<center>**Types of Supervision**</center>

The types of supervision and their effect on attainment of educational goals are of great interest to a number of researchers and educationists. Neagley and Evans (2001) have written about two types of supervision. These are internal supervision and external supervision.

Internal supervision refers to supervision within various institutions by the leader while external supervision deals with supervision from the local, district or national offices. Musaazi (1985) contends that internal supervision is a situation where the head is to ensure the improvement and making of the instructional process effective. Cubberly (1990) notes that the responsibility of the head is to ensure continuous programme of curriculum improvement and sustained staff supervision.

External supervision has also drawn comments and views from noted educational writers like Halpin, Brickell, Burton and Bruckner. Halpin (1977) sees external supervision as playing a complementary role in the supervisory process. He perceives external supervision as "complementing the role and duties of the internal supervision by providing professional advice and guidance to teachers" (p.14). Brickell (2000) observes that "the roles of the supervisor include making the work of teachers more effective through such things as improved

<center>18</center>

working conditions, better materials for instruction, improved methods of teaching, preparation of courses of study, supervision of instruction through direct contact with the classroom teacher" (p.47).

According to Burton and Bruckner (1995)," since the classroom teacher is so much preoccupied with teaching in the classroom, it is the external supervisor who is expected to enrich the professional knowledge of the teacher by giving him fresh ideas through in-service training courses"(p.34). Becker (1999) is of the view that "the external supervisor is mainly to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional programme in terms of what it does to the pupil" (p.35). According to Musaazi (1982) supervision falls into a number of categories. These are: Intensive Supervision, Routine Supervision and Casual or check up visits.

Intensive Supervision

Supervision which is usually carried out when a group of inspectors/supervisors look into all aspects of a school is termed Intensive Supervision,(Musaazi,1982). For instance, subjects taught can be the object of supervision. In the course of supervising these, note is taken of such things as timetables, schemes of work, lesson preparation and subject teaching. The textbooks recommended officially must be known to the supervisor so that they are able to discuss their contents, their difficulties and weaknesses with the teachers who use them all the time.

Carefully studying how effective the children are learning and a thorough examination of the teaching process, according to Cubberly (1990) should be supervisor's initial concern. The standard of education in each class should also

be found out. The supervisors should discuss ways of improving pupils learning process with the teachers concerned should there be any problem. They may suggest improvements and modifications in teaching techniques. This approach according to Swearingen (2001) is most applicable where it is obvious that an attempt to introduce radical changes would result in even less effective teaching and learning, or where in trying to follow other methods the teachers find themselves in even greater confusion.

Corey (1990) is of the view that apart from the school curriculum, the supervisors must examine the whole organization of the school. For example, the staffing situation in the school, enrolment figures, pupils attendance records, the daily routine, staff duties, school discipline, school records and ledgers, the cleanliness of the school and the health of the pupils, school meals if any and school funds. Elsbree and Harold (1967) include the examination of such things as school buildings, furniture and equipments. Specifically, they must determine whether there are sufficient books, classroom materials and visual aids. Full inspection in this connection takes into account the number of school libraries and how well they are stocked.

Rukare (1974) writing on supervision said the following: the full inspection team is normally headed by a very senior officer. Usually, various factors are considered when choosing the leader of a panel of supervisors, such as type of schools being inspected. The duration of the inspection can range from three to five days, depending on the size of the school. How often this kind of inspection is carried out depend in our case on the Ghana Education Service.

Once in every three years may be normal, but it might not be possible for every school to be visited this often because of the scarcity of supervisors and number of schools to be inspected. The school head is usually informed in advance of an inspection so that he can fully prepare for it. A full inspection is not meant to threaten the school head, neither is it an exercise for window dressing (William & Thelbert, 1980).

On the first day of inspection, it is customary for a short meeting to be held with the school head and staff. During this meeting the objective of the supervision is explained and a request is made to the school head for the information needed by each supervisor. Thereafter, the supervisors are familiarized with the school site.

In general, the supervisors are able to form their own impressions about the school's main strengths and weaknesses. At the end of the visit, the supervisors discuss their findings and observations with the school head and the staff. The meeting with the school head gives the supervisors an opportunity to tell the teacher frankly which of the school's defects are attributable to the teacher. This meeting also gives the school head a chance to talk frankly about his/her problems and those of his/her staff.

The meeting with the staff according to Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) enables the supervisors to present their advice and comments without any delay. In the same way, the staff is given an extremely useful forum for the exchange of views and further clarification of any minor details not quite clear to the supervisors as a result of their supervision. From experience one finds that the

relationship between teachers and supervisors is usually cordial. It is true that while occasional misunderstanding are inevitable, differences of opinion and disagreements are often settled during these frank discussions (Johnson 1998).

It is the duty of the supervisors to demonstrate that all criticisms are made from a desire to help the school improve. After their supervision, a follow-up report should be made, of which copies should be given to the school head, the school management committee and the members of staff.

Routine Checking

According to Wiles (2000) this kind of supervision involves discussions with teachers and the school head. A report is usually written with particular emphasis on the supervisor's own field of specialization and perhaps one other related subject. For example, you may have an inspector who specializes in mathematics, but he may also be responsible for examining the teaching of science. In this report he will concentrate on the teaching of mathematics, but he will probably also make a few general observations about the teaching of science.

Becker (1999) is of the view that, other essential areas that might also be inspected are the general administration and organization of the school. Such a report is not usually published but is used for evaluative purposes. For instance, the report can be used to collect information about the quality of work in the school. It can be used as a basis for recommending schools for more grants. Normally, this type of supervision lasts for a short time, say, one or two days.

Casual or Check up Visit

Musaazi (1982) commenting on this type of supervision, stated that this kind of supervision is usually carried out informally. It is either ordered by the Assistant Director Inspectorate or an individual officer at the district level depending on the prevailing situation in the school. In this type of supervision, no written report is sent to the head teacher or the owner of the school. The supervisor makes a confidential report to the appropriate authorities for necessary follow-up action. During such visits, the supervisor is expected to form a judgment on what he sees and to discuss it with the teachers and the school head. Generally, the supervisor assesses the work of the teacher and his pupils.

Doll (1983) is of the view that a supervisor should not behave as a faultfinder or as a bully or a mere critic, but as an advisor, inspirer, modernizer, authority and helper in every way possible in order to attain the desirable standard in schools and to maintain good relationship. The job of writing report is a secondary task. The role of the supervisor should never hamper the teacher's own personality, resourcefulness, progress or initiative. According to Eye and Netzer (1965) we must remember that whatever form of supervision is carried out, must be done in order to test the effectiveness of the teaching as well as that of the teacher in achieving the objectives of education in schools.

Clinical and Peer Supervision

Glickman (1990) talks about clinical and peer supervision. Clinical supervision is a recent development in the field of supervision. It was developed at Harvard University by Morris Cogan, Robert Goldhammer and Robert

Anderson. This form of supervision has generated considerable interest. Clinical supervision has been defined as "that phase of instructional supervision which draws its data from first-hand observation of actual teaching events and involves face-to-face (and associated) interaction between the superior and the teacher in the analysis of teaching behaviours and activities for instructional improvement" (Goldhammer, 1980, p.15). Clinical supervision is based on the proposition that the relationship between the teacher and supervisor is mutual and that the two work together as colleague rather than in a superior-subordinate relationship.

Most writers in the field of clinical supervision e.g. Cogan (1973), Anderson (1984), describe the model as consisting of stages or phases. Although they disagree as to the number and names of phases, their models have similar content and include establishing the supervisor-teacher relationship, agreeing on the focus of the observation, observing and collecting descriptive, data, analyzing the data, discussing the data's meaning and implications for the teachers and planning for long-term development and future observations. Turner, (1976) found evidence of teacher growth in self-confidence and self-direction as a result of clinical supervision experiences. They also found clinical supervision to be more democratic than the other supervisory approaches.

Alfonso, Firth and Neville (1984) posit that their Peer Supervision focuses primarily on the process of observation, analysis and feedback making teachers their own supervisors. However within the broader context of supervision curriculum and development in-service education, goal setting, evaluation selecting materials and long range planning, he argues that Peer supervision is

severely limited and should only be used as an adjunct to broad-based programmes of instructional improvement and not as a replacement.

Factors Relating to Effective Supervision

The literature on this aspect of supervision is most crucial to the present research – namely the Effective of supervision in Secondary Schools. Various writers have written about conditions that can make supervision effective and also about how effective supervision can promote teaching and learning.

Neagley and Evans (2001) contend that "for supervision to be effective, the general limits of authority and responsibility must be well established so that all members of the supervision staff are able to function effectively as a term" (p.51). Halpin (1977) is of the view that "supervision can be effectively carried out when materials and logistics are provided to support it. There are other writers who are of the view that effective supervision depends on the caliber of personnel involved. Baldrige (1971) wrote that "for supervision to achieve its objectives the quality of the supervisor should be considered paramount" (p.84).

Merton (1968) is also of the view that supervision can be effective if supervisors are constantly oriented with fresh ideas. On effective supervision is how it could promote teaching and learning. Neagley and Evans (2001) are of the view that effective supervision of instruction can improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom.

Burton and Bruckner (1995) hold that supervision is effective in ensuring the achievement of school objectives because "it directs attention towards the fundamentals of education and orients learning and its improvement within the

general aim of education" (p.75). Burton and Bruckner again emphasized that supervision is effective in ensuring the aims of educational objectives because it aims at the improvement of the total setting for learning rather than the narrow and limited aim of improving teachers in the service. They conclude that effective supervision ensures a proper appraisal of the teaching and learning processes in order to bring about the achievement of objectives.

Bruckner (1995) contends that supervision helps teachers to secure an effective working knowledge of the tools of teaching. They are also of the view that supervision is effective in the promotion of educational aims because while it helps teachers to understand theory, supervision again helps them to practice it. Supervision constantly seeks to refine methods and procedures for making theory effective.

Unruh (1973) writing on effectiveness of supervision and how it enhances the ability of teachers to perform better and achieve targets says that, "effective supervision encourages teachers to demonstrate the ability to exercise sound and mature judgment in the performance of their duties resulting in the achievement of school objectives" (p.563). Eye and Netzer (1972) contend that for supervision to achieve its goals it must "institute an evaluation programme that is comprehensive enough to include the participation of pupils, teachers and administrators and also examine the effectiveness of learning in the light of instructional supervisory and other administrative procedures" (p.80).

Musaazi (1985) is of the view that in order for supervision to achieve its goals, "the supervisor must provide accurate, honest and positive reports on the

schools he supervises, on the teachers he observes and on the educational value obtained from the expenditure of public money" (p.56). These reports according to Musaazi will be useful to people such as:

1.   Heads of schools and their staff who refer to such reports for guidance of their work.

2.   Managers of schools who would like to know how their schools compare with others and what improvements are necessary.

3.   Those responsible for equipping the schools that is providing schools with textbooks, exercise books, equipment and tools.

4.   To the inspector/supervisor as a record of what was seen to be lacking and what was recommended.

Kinhart (2000) cited a study to show the positive effects of supervision on English achievement for High school students. He grouped the pupils in twelve sections of English on the basis of mental age, chronological age and achievement in English as determined by standardized test. Two sections were assigned to each of six teachers who were judged to be equal in ability. Supervision was applied to three teachers for approximately one semester but not to the other three. At the end of the period, achievement tests were given. After the administration of the tests, gains were noted.

The data showed that there was a superiority of attainment in pupils whose teachers were supervised over those who were not. This gave the indication that supervision can influence both the instructional process and students' achievement. Kinhart concluded that all the six sections taught by supervised

teachers made a greater final gain on standard tests than any of the six sections taught by unsupervised teachers. It therefore stands to reason that schools with superior supervisory practices tend to have better teaching techniques which improve considerably pupils' achievement.

Johnson (1988) is of the view that 'students whose teachers are adequately supervised while learning could perform better than students whose teachers are not adequately supervised" (p.87). From the foregoing reviews of literature it is very clear that supervision has been identified by most writers as having a direct correlation with improved teaching and learning.

The Role of the School Head in Supervision

One of the school head's primary tasks is the improvement of the school curriculum (Pritenard, 1975). Related to this task is the need to improve and make more effective the instruction within the school. The school head must establish areas where improvement is needed in the curriculum or in instructional techniques.

Brickell (2000) holds the view that, there are many means by which the school head might identify these needs. For example, through checking weekly or monthly the teachers' schemes of work or lesson plans, he can easily find out if improvement is needed in teachers' work preparations. He can listen to teachers' discussions of the school curriculum and other matters related to the school. He can also ask teachers directly about certain school matters that need improvement.

If it becomes clear that the school lacks textbooks, chalks, science equipment, he can contact the district education office immediately. A good

school head is thought of as a helper, advisor, provider of resources and a leader (Boafor, 1995). A school head may not be able to fulfill adequately all these roles to all teachers, but he can do much more than is generally being done in the area of supervision of the curriculum and instruction in the school.

Qualifications and Duties of a Supervisor

Qualifications

Burton and Bruckner (1995) have stated that the basic qualifications of a supervisor must be that he possesses:

1. A recognized teaching qualification. This qualification simply means that the supervisor must have been a teacher himself, and this means that the supervisor must have gone through a course of studies in a recognized teacher training institution, at the end of which he has obtained a certificate, diploma or degree authorizing him to teach.

2. Outstanding skills as a teacher. This is because it is such skills that he has to pass over to other teachers during the course of his work. In the same way, it is such skills that give him confidence when advising teachers in the field.

3. Experience in the teaching profession. The amount of teaching experience considered necessary for the post of a supervisor varies but a principal superintendent should be regarded as a minimum. A qualified teacher of principal superintendent and above with some years of teaching experience has sufficient knowledge of the day-to-day application of the skills to enable him to be of help to others.

Duties of a Supervisor

The supervisor is an adviser and a guide to teachers. He provides possible means concrete and constructive advice to teachers so that the quality of education in the schools can be improved (Burton and Bruckner, 1995). According to Bolam (1982) the supervisor can arrange courses or workshops for teachers and head teachers. These courses or workshops should relate specifically to those areas in which teachers and head teachers have been found weak by the supervisor of education. The aim of the workshops or courses should be the improvement of quality education in schools. As an agent of improvement and catalyst for innovation and curricular development, the supervisor of schools must critically evaluate and review new publications and textbooks sent to schools. He must also run induction courses for newly recruited teachers and school heads.

Campbell, Brigges, and Nystrand (1977) have stated that the supervisor is a "moving teachers' college" in the sense that his work is an extension of that done by the teacher training college. He counsels untrained teachers about better teaching methods and informs them of recent development in the teaching profession. As regards teachers, he has the duty of assisting them to improve generally in their profession. For those who cannot teach well, the supervisor must advice them on ways of improving their teaching. In such cases it can be of help if the supervisor himself arranges with the teachers concerned to give a demonstration lesson.

The supervisor also provides honest, accurate and positive reports on the schools he inspects, on the teachers he observes and on the educational value

obtained from the expenditure of public funds. According to Kimbel (1965) these reports are of use to many people namely:

1. The heads of schools and their staff who refer to such reports for guidance in their work.

2. Managers of schools who would like to know how their schools compare with others and what improvement are necessary.

3. Those who are responsible for equipping the schools, that is providing schools with textbooks, chalk, exercise books, etc.

4. The supervisor himself as a record of what was seen to be lacking and what was recommended.

Baldrige (1971) concluded that the supervisor should always remember that the classroom teacher is his colleague and should therefore take pains to ensure that at all times; he treats him with courtesy and consideration.

Personal Qualities of a Good Supervisor

According to Musaazi (1982), there are certain personal qualities which are essential for anybody preparing himself to succeed as a supervisor of schools. Some of these qualities are presented in the following sections.

Willingness and Eagerness to go on Learning

This quality is usually reflected in attendance at courses and perhaps in the acquisition of additional qualifications following the completion of the initial teachers training. As a teacher of teachers, he should have additional knowledge upon which he can draw and he should keep up-to-date. A successful supervisor must allow himself to read and study and this learning process has to be carried

out constantly. Conducting courses and writing articles are in themselves methods of acquiring new knowledge, because the very act of preparing materials for the consumption of others not only demands the organization of knowledge already possessed by the inspector, but also as rule, the discovery of additional information.

Merton (1968) is of the view that the supervisor learns a lot from the reactions and questions of those who attend the courses and also from the course teachers. Teachers themselves can also be a source of new knowledge to the supervisor. As the supervisor moves from school, he acquires many new ideas and techniques from observing excellent teachers at work. These ideas and techniques will definitely enrich the supervisor's store of knowledge and will eventually be passed on to others. According to Morant (1981) the experienced supervisor always recognizes the fact that he is leaning from others. A learning supervisor can gain a lot from conversations with school managers, parents, village elders/heads, students and specialists in other fields. The supervisor should generally know more than the teachers he supervises/inspects.

Good Relationship with other People

According to Pritenard (1975) the supervisor works closely with, and through people, so if he is to succeed in his work, he must have the cooperation of others. To gain this cooperation requires the nurturing of good relationships with teachers, school heads and students. The supervisor must appreciate the fact that although he may advise, guide and recommend most of the time it is the teachers,

school administrators and those closely concerned with pupil's education that will take action. He must therefore learn to work with them and to seek their help.

Sincerity, Tactfulness and a Positive approach to Criticism

A good supervisor does not simply praise everything he sees in the school because he desperately wants to gain popularity. If he does this, he will in the long run lose the respect of the teachers and may in fact; harm the education of the pupils (Brickell, 2000).

Becker (1999) has emphasized that important criticism must never be glossed over in an attempt to be friendly. Very often teachers appreciate an honest and frank evaluation of their work, provided that the frankness is seen to stem from knowledge and a desire to help. Negative criticism, however well meaningful, does nothing but harm. To tell a teacher simply that his social studies lesson was very poor because it was based on the dictation of notes and wrong facts may be both honest and constructive. However, a tactful supervisor will help to improve the lesson. Of course, factual errors and other elements of bad teaching will have to be pointed out, but in a helpful and tactful way (Fielder, 1967)

According to Bolam (1982) a supervisor who is frank and honest is likely to be reliable. If the supervisor is reliable the teachers will put their confidence in him and his words. The reliable and experienced supervisor therefore only makes promises he can fulfill. For example, if he promises to send science equipment to the school, he must make sure that such equipment is sent.

Sociability

According to Hammock and Owings (1955) to function effectively in all duties and responsibilities placed upon a supervisor, he must interact with many individuals and groups of people. To work effectively with all, the supervisor must be friendly, good-humoured, cheerful, genial and sociable in his approach to people.

Zeal and Enthusiasm

Johnson (1988) is one of the writers who has identified zeal and enthusiasm as commendable qualities in any occupation. The genuinely enthusiastic and zealous supervisor will influence those with whom he comes into contact, particularly to teachers. Teachers and school heads are bound to respond more favourably to advice of a supervisor who is really keen about his work and will respect him.

Patience

According to Swearingen (2001) the supervisor who expects immediate improvements or who takes it for granted that his advice will transform a school overnight is likely to face disappointment. Naturally, some teachers will ignore his advice; others will misunderstand it, and even if they understand the advice and act upon it, its impact will not always show quickly. In other words, things take time to happen. Harris (1963) is of the view that many visits have to be made to the school before, for example, a new technique is fully understood and put into practice. A supervisor may have recommended certain books for use in the school but these books may be out of print, or supplies of school materials may be slow.

Thus, there are many setbacks that might hinder the implementation of the supervisor's recommendations.

Practical Issues in School Supervision

Transport

Burton and Bruckner (1995) contend that the supervisor should be provided with official transport to be able to carry out his work. If no official transport is provided then he should purchase a car. We are all aware that a large number of schools are found in remote areas of the country. In the rainy season some roads are almost impassable. Therefore, in choosing to buy a car, the supervisor must make sure that it is a type which is suitable for his job. Perhaps a supervisor should use a Land Rover which is capable of negotiating very difficult road conditions. But Land Rovers are expensive cars for inspectors to buy, however, small easily maintained cars can also be made available for inspectors to buy, however, small easily maintained cars can also be used for supervision purposes. It is suggested that the Ministry of Education and the Ghana Education Service should help in the transport of its supervisors while on duty.

Accommodation Facilities during Inspection/Supervision

Wiles (2000) is of the view that, the supervisor has to decide where to spend the night or a series of nights in the places where he has to carry out his supervision, especially in rural areas far away from the supervisor's station. Before the supervisor starts his tour, the supervisor should find out about suitable hotels or guest houses in the areas where he will be working. Of course, he has to find out the charges so that they do not exceed his night allowance. According to

Musaazi (1982) it is usually not advisable for the supervisor to stay at a teacher's house because the supervisor feels obligated to his host. It is advisable for the inspector to use cheap accommodation where he is under no obligation to anyone and where he can sit down and work undisturbed.

Selection of Priorities

The supervisor is always faced with three limitations, namely time, the possibility of change and money. Whatever he does and whatever he suggest or recommends must be within the financial resources available. We also know that he cannot introduce all desirable changes at once (Campbell, et al. 1977). Therefore, his proposals or schemes must be arranged in order of priority and of course, he should be aware that supervisor should set himself no more than three major aims for each year and subordinate everything else to the achievement of these aims. For example, one of his aims might be that he wants to ensure that teachers within his supervisory area prepare their lessons before going to teach.

Report Writing

Farrant (1986) argues that, it is advisable for the supervisor to complete the writing of reports in the course of his visits, so that when he returns to his station, the reports only need typing and then sending out to the appropriate authorities. This practice is important because it reduces the inevitable time-lag between the inspection and the receipt by the school. Such a practice also enables the supervisor to attend to the mail that has arrived in his absence without having to think about writing inspection reports. Inspection reports should be clear, concise and to the point (Printenard, 1975).

Throughout the report the emphasis must be on recommendations for improvements rather than on the details of what is going wrong (Moorer, 1956). This is not to say that faults and inefficiency are to be left out of the report, but they should be pointed out frankly and briefly before making concrete suggestions for their remedy. It is important that the emphasis is on the cure, not the disease.

According to Neagley and Evans (2001), reports on the teachers are of the greatest importance to the employers. They are also of the greatest importance to the teachers themselves, although the teachers do not see them. Such reports measure the career of the individual teacher. If constructively, objectively and impartially written, these reports help a great deal in evaluating the performance of teachers. Reports on teachers should assess their ability in terms of the preparation of lessons, class management, the use of teaching/learning materials, the marking of pupils work, and records of marks and pupils progress (Eye and Netzer, 1972). There are many other factors that might be considered in the assessment of a teacher's ability. For instance, his voice and manner of conduct in the classroom, how he asks questions in class, and his depth of knowledge in the subject he is teaching.

Follow-up Action

Enus (2000) is of the view that inspection reports and the whole exercise of inspection are meaningless unless they are followed by action. It is, therefore, the duty of the supervisor to make sure that action has been taken following his report. The supervisor should return to the school after an appropriate time lapse to see whether his recommendations and suggestions have been followed.

The return visit to the school should result in a follow-up report on the extent to which previous recommendations and suggestions have been implemented. Such a report is specifically to assess whether the actions taken to implement the supervisor's recommendations are achieving the desired results (Elsbree, and Harold, 1967). Sometimes however, the supervisor finds himself in a dilemma when other division/sections of the Ghana Education Service are supposed to have provided the schools with certain items recommended by him and they have not done so. What should the supervisor do when his recommendations have not been followed because the Ghana Education Service could not help the school? Duncan (1980) has suggested that the supervisor reports his state of affairs to his immediate superior, who would follow it up with his colleagues in those divisions which are responsible for the specific recommendations made by the supervisor.

The inspection of schools is only one of the several methods of improving the quality of education. Supervisors of education are charged with the responsibility of helping teachers in schools achieve the educational objectives. Doll (1983) has stated that the supervisor's relationship with teachers, school administrators and all those concerned directly with children's education in school must be very good. School supervisors must be sources of information for teachers. In other words, they must be men and women who are knowledgeable about current educational developments in the country and in the world in general. Supervisors must know the prescribed syllabuses, textbooks recommended by the Ghana Education Service, supplementary textbooks, modern

methods of teaching, official circulars and laws and regulations relating to supervision of education.

According to Matsudaira (1982), supervision must be carried out periodically so that the standards of education are regularly assessed and controlled. Inspection reports should be fair and constructively written. It is important that supervisors should go back to the schools after some time to see whether their recommendations have been implemented. The assessment report written by the supervisor is referred to as a follow-up report.

Finally, Reed (1986) holds the view that supervisors should help advice the government by providing accurate information on institutions and their potentialities. This includes the assessment of teachers, and knowing the progress of schools in relation to government objectives through inspection exercise.

The Role of Motivation in Supervision

Motivation is a general term used to describe the conditions or factors which activate and direct behaviours towards particular goals (Annoh, 1977). Motivation is concerned with the cause of behaviours, why people act, speak or think in a particular way (Kelvin, 1991). School heads need to know how to motivate. They need to get results through people or get the best out of people.

This is known as intrinsic motivation which is too often based on fear. Results will then be the best that the teacher can produce and be more likely to be in line with the overall goals and ethos of the school.

Principles of Motivation

Participation

The staff should be involved in decision making and in matters which affect them directly. The more the staffs become involved, the more they will have sense of ownership in decisions and be prompted to help in achieving the objectives (Appleby, 1994). Involving the staff in decision making does not alter that the school head remains accountable for taking the final decisions and for their result.

Communication

According to Ozigi (1981), if the staff is informed about the objectives and the results achieved, they are inclined to cooperate more and feel that they are part (members) of the group. The opposite is also true, if staff do not know what they are supposed to be achieving, they will show little interest and have little motivation. Staff should not only be informed about results, but also about changes and progress.

Recognition

If staff members receive the necessary recognition for work done, they will be inclined to work harder. Recognition should be given to the staff member as a person and not just as a human resource (Fielder, 1967).

Delegated Authority

Kelvin (1991) is of the view that, a school head should be prepared to delegate authority to capable people. In this way a person's post is enhanced, and this serves as a means of personnel development. Delegated authority also means

that more people will be allowed to make decisions themselves in connection with their work within set guidelines.

Motivating Staff

The principles of motivation outlined above indicate that there are a variety of factors which influences an individual's level of motivation at work. The school head therefore should not only have some knowledge of the staff but should bear in mind that all the different factors can be divided into four groups. The personal needs of all human beings, factors inherent in the work situation, management methods and the social system as reflected in the community.

Personal Needs

Kelvin (1991) again agrees that the needs of every person should be taken into account, such as the need for recognition, the need to achieve, the need to be a valued person in the community, the need for self-respect and for friendship. If a teacher occupies a temporary post, there is the need for work security. Merit, awards and promotion can give the necessary recognition of teachers' achievements. Non-recognition of achievements has a demotivating effect on teachers and can lead to high staff turnover. A sense of responsibility should be cultivated as well as pride in the quality of work done.

Work Situation

Factors related to the work itself may also affect levels of motivation, for instance, the nature and type of work, the opportunities for group identity, the chance of promotion, the work environment, the opportunities and challenges of the work that is, the opportunities for creativity and renewal (Nwagwu, 1984).

Monotony and routine can be demotivating. Routine work leads to frustrations and boredom and to lack of motivation. One solution can be to rotate some routine activities so that boring chores do not have to be done by the same person.

Management Factors

Chung (1988) is of the view that, the quality of management affects behaviour, attitudes and effort. Positive interpersonal relationships are regarded as strengthening motivation. In this respect, communication is of great importance. Teachers like to know and should be coupled with competent and just leadership which sets out acceptable tasks together with clear guidelines.

Community Factors

Rukare (1974) has stated that if the community's values whether religious, moral, economic, cultural, political or social differ from those of the teachers, these community factors will have demotivating effect on the teacher. The personal life of teachers, such as their relationships with their families, will also influence behaviour. The head has little control over such motivating factors, but he or she has to deal with the situation should it have a negative effect on a teacher's work. According to Fagbulu (1972), to motivate staff effectively, a school head should have knowledge of their personal needs, their work circumstances, and the requirements of the community and have an effective management style.

Motivation and the School Head

We should remember to use the 'motivators', that is people's need for achievement, recognition, responsibility, job interest, personal growth and

advancement potential (Steers, 1977). We tend to understand the needs of other people in these areas. Involving others in decisions, which affect them, is one way of meeting all or most of these needs. School heads should avoid window dressing.

According to Kelvin (1991) the relative intensity of psychological needs will very much differ from person to person and from time to time. There are people whose motivation is not work related. If a teacher's spouse loses his or her job, security needs may well be the most important. If there is a marriage break-up, both security and social needs may surface, though these may be followed later by a need find renewal interest and achievement in the job.

Doll (1983) is of the view that, there are predictable and often recognizable behavioural phenomena. However, when symptoms and causes are less obvious, the risk is that we misjudge the needs of colleagues or friends. Some of us have a tendency to assume that the needs of others are the same as our own; others tend to assume the opposite.

We should try to suit our management behaviour to both the personalities and the needs of the situation. Our automatic reaction may not be the right one, think about the alternatives. Despite every effort there will remain individuals who have no wish to be 'motivated' and who view with suspicion any attempts to increase their responsibilities, job interest or involvement (Becker, 1999). Such attitude may typically be found in teachers who are frustrated. However, the danger is always that we give up too easily. The right approach may prompt a surprising warm response.

Andrew (1965) has stated that, it is necessary for a school head to establish by means of honest self – evaluation what the true nature is of his or her attitude towards staff. It is important that this introspection is honest and open, because experience has shown that it will determine the way the head leads and motivate the staff. It is indubitably true that the way in which heads treat their staff will, to a great extent be determined by their outlook on life, their attributes to motivation as the basis of human behaviour in a specific working situation (Andrew, 1965).

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring simply implies putting a system in place to keep watch over school facilities, teaching and learning, school governance and school finance. Hornby, Gutenby and Wakefield (1967) define monitoring as to "watch something carefully for a period of time in order to discover something about it". (pp.632). Monitoring ensures that teachers attend classes regularly, prepare lesson notes and teach the lessons as expected. It also ensures that materials supplied to the schools are properly used and that the school is effectively governed by the head teacher.

Evaluation

Evaluation is the systematic assessment of the operation and/or the outcomes of a programme or policy, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to the improvement of the programme or policy (Weiss, 1998).

According to Giandomenico (1988) results of evaluation should help answer questions about where to go next to how to improve the current programme or policy, such as: Is the programme worth the money it costs? Should it be continued, expanded, cut back, changed, or abandoned? Does it work for everybody or only some kinds of people? The real challenge for evaluation research and policy analysis is to develop methods of assessment that emphasize learning and adaptation rather than expressing summary judgement of pass or fail (Weiss, 1998).

Characteristics of an Evaluation

Diagnostic Purpose

According to Tyler (1992) an evaluation has a stated purpose which is written in behavioural terms. When done effectively, the results of the evaluation will guide subsequent action. In effect, the results tell manager, "do more of that", "don't do this anymore" or "this part was effective, that part was not".

Organized Procedure

An evaluation has a specific procedure that it follows and that procedure should be written out in enough detail so that the same procedure could be followed again at a different point on time or by someone else in a similar setting (Robinson, 1981).

Information Needed

An evaluation specifies what information it will use to determine if its purpose has been met. Michael (1991) is of the view that the information may be from observation, from interviews, from existing records, or from specially

constructed data-gathering tools such as classroom quizzes or teacher questionnaires. Often we are interested in comparing what is happening at two different points in time; if so, the frequency of data collection should be specified.

Information Sources

An evaluation is specified about who to go to in order to get the necessary data. If for example, we are concerned about teacher's use of textbooks in the classroom, we would probably get information from the teachers, either by observing them or by asking them. In addition, we might want to get information from the teachers, either by observing them or by asking them. In addition, we might want to get information from head teachers or even from the children (Giandomenico, 1988).

Analysis

An evaluation summarizes and displays information in a form that is understandable to interested outsiders (Weiss, 1998). If for example, the evaluation has to do with trends in school attendance for lower and upper primary schools, decisions need to be made about that information, its importance and how it should be displayed. Is it of current or future interest to collect and display information for boys and girls separately, class by class, term by term, circuit by circuit or district by district? Will attendance be compared with enrolment?

Record-keeping

Evaluation implies comparison therefore, it is important to keep clear, accessible records. Evaluation comparisons are often made over a period of time. This year's results with similar results will be compared two years from now

(Gaindomenico, 1988). With this in mind, the record-keeping format needs to be thought carefully and labeled clearly. Generally, it is best to save all basic information, that will allow you to go back to the data two years from now and perform additional analysis, such as looking at boys data and girls data separately, even though that may not have been an issue at the time of the original evaluation effort. Both Annoh (1997) and Manu (1983) recommended the following as the most important records that need to be kept in every basic school in Ghana. They are class attendance register, the log book, inventory book and the cash book.

Information Needed for Basic District Monitoring and Evaluation System

According to Elizabeth (1998) there is the need for information to identify trends in access, equity, efficiency and effectiveness in schools. Information gathered from schools is aggregated by circuit; the circuit information is then aggregated by district, while that of the district is aggregated by region. There are a number of issues on which information is gathered in the schools

Information on School Operations

Manu (1983) has identified the following as key elements of information on school operations.

1.   Enrolment by gender, by class.

2.   Number of streams per school.

3.   School completion rates by gender.

4.   Class repetition rates by gender.

5.   Percent of pupils' cohort, P1 finishing P6, six years later.

6.   Dropout by gender and by class.

7.   Number of teachers by class.

8.   Average pupil/teacher ratio.

9.   Ratio of number of trained and untrained teachers.

10.   Number of unfilled teaching posts.

11.   Academic achievement in Mathematics, English by class and by gender.

12.   Textbook possession by class and by subject.

13.   Teacher/pupil attendance ratio trends by term.

(1)   Information on School Governance

Weiss (1998) also identified the following as key elements of information on school governance:

1.   School staff summary management, teachers, clerical, cleaning/gardening.

2.   Staff and whether each post is filled.

3.   Frequency of staff meetings.

4.   Frequency of instructional supervision by school head, by class and by term.

5.   Frequency and number of SMC and PTA meetings per term.

6.   Progress on implementation of community school improvement plan (CSIP) quarterly.

Information on Facilities

1.   School toilets, potable water and electricity.

2.   Annual state of facilities, (repairs needed, new facilities, rehabilitation needs) (Giandomenico, 1988).

Information on Finances

According to Manu (1983) the following can be considered as information on finance.

1.   Allocation and use of common funds and by purpose.

2.   Local community financial support (in kind, i.e., labour, materials, time, donations as well as direct monetary support).

3.   Sports and culture fees retained in the school.

4.   Impress given to the schools by the district directorate.

Improving Monitoring and Evaluation in Ghana's Basic Schools

From 1990 to 1997 USAID/Ghana worked with Ghana's Ministry of Education (MOE) through it's Primary Education Programme (PREP) to support the nation in its efforts to correct an educational system which experienced substantial deterioration in the 1990s. The PREP programme was essentially a programme of improving the supply and quality of education inputs to the primary education sub-sector (Elizabeth, 1998).

Tom and Rebecca (2000) have stated that, in 1997 the USAID/Ghana mission began a multi-level programme of assistance which provided support to the Government of Ghana (GOG) in improving the effectiveness of the primary education system. This programme, the Quality Improvement in Primary Schools (QUIPS), provides assistance by focusing simultaneously on policy reform and school and community development through a nationwide programme of community school partnerships. The school – based and community – based interventions have been led by two inter-dependent projects, improving learning

through partnership (ILP) and the Community School Alliance (CSA), respectively. In the 3rd Quarter of 1999 the QUIPS team was extended to include the participation of an international NGO, the Catholic Relief Services (CRS). CRS is responsible for implementing the QUIPS programme interventions in Ghana's northern regions.

In March 1998, the Mitchell group (TMG) entered into a contractual agreement with USAID/Ghana mission to meet the performance monitoring and evaluation objectives of the QUIPS programme through the Performance Monitoring and Evaluating project (PME). The Harvard Institute for International Development (HID) joined the PME project team in May 1999 (Elizabeth, 1999).

According to Tom and Rebecca (2000) the objectives of the PME project are twofold:

(1)   To design and implement a monitoring and evaluating system for USAID/Ghana's primary education programme or QUIPS.

(2)   To assist the MOE in developing the capacity for monitoring and evaluating their primary education programme.

Process Involved in Supervision

Many educational writers and researchers hold the view that supervision could be carried out in various ways to achieve educational goals and objectives. Neagley and Evans (1970) are of the view that "the primary aim of every supervisor is to lead his school, zone or district in the improvement of instruction". The following supervisory activities are noted.

1.   Individual teacher conferences mostly informal

2.   Regular class visitation

3.   Action research in the classroom

4.   Coordination of special subjects like art, music, physical education with the academic curriculum

5.   Demonstration and substitution in teaching on occasions

6.   An active work in district-wide curriculum improvement

7.   Planning and presentation of in-service training programmes.

Harris (1963) is of the view that instructional supervision is carried out mainly under six major tasks, these include the following.

i.   Organizing for instruction. This involves making organizational arrangements to implement the curriculum.

ii.   Selecting and assigning the appropriate instructional staff member to appropriate activities in the organizer. Programmes related to this task include recruiting, screening testing and maintaining personnel records.

iii.   Providing facilities and materials and securing their utilization in order to make for efficient and effective provision of instruction.

iv.   Arranging for in-service training in order to orientate staff members. This provides staff members with the necessary information and understanding which go a long way to maximize their chances of success, with a minimum of difficulties in the performance of their duties.

v.   Identify those services which have the greatest contribution to make to the instructional programmes and which facilitates it to achieve maximum success.

vi.   Planning organizing and implementing activities for the evaluation of all facets of the educational process directly related to provision of instructions.

Musaazi (1985) is of the view that supervision is carried out consistently and continuously as in process of guidance, based on frequent visits which focuses attention on one or more aspects of the schools work and its organization. This he concludes should guide every supervisor in the performance of his duties.

Johnson (1988) notes that factors related to the head's supervisory practices deal with involvement in classroom life, reporting of classroom observation and helping to improve the instructional process.

Local Work on Supervision

The bulk of the literature received in connection with the various areas of interest to the present work has been the works of researchers and writers outside of the African environment. This is clear evidence that not much work has been done locally in this field. So far the researcher has been able to encounter three main works locally (Asiedu, 1997; Arhin, 2001 and Annan, 2001).

Asiedu (1997) did work on supervision of JSS schools in New Juaben district. His work actually dealt with the nature of supervision being undertaken. His findings showed that Internal Supervision was more common and respondents preferred it to External Supervision.

Arhin (2001) did a similar work looking at supervision of instruction in the Techiman Education District. He also discovered the prevalence of Internal Supervision in that district and ended up advocating the complimentary role that external supervision is expected to play in the teaching and learning process for the attainment of goals.

Annan (2001) on her part looked at "Improving Tutor Performance through Supervision of Instruction" in Foso Training College. Her's was an action research and her intervention consisted of steps which were taken to maximize teacher class attendance and ensure optimal use of instructional time. The Intervention is described as Clinical Supervision, a new type of supervision referred to earlier in this review. The result of her work showed that at least in the short term of her work desirable changes and improvement in teacher instructional behaviour took place.

The present work attempts at finding out the effectiveness of the existing supervisory practices at the private and public Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology. The issues addressed under this section include the research design, the population of the study, the sample and sampling technique, research instrument, pilot testing, data collection procedures and data analysis.

Research Design

According to Best and Kahn (1989), descriptive survey is concerned with the conditions or relationships that exist, such as determining the nature of prevailing conditions, practices and attitudes, opinions that are held, processes that are going on or trends that are developed. Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) also maintain that in descriptive research, accurate description of activities, objects, processes and persons is the objective.

Descriptive survey deals with interpreting the relationship among variables and describing their relationships. Descriptive survey seeks to find answers to questions through the analysis or relationships between or among variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). In addition, the descriptive survey affords the opportunity to select a sample from the population being studied and then generalizes from the sample of the study (Best & Kahn, 1989). Descriptive research design is highly regarded by policy makers in the social sciences where

large populations are dealt with using questionnaires, which are widely used in educational research since data gathered by way of descriptive survey represents field conditions (Osuala, 2001).

Nevertheless, there are difficulties involved in a descriptive survey, in that it is not comprehensive enough to provide answers to questions and cannot establish causes and effect relationship (Osuala, 1991). Furthermore, according to Leedy (1985), "one of the most subtly and ineradicable shortcomings of descriptive survey is the presence of bias" (p.132) and especially when one uses questionnaires. These include ensuring that the questions to be answered are clear and not misleading, getting respondents to answer questions thoughtfully and honestly and getting sufficient number of questionnaires completed and returned so that meaningful analyses can be made (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000).

Despite the shortcomings identified, the descriptive survey design was used because according to Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) an advantage of the design is that it has the potential to provide a lot of information obtained from quite a large sample of individuals. It was therefore expedient to use the descriptive survey to find out the supervisory practices in the private and public junior high schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

Population

The population for the study included all headteachers, assistant headteachers, teachers and prefects in the public and private Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. There are 123 Junior high schools in the Metropolis of which 80 are public schools while the remaining 43 are private schools. The

total number of teachers in the Metropolis is 607, with the public school teachers numbering 395 and private teachers 212. That of the headteachers and their respective assistants included 80 from public schools and 43 from private schools totaling, 123 respectively. The total number of prefects in the 123 schools in the Metropolis was composed of 400 from public schools and 215 from the private schools. Finally, 6 circuit supervisors were also included in the study. In all, a total of 1,474 participants formed the target population for the study. Table 1 illustrates the summary of Junior High Schools in the Metropolis while Table 2 presents the distribution of teachers by circuits and school type.

Table 1: **Summary of Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis by Circuits**

Circuits	Public	Private	Total
Cape coast	13	7	20
Aboom	16	11	27
Bakaano	14	3	17
Pedu/Abura	14	13	27
OLA	9	6	15
Efutu	14	3	17
Total	**80**	**43**	**123**

Source: Cape Coast Metropolitan Education Directorate, 2009

Table 2: **Distribution of Teachers and Prefects by Circuits and School Type in the Metropolis**

Circuits	Total Number of Schools		Total Number of Teachers		Total Number of Prefects	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Cape coast	13	7	64	34	65	35
Aboom	16	11	79	54	80	55
Bakaano	14	3	69	15	70	15
Pedu/Abura	14	13	69	64	70	65
OLA	9	6	45	30	45	30
Efutu	14	3	69	15	70	15
Total	**80**	**43**	**395**	**212**	**400**	**215**

Source: Cape Coast Metropolitan Education Directorate, 2009

Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample size chosen for the study comprised of 606 participants. This was in line with Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh (1990) assertion that for the purpose of generalization, the sample must represent a higher proportion of the population. Stratified sampling and simple random sampling (hat and draw method) techniques were used to select 60 (40 public and 20 private) schools randomly from the 123 schools in the Metropolis to constitute the sample. The stratification variables used were circuits and school type within the Metropolis. Based on the strata, 300 teachers and prefects respectively made up of 200 and 100 from the public and private schools were selected using the hat and draw method from each strata. Purposive sampling technique was used to select all the 6 circuit supervisors and all the head teachers, and assistant headteachers, from the 60

sampled schools from the Metropolis. This was because their expertise was of paramount to the study. Also, in line with the assertion held by Nwana (1993) every member of a population must be studied if the population size is small. The sample distribution of Junior High Schools in the Metropolis by circuits as well as the distribution of teachers and prefects by circuits and school type is shown in Table 3 and 4 respectively.

Table 3: **Sample Distribution of Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis by Circuits**

Circuits	Population		Sample	
	Public	Private	Public	Private
Cape coast	13	7	7	3
Aboom	16	11	9	4
Bakaano	14	3	7	3
Pedu/Abura	14	13	7	4
OLA	9	6	3	3
Efutu	14	3	7	3
Total	**80**	**43**	**40**	**20**

Table 4: **Sample Distribution of Teachers and Prefects by Circuits and School Type**

Circuits	Schools		Teachers		Prefects	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Cape coast	7	3	35	15	35	15
Aboom	9	4	45	20	45	20
Bakaano	7	3	35	15	35	15
Pedu/Abura	7	4	53	20	35	20
OLA	3	3	15	15	15	15
Efutu	7	3	35	15	35	15
Total	**40**	**20**	**200**	**100**	**200**	**100**

Research Instruments

The main instrument used was questionnaires with closed-ended questions. Other instruments used were guided interviews and examination of available documents. Some of the items in the instruments were designed by the researcher herself while others were adapted from Duncan's (1980) study of Instructional supervision.

The instruments were grouped into three parts.

Part One: Questionnaire for teachers.

Part Two: Questionnaire for students.

Part Three: Interview guide/ Observations and examination of documents.

Part one being Questionnaire for teachers was divided into sections A, B, C, D and E. Section A dealt with personal data of respondents. Section B dealt with issues relating to Types and Mode of Supervision. This section had 35 items

59

dealing with issues ranging from the types of supervision being practiced and their adequacy and effectiveness to the personnel involved in supervision and whether or not they are perceived to be doing what is expected of them. This section, extensive as it was, proved valuable in answering the research questions one and two.

Section C dealt with teachers' supervision and appraisal. This section had 8 items. Teachers were requested to indicate by ticking acceptable responses to show whether certain activities were carried out by supervisors in respect of teachers' work and the regularity of such activities. This section helped in answering research question two. Section D dealt with the effectiveness of Supervision. The section had 6 items and it was concerned with supervision judging from the work of supervisors and the outcome of such activity. This section helped in answering the research question 3. Section E dealt with problems in supervision. This section had 4 items. Some common problems of supervision were stated and teachers were requested to rate them using a 5 point likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". This section also helped in answering research question 4.

The part two being questionnaire for students was made up of sections A, B, C and D. Section A dealt with personal data of respondents. Section B dealt with types of supervision and the personnel involved. This section helped in answering research question 1. Section C dealt with Appraisal of teachers' work. This section helped in answering research question 2. Section D dealt with

involvement of students in supervision. This section also helped in answering research question 2.

The part three had to do with the involvement and effectiveness of the circuit supervisors from the Metropolitan Education Office. It covered interview guide for the circuit supervisors. In all cases attempts were made to obtain available documents such as the teachers' time book to authenticate.

Pilot testing

Pilot testing of the instruments was conducted at the Komenda Edina Eguafo Abrem (KEEA) municipality. One private and one public JHS were used. (Peter B.A. Holdbrook Smith Academic Complex and Elmina Methodist A JHS respectively) Responses were later coded and analyzed to check for their reliabilities. The reliability test estimated for the questionnaire for teachers and students were .909 and .924 respectively using Cronbach co-efficient alpha formula. Aiken (as cited by Kouzes & Posner 2002a) states that instruments with reliabilities above .60 are considered good. The instruments were therefore deemed reliable. The content of the instrument was validated by peers and supervisors.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher made personal contacts with the respondents in order to administer the instruments. The instruments were administered during the first term in the 2008/2009 academic year.

A letter of introduction was collected from the department and sent to the various schools. The researcher conferred with the various headteachers to fix

dates for the questionnaire administration. The second visit was used to administer the questionnaires. For each of the schools, the researcher administered the questionnaires and collected them on the same day except for a few teachers that personal follow up had to be made at a later date and the return rate was 100%. This procedure by the researcher ensured that students and teachers would not have the opportunity to compare their responses. It was also to ensure that majority of the questionnaires were retrieved while a lot of time was saved.

Data Analysis

The data collected were edited to ensure that responses were suitable. The editing also helped to exclude the questionnaires which were not complete. The questionnaires were serially numbered for easy identification. Finally, the questionnaires were coded for easy analysis. All responses were analysed using the Statistical Product for Service Solutions version 16.0. The research questions were analysed using frequencies and percentages as well as the independent sample t-test.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with the presentation and discussion of the data collected in the research. The data from the various groups in the sample population were presented and analysed separately. The data was collected from forty public junior high schools and twenty private Junior High Schools of the Cape Coast Metropolis. Six circuit supervisors from the Cape Coast Metropolitan Education office were interviewed.

1.   The study was to find out first and foremost the types of supervision carried out in the private and public junior High schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The other areas of focus were the following.

2.   How are those responsible for supervision actually doing what is expected of them at the public and private Junior High School (JHS) level?

3.   What are the challenges confronting supervisors in conducting their work at the public and private Junior High School level?

4.   How can the supervisory practices be enhanced or promoted at the Junior High School level in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

In all, there were 606 respondents. Two hundred respondents were from the public JHS teachers and 200 were from the public JHS students. One hundred

respondents were from the private JHS teachers, 100 were from the private JHS students and 6 circuit supervisors were interviewed.

Forty JHS from the public school were covered and twenty Junior High schools from the private were also covered. The metropolis is made up of 6 circuits and all the circuit supervisors were also covered. The retrieval rate of the questionnaire was 100%. Below is the presentation of summary of the data and its discussion.

Gender of Respondents

From the respondents, 86 female teachers and 114 male teachers from the public JHS were captured whilst 74 female teachers and 26 male teachers from the private J.H.S were captured. In all, 160 female and 140 males were covered for the study.

Table 5: **Gender of Teachers of Private and Public JHS**

Gender	Public	Private	Total
Female	86	74	160
Male	114	26	140
Total	**200**	**100**	**300**

Table 6:   **Gender of Students of Private and Public JHS**

Gender	Public	Private	Total
Female	122	45	167
Male	78	55	133
Total	**200**	**100**	**300**

In Table 6, 133 students were males out of which 78 were from the public J H S and 55 were from the private J H S. One hundred and sixty–seven respondents were females from which 122 were from the public J.H.S and the remaining 45 were from the private J.H.S.

Gender of Circuit Supervisors

There were six (6) male circuit supervisors used for the study.

Age of Respondents

Eight students were 11 years old; 4 students from the private and the other 4 from the public J.H.S. For age 12, only the public J.H.S recorded 9 students. For age 13, 52 students were recorded from which 35 were from the public school and 17 from the private school. For age 14, 84 students were recorded; 39 from the public school and 45 from the private school. Age 15 recorded 87 students thus, 60 from the public and 27 from the private school. For age 16, 42 students were recorded; 35 were from the public school and 7 from the private school. For ages 17 and 18, only the public school recorded 10 students and 8 students respectively.

Table 7:   **Age of Student Respondents**

Age(Years)	Public JHS	Private JHS	Total
11	4	4	8
12	9	-	9
13	35	17	52
14	39	45	84
15	60	27	87
16	35	7	42
17	10	-	10
18	8	-	8
Total	**200**	**100**	**300**

Three out of the 6 circuit supervisors interviewed constituting 50% were between the ages of 36 and 40. Two circuit supervisors (33%) were between ages 41 and 45. Only one (16.67%) was 46 years.

Table 8:   **Classes of Student Respondents**

Class	Public	Private	Total
JHS 1	34	6	40
JHS 2	54	6	60
JHS 3	112	88	200
Total	**200**	**100**	**300**

In Table 8, 40 students were recorded for J.H.S 1 from which 34 were from the public school and the remaining 6 were from the private school. For

J.H.S 2, 60 students were recorded; 54 from the public schools and 6 from the private school. For J.H.S 3, 200 students were captured; 112 students were from the public school and the remaining 88 were from the private school.

Professional Status

In Table 9, 30 teachers from the public JHS were non-professionals and 23 teachers from the private JHS were also non-professionals. Professional teachers from the public JHS were numbered 170 whilst 77 were from the private JHS.

Table 9: **Professional Status of Teachers**

Status	Public	Private	Total
Non-Professional	30	23	53
Professional	170	77	247
Total	**200**	**100**	**300**

Table 10: **Positions of Teachers**

Post	Public	Private	Total
Class teachers	124	32	156
Form masters	63	68	131
Total	**187**	**100**	**287**

One hundred and twenty-four teachers from the public JHS were class teachers whilst 32 teachers from the private JHS were recorded as class teachers. Sixty-three teachers from the public JHS were form masters whilst 68 teachers were recorded as form masters from the private JHS. In all, 156 teachers were

class teachers and 131 teachers were form masters. Thirteen teachers did not show the positions applicable to them.

<p style="text-align:center">Qualification of Teachers</p>

Ninety–five teachers from the public JHS hold diploma certificates. Eighty-two were graduates and 20 were post graduates. Three respondents did not show their level of education. With the private JHS, 28 teachers were diploma holders, 66 were graduates and 5 were post graduates making 99 respondents. One respondent did not show the level of education. In all, 296 respondents showed their level of education and 4 respondents did not.

Table 11:   Qualification of Teachers

Level of Education	Public	Private	Total
Diploma	95	28	123
Graduate	82	66	148
Post Graduate	20	5	25
Total	**197**	**99**	**296**

The circuit supervisors were all degree holders.

Rank

In Table 12, it was realised that 66 teachers from the public JHS were of the rank of senior superintendent and 25 were from the private JHS. So there were 91 teachers with the rank of senior superintendent. Eighty teachers from the public JHS were of the rank of principal superintendent while 67 were from the public JHS thus, 147 were of the rank of principal superintendent. Two teachers

from the public JHS recorded for the rank of Assistant Director. There was no teacher from the private JHS with the rank of Assistant Director. Eight teachers from the public JHS were Directors. There was no Director in the private school. Forty teachers specified Diploma rank applicable to them other than what was on the questionnaire. Twelve teachers did not show their rank.

Table 12:   Rank of Teachers

Rank	Public	Private	Total
Senior Superintendent	66	25	91
Principal Superintendent	80	67	147
Assistant Director	2	0	2
Director	8	0	8
Diploma	40	0	40
Total	**196**	**92**	**288**

All of the circuit supervisors were Principal Superintendent (PS). For the purpose of clarity, data was presented in a tabular form. Below is the presentation of summary of the data and its discussion.

Types of Supervision Emphasised in the Public and Private J.H.S.

Research Question 1: What are the types of supervision carried out in the Public and Private Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

To determine the type of supervision being emphasised in the public and private J. H. S, both teachers and students were requested to indicate whether supervision carried out in their schools was external supervision only, internal

supervision only or both. Again teacher's views were sought on the frequency and mode of external supervision from the metropolis and the regional offices of education. The results from both sets of enquiries are presented in Tables 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 respectively.

Table 13:   Types of Supervision from Teachers

School Type	None (%)	Both (%)	Internal (%)	External (%)	Total (%)
Public	2 (1)	160 (80)	13 (6.5)	25 (12.5)	200 (100)
Private	2 (2)	93 (93)	1 (1)	4 (4)	100 (100)
Total	**4 (1.3)**	**253 (84.3)**	**14 (4.7)**	**29 (9.7)**	**300 (100)**

Table 14:   Types of Supervision from Students

School Type	Internal (%)	External (%)	Both (%)	None (%)	Total (%)
Public	62 (31.79)	30 (15.38)	101 (51.79)	2 (1.03)	195 (100)
Private	36 (36)	3 (3)	51 (51)	10 (10)	100 (100)
Total	**98 (33.2)**	**33 (11.2)**	**152 (51.5)**	**12 (4.1)**	**295 (100)**

The data in Tables 13 and 14 clearly indicate that respondents both teachers and students from both public and private basic schools of the Cape

70

Coast metropolis are of the view that a lot of emphasis are put on both internal and external supervision in the Cape Coast Metropolitan basic schools. About 80% of teachers and 51.79% of students from the public schools who responded to the questionnaire felt that both internal and external supervision were being emphasised. Again, about 93% of teachers and 51% of students from the private schools who responded to the questionnaire also felt that both internal and external supervision were being emphasised.

Table 15:   Frequency of Metropolitan Visits

School Type	Monthly (%)	Quarterly (%)	Once a Year (%)	Rarely (%)	Total (%)
Public	35	143	6	13	197
	(17.77)	(72.59)	(3.05)	(6.60)	(100)
Private	17	31	43	9	100
	(17.00)	(31)	(43)	(9)	(100)
Total	**52**	**174**	**49**	**22**	**297**
	(17.1)	**(58)**	**(16.1)**	**(7.1)**	**(100)**

Table 15 gave a clearer picture of the external supervision that was being undertaken. About 72.59% of teachers from the public school felt that there were quarterly visits from the metro office while 43% teachers from the private school felt that such visits were rather annual.

Table 16:   **Frequency of Regional Visit**

School Type	Monthly (%)	Quarterly (%)	Once a Year (%)	Rarely (%)	Total (%)
Public	68	39	26	60	193
	(35.23)	(20.21)	(13.47)	(31.09)	(100)
Private	44	24	17	12	97
	(45.36)	(24.74)	(17.5)	(12.37)	(100)
Total	**112**	**63**	**43**	**72**	**290**
	(37.1)	**(21)**	**(14.1)**	**(24)**	**(100)**

Table 17:   **Form of External Supervision**

School Type	Casual (%)	Occasional (%)	Regular (%)	Intensive (%)	Total (%)
Public	6	43	76	74	199
	(3.02)	(21.61)	(38.19)	(37.19)	(100)
Private	2	27	43	28	100
	(2)	(27)	(43)	(28)	(100)
Total	**8**	**70**	**119**	**102**	**299**
	(2.2)	**(23.1)**	**(39.2)**	**(34)**	**(100)**

Again 35.23% of teachers from the public school and 45.36% of teachers from the private school responded that visits from the regional office occurred monthly. As to the nature of external supervision, about 38.19% and 43% of teachers from the public and private schools respectively who responded indicated

that the visits from the metropolitan office were regular visits while 37.19% and 28% of teachers from both schools described them as intensive visits. About 21.61% and 27% of respondents from the public and private schools respectively indicated that the visits from the regional office were in the form of occasional supervision while about 3.02% and 2% of respondents from the public and private schools respectively describe them as casual visits.

The result about the metropolitan office was confirmed when the researcher interacted with the metropolitan office. The researcher had gone to the metropolitan office with an interview guide for the circuit supervisors. The researcher was told by the circuit supervisors that the metropolitan inspectorate division solely deals with the basic schools. One circuit supervisor admitted that; "We actually have a thorough inspection in the basic schools but mostly with the public basic schools". He added that "We intervene especially when the private schools are not performing". They also visit the private basic schools to take enrolment on both teachers and head teachers.

The first research question sought to find out the types of supervision being emphasised in the public and private basic schools of the Cape Coast metropolis. This question has been answered. It is both internal and external supervision that is emphasised. This situation appears to conform to the view held by Boardman (1953) that both internal and external supervision must be emphasised if educational goals are to be attained.

Brickell (2000) thinks that it is the external supervisor who sets the tone for instructional improvement in the schools. Again, Halpin (1977) maintains that

external supervision must complement the role and duties of the internal supervisors by providing professional advice and guidance to teachers.

<p align="center">**Involvement of those Responsible in Supervision**</p>

Research Question 2: The second research question sought to find out how those responsible for supervision in both public and private Junior High School level actually doing what is expected of them.

The personalities normally associated with internal supervision are the following:

1. Headteachers

2. Assistant Headteachers

3. Class teachers

4. Teachers on duty

5. Student prefects.

The researcher sought from students and teachers about the involvement of these personalities in supervision in both public and private basic schools and the rating of their individual performance as far as internal supervision was concerned. The results are presented in tables 15,16,17,18 and 19.

Table 18:   Headteacher's Involvement in Supervision

Headmaster Involvement	Public	%	Private	%	Total
No	11	5.5	2	2	13
Yes	189	94.5	98	98	287
Total	**200**		**100**		**300**

Table 19:   Assistant Headteacher's Involvement in Supervision

Assistant Headteacher's Involvement	Public	%	Private	%	Total
No	38	19.49	37	40.66	75
Yes	157	80.51	54	59.34	211
Total	**192**	**100**	**91**	**100**	**286**

Table 20:   Class Teacher's Involvement in Supervision

Class Teacher Involvement	Public	%	Private	%	Total
No	44	22.45	59	59	103
Yes	152	77.55	41	41	193
Total	**196**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**296**

Table 21:   Teacher on Duty's Involvement in Supervision

Teacher on duty Involvement	Public	%	Private	%	Total
No	51	25.63	31	31	82
Yes	148	74.37	69	69	217
Total	**199**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**299**

Table 22: Student's Involvement in Supervision

Students Involvement	Public	%	Private	%	Total
No	86	43.43	23	23	109
Yes	112	61.62	77	77	189
Total	**198**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**298**

The data indicates the following:

Respondents confirmed almost all the personalities as being involved in supervision. However quite a significant number (43.43%) of respondents from the public school did not see students as being involved in supervision. It is quite significant that as many as 59% of respondents from the private school did not see class teachers as supervisors. Assistant headteachers from both the public and the private basic schools were also considered by the majority of respondents (80.51%) and (59.3%) respectively as being involved in supervision. The individual rating of the various personalities would present a clearer picture.

Comparison of Supervisory Performances between Public and Private JHS

Rating of Headteachers' Performance in Supervision

Headteachers are expected to set the tone for all aspects of school activity. Specific duties of the headteacher that the researcher considers to be crucial in supervision were proposed to the respondents for rating. The following were the areas proposed.

1. Ensuring effective discipline in the school.

2. Active involvement in supervision.

3. Monitoring staff class attendance registers.

4. Checking student class attendance registers.

5. Involvement of staff in decision making.

6. Delegation of authority.

7. Disciplining teachers for absenteeism and lateness.

8. Commanding respect from teachers and students.

9. Visiting classrooms to observe teaching and learning activities on regular basis.

The ratings of teachers from both private and public basic schools have been merged in Table 20. To be able to distinguish between head teachers performance in private and public JHS, the test statistic used was the student's t-test at a 0.05 significant or alpha (α) level. A satisfactory performance ranges from a mean value of 3.00 and above while below a mean value of 3.00 is classified as an unsatisfactory performance.

Table 23:   Ratings of Headteacher's Performance in Supervision

	School Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	Sig.
Discipline	Public	200	4.62	.818	.058	22.334	.000
	Private	99	2.23	.967	3097	21.111	.000

Table 23 cont'd

Head actively	Public	200	4.46	1.021	.072	15.138	.000
	Private	99	2.51	1.101	.111	14.759	.000
Head monitors	Public	200	4.55	.923	.065	16.761	.000
	Private	99	2.32	1.346	.135	14.822	.000
Head check	Public	200	4.37	.870	.062	15.886	.000
	Private	100	2.60	.985	.098	15.244	.000
Head involve	Public	198	4.31	.978	.070	14.268	.000
	Private	100	2.50	1.142	.114	13.565	.000
Head delegate	Public	200	4.38	.949	.067	17.386	.000
	Private	99	2.24	1.098	.110	16.550	.000
Head late	Public	196	3.91	1.106	.079	11.870	.000
	Private	100	2.30	1.096	.110	11.902	.000
Head enjoys	Public	194	4.30	.902	.065	17.772	.000
	Private	100	2.13	1.152	.115	16.454	.000
Head visits	Public	196	2.05	1.404	.072	3.427	.001
	Private	100	3.56	1.395	.139	3.098	.002

Source: Fieldwork.

The results of the rating of the head teacher as shown in Table 23 reveal that all the aspect of head teacher's involvement between the public and the private J H S showed significant differences. This is because the 2-tailed test from the table indicates that each of the tests was below the 0.05 alpha level used. From the results, head teachers performance in supervision from the public

schools is better as compared to that of the private schools. This is due to the fact that almost all the aspects of supervision of the public school unlike the private school had a mean value above 3.00.

The impression gathered from the results is that head teachers from the public schools involve staff in decision making and delegation of authority. They do not visit classrooms to observe teaching and learning on regular basis. But delegation of authority without monitoring to get feedback would amount to shifting of responsibilities since headteachers are ultimately accountable for all school activities. Headteachers from the public schools are therefore busy with administrative duties and are satisfied with delegating the work of supervision to others.

Rating of Assistant Headteacher's Performance in Supervision

The assistant headteachers from both public and private JHS were rated in the following areas.

1. Ensuring early release of teaching time table.

2. Checking the effective use of contact hours by teachers.

3. Visiting classrooms to observe teaching/learning activities.

4. Monitoring staff/student class attendance.

5. Ensuring up to date records of continuous assessment.

6. Drawing effective exams timetable and ensuring strict supervision of exams.

7. Ensuring that teachers mark exams scripts and submit assessment on time.

8. Seeing to the prompt dispatch of student reports.

9. Ensuring provision of teaching/learning materials.

10. Discussing teachers work individually or in groups.

11. Allocating subjects and assigning teaching periods.

12. Inspecting scheme of work of teachers.

13. Conducting teachers' appraisal for teachers.

14. Arranging for in-service training or refresher courses for teachers.

The ratings of teachers of both public and private schools are presented below. Again the student's t-test at a 0.05 significant or alpha (∝) level was used to distinguish between the assistant headteachers performance of both public and private schools. Where the mean shows 3.00 and above is a satisfactory performance. Below 3.00 is an unsatisfactory performance.

Table 24:   Rating of the Assistant Headteacher's Involvement

	School Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	Sig.
Asst. ensures	Public	200	3.90	1.160	.082	3.146	.002
	Private	99	3.44	1.214	.122	3.098	.002
Asst. check	Public	200	3.70	1.076	.076	1.461	.145
	Private	99	3.48	1.343	.135	1.356	.177
Asst. visits	Public	200	3.00	1.313	.093	-3.387	.001
	Private	96	3.54	1.273	.130	-3.424	.001
Asst. monitors	Public	200	3.26	1.278	.090	-2.050	.041
	Private	99	3.60	1.384	.139	-1.995	.048

Table 24 cont'd

Asst. register	Public	200	3.16	1.201	.085	-.724	.470
	Private	99	3.27	1.391	.140	-.689	.492
Asst. record	Public	200	3.62	1.155	.082	2.261	.024
	Private	94	3.28	1.282	.132	2.178	.031
Asst. time	Public	197	3.68	1.354	.096	.981	.327
	Private	93	3.51	1.419	.147	.965	.336
Asst. exam	Public	200	3.52	1.280	.090	.886	.376
	Private	93	3.38	1.318	.137	.876	.382
Asst. prompt	Public	195	3.52	1.329	.095	-.553	.581
	Private	99	3.61	1.211	.122	-.570	.569
Asst. TLM	Public	200	3.46	1.370	.097	1.655	.099
	Private	96	3.19	1.308	.134	1.682	.094
Asst. meets	Public	200	3.23	1.310	.093	-1.809	.071
	Private	100	3.53	1.439	.144	-1.753	.081
Asst. periods	Public	195	3.34	1.392	.100	-2.316	.021
	Private	100	3.72	1.232	.123	-2.408	.017
Asst. inspects	Public	196	2.78	1.373	.098	-5.651	.000
	Private	99	3.71	1.239	.125	-5.844	.000
Asst. conduct	Public	193	2.68	1.369	.099	-5.071	.000
	Private	97	3.55	1.362	.138	-5.080	.000

Table 24 cont'd

Asst. in-service	Public	196	2.72	1.467	.105	-4.894	.000
	Private	100	3.58	1.357	.136	-5.019	.000

In Table 24, the assistant head teacher ensuring early release of teaching time table at the beginning of the academic year generated a mean value of 3.90 for the public JHS and 3.44 for the private JHS. The t-test statistic used showed a significant difference between the public and the private schools because the t-test generated 3.146 and the 2- tailed significant level was 0.02. Again, the assistant headteacher checking on the effective use of contact hours by teachers generated a mean value of 3.70 for the public JHS and 3.48 for the private JHS. The t-test statistic used showed a value of 1.356 and the 2.tailed significant level was .177. This means their difference is not significant because the 2.tailed significant level is above the alpha level used. It was also observed from the table that the assistant head teacher visiting classrooms to observe teaching and learning activities on regular bases had a mean value of 3.00 for the public schools and 3.54 for the private schools .The difference here is significant using the t-test statistic because the t-test recorded -3.424 and the 2-tailed significant level was .001which is below the alpha level used.

In the table, the assistant head teacher monitoring staff attendance register daily and frequently generated a mean value of 3.26 for the public schools and 3.60 for the private schools. The t-test statistic showed that the difference between the public and the private schools is significant because the t-test generated -2.050 and the 2-tailed significant level was .041 which is below the alpha level used.

In the table, the assistant head teacher ensuring that school- based assessment records are kept up to date generated a mean value of 3.62 for the public schools and 3.28 for the private schools. The t-test for equality of means also generated 2.261 and the 2- tailed significant level was .031 which is below the alpha level used. This shows that the difference between the public and the private schools is significant.

According to the table, the assistant head teacher allocating subjects and assigning teaching periods generated a mean value of 3. 3.34 For the public schools and 3.72 for the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, the difference between the public and private schools is significant because the t-test generated -2.316 and the 2-tailed significant level was 0.21 which is below the alpha level used.

According to the table, the assistant head teacher inspecting scheme of work of teachers had a mean value of 2.78 for the public schools and 3.71 for the private schools. The t-test statistic also showed that the difference between the public and the private is significant. This is because the t-test generated -5.651 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used.

Again, it was realised that the assistant head teacher conducting teacher's appraisal generated a mean value of 2.68 for the public schools and 3.55 for the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, the difference between the public and the private schools is significant because the t-test showed -5.071 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used.

Also, the assistant head teacher arranging for in-service training or refresher courses for teachers had mean value of 2.72 for the public schools and 3.58 for the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, the difference between the public and the private schools is significant. This is because the t-test generated -4.894 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used.

It was again realised from the table that the assistant head teacher checking on effective use of contact hours had a mean value of 3.70 for the public schools and 3.48 for the private schools. The t-test statistic showed that the difference between the private and not significant because the t-test generated 1.461 and the 2- tailed significant level was 0.1 45 which is above the alpha level used.

The table also showed that the assistant head teacher monitoring student's class attendance register daily and frequently had a mean value of 3.16 for the public schools and 3.027 for the private schools. The t-test statistic generated -.724 and the 2-tailed significant level was 470 Which is above the alpha level used. This shows that the difference between the two schools is not significant.

The assistant head teacher drawing an effective exams time table and ensuring strict supervision of exams generated a mean value of 3.68 for the public schools and 3.51 for the private schools. The difference between the public and the private schools was not significant because the t-test statistic showed.981 and the 2-tailed significant level was .336 which is above the alpha level used.

The table also recorded that the assistant head teacher ensuring that teachers actually mark examination scripts and submit assessment records on time, had a mean value of 3.52 for the public schools and 3.38 for the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, it was realised that the difference between these two schools is not significant because the t-test showed .886 and the 2-tailed significant level was .376 which is above the alpha level used.

The assistant head teacher seeing to the prompt dispatch of students reports had a mean value of 3.52 for the public schools and 3.61 for the private schools. The t-test statistic used showed that the difference between the public and the private schools is not significant because the t-test generated -.553 and the 2-tailed significant level was .581 which is above the alpha level used.

From the table, it was realised that the assistant head teacher ensuring the provision of relevant learning materials generated a mean value of 3.46 for the public schools and 3.19 for the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, it was realised that the difference between the public and the private schools is not significant because the t-test generated 1.655 and the 2-tailed significant level was .099 as this is above the alpha level used.

According to the table, the assistant head teacher using individual and/or group meetings with teachers to discuss their work had a mean value of 3.23 for the public schools and 3.53 for the private schools. When the t-test statistic was used, it was realised that here, the difference between these two schools is not significant. This was due to the fact that the t-test generated was -1.809 and the 2-tailed significant level was .071 as this is above the 0.05 alpha level used.

From the responses (Table 21) the assistant headteachers in the public and private schools are all performing better in the following aspects of supervision: ensuring early release of teaching time table; visiting classrooms for observation; monitoring staff attendance; keeping of school-based records; allocation of subjects and assigning periods. Although the 2-tailed test from the table indicates that all the above mentioned aspects of the assistant headteachers involvement in supervision showed a significant difference because the tests were below the alpha level used, their performance ratings were satisfactory. Thus, their mean values were above 3.00. The impression then is that the assistant headteachers from both the public and the private schools rely on the records kept by class prefects to determine the effective use of contact hours by teachers. But just how accurate are these records?

The other aspects of performance being; checking on effective use of contact hours of teachers; monitoring students' attendance; ensuring strict supervision of exams; ensuring that teachers actually mark examination scripts and submit assessment records on time; seeing to the dispatch of students report; provision of teaching and learning materials; meeting with teachers to discuss work; showed no significant difference and the ratings of their performance were also satisfactory.

However, from the responses, the assistant headteachers from the private Junior High Schools are performing satisfactorily as compared to the assistant headteachers from the public Junior High Schools in the following aspects of supervision; inspection of scheme of work; conducting staff appraisal and

arranging for in-service training. The rating of the performance of the assistant headteachers from the public school is rather unsatisfactory in the mentioned aspects of supervision.

Appraisal of Teachers' Work

Students were given the opportunity to rate teachers' work by responding to the following;

1. Regularity in class

2. Punctuality

3. Teaching for the whole period

4. Following the syllabus

5. Lessons being understandable

6. Use of teaching aids

7. Answering questions well in class

8. Giving exercises and assignments

9. Marking and discussing exercises

10. Having time for weak students

11. Time for students after class

The student's t-test at a 0.05 alpha level was used. Satisfactory performance is rated from mean value of 3.00 and above while a mean value below 3.00 is considered an unsatisfactory performance. This is presented in Table 25.

Table 25:   Appraisal of Teachers from Students

	School Type	N	Mean	t	Sig.
Teachers regular	Public	200	4.3250	2.886	.004
	Private	100	3.9800	2.733	.007
Teachers punctual	Public	200	4.0250	2.072	.039
	Private	100	3.7600	2.006	.046
Lessons understandable	Public	200	4.0700	1.389	.166
	Private	100	3.8800	1.309	.192
Use aids to illustrate	Public	200	3.5800	2.504	.013
	Private	100	3.1900	2.507	.013
Teachers answers questions well	Public	200	4.2350	2.027	.044
	Private	100	3.9600	1.844	.067
Regular exercises	Public	200	4.1550	6.539	.000
	Private	100	3.2700	6.347	.000
Teachers mark discuss exercises	Public	200	3.8050	-.948	.344
	Private	100	3.9400	-.908	.365
Have time for weak performers	Public	200	3.6650	2.333	.020
	Private	100	3.3200	2.229	.027

Table 25 cont'd

Teacher availability after class	Public	200	3.4850	2.937	.004
	Private	100	3.0300	2.846	.005

The regularity of teachers to class generated a mean value of 4.3250 for the public schools and 3.9800 for the private schools. The t-test statistic recorded that their difference is significant because the t-test generated 2.886 and the 2-tailed significant level was .004 which is below the alpha level used.

The punctuality of teachers to class also generated a mean value of 4.0250 from the public schools and 3.7600 from the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, the difference is significant because the t-test had a value of 2.072 and the 2-tailed significant level was .039 which is below the 0.05 alpha level used.

To test for whether teachers teach for the whole period, a mean value of 4.2900 was generated from the public schools and 3.8900 from the private schools. The t-test statistic used showed that the difference is significant since the t-test had a value of 3.283 and the 2 –tailed significant level was .001 which was below the alpha level used.

To check on whether lessons taught are understandable, a mean value of 4.0700 was generated from the public schools and 3.8800 from the private schools. The t-test statistic showed that their difference is not significant. This is due to the fact that the t-test gave a value of 1.389 and the 2-tailed significant level was .166 which is above the alpha level used.

From the table, the use of teaching aids to illustrate generated a mean value of 3.5800 and 3.1900 from the public and private schools respectively. The t-test statistic used showed that the difference is significant since the t-test had a value of 2.507 and the 2-tailed significant level was .013 which is below the alpha level used.

To check on whether teachers answer questions well had a mean value of 4.2350 and 3.9600 from the public and private schools respectfully. Using the t-test statistic, the difference here is not significant. This is the fact that the t-test generated a value of 2.027 and the 2-tailed significant level was .044 which is above the alpha level used.

Teachers giving exercises regularly generated a mean value of 4.1550 and 3.2700 from the public and private schools respectively. The t-test statistic used showed that the difference here is significant. This is true because the t-test had a value of 6.539 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used.

For teachers to mark and discuss exercises generated a mean value of 3.8050 from the public school and 3.9400 from the private school. The t-test statistic used recorded that the difference is not significant because the t-test generated a value of -.948 and the2-tailed significant level was .344 which is above the alpha level used.

Whether teachers have time for less performing students generated a mean value of 3.6650 and 3.3200 from the public schools and the private schools respectively. Using the t-test statistic, the difference is significant. This is so

because the t-test had a value of 2.333 and the 2-tailed significant level was .020 which is below the alpha level used.

For teachers to be available to students after class hours had a mean value of 3.4850 from the public schools and 3.0300 from the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, the difference is significant because the t-test generated a value of 2.937 and the 2-tailed significant level was .004 which is below the alpha level used.

From the responses, class teachers from both public and private J.H.S performed satisfactorily in all the aspects. However, performance of teachers from both schools with regards to the use of teaching aids, giving exercises and assignments, marking and discussing exercises and having time for weak students needed to be looked at more.

Students' Involvement in Supervision

The extent of students' involvement in supervision was sought from two sources- teachers and students themselves. Teachers were asked to give views on the following:

1. Involvement of student leaders in supervision.

2. Support of students work in supervision by authorities.

3. Effectiveness of students in controlling other students.

4. Accurate reporting on punctuality and attendance of teachers to class by class captains.

5. Satisfaction of teachers with performance of student leaders.

The ratings from teachers of both private and public schools are presented below. The students T-test at a 0.05 significant level was used and recorded in table 18. Where the mean records 3.00 and above is classified as a satisfactory performance; However, where the mean generates below 3.00 is classified as unsatisfactory performance.

Table 26:   Views of Teachers on Students' Involvement in Supervision

	School Type	N	Mean	T	Sig.
Stds leaders	Public	194	3.07	-5.399	.000
	Private	100	4.00	-5.653	.000
Authorities	Public	191	3.32	-2.766	.006
	Private	97	3.78	-2.822	.005
Stdscon	Public	196	3.44	-1.158	.248
	Private	100	3.62	-1.093	.276
Class captain	Public	195	3.31	-2.657	.008
	Private	100	3.73	-2.713	.007
Trs. satisfied	Public	195	3.20	-3.379	.001
	Private	99	3.71	-3.490	.001

From the table, it was realised that whether student leaders are involved in supervision had a mean value of 3.07 from the public schools and 4.00 from the private schools. The t-test statistic used showed that their difference is significant

because the t- test statistic showed -5.653 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used.

Looking at whether the school authorities recognize and support the work of students in supervision had a mean value of 3.32 from the public schools and 3.78 from the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, it was realised that the difference is not significant. This is so because the t-test statistic recorded -2.822 and the 2-tailed significant level was .006 which is above the alpha level used.

To measure student leaders' effectiveness in controlling other students had a mean value of 3.44 from the public schools and 3.62 from the private schools. The t-test statistic showed that their difference is not significant because the t-test statistic generated -1.158 and the 2-tailed significant level was .248 which is above the alpha level used.

From the table, the class captains reporting accurately on the punctuality and attendance of teachers to class had a mean value of 3.31 from the public schools and 3.73 from the private schools. Using the t- test statistic, it was realised that the difference is not significant. This is so because the t-test generated -2.713 and the 2-tailed significant level was .008 as this is above the alpha level used.

To measure whether teachers are satisfied with the performance of student leaders in supervision had a mean value of 3.20 from the public schools and 3.71 from the private schools. The t-test statistic used showed that the difference is significant because the t-test statistic generated -3.490 and the 2-tailed significant level was .001 which is below the alpha level used.

The responses of teachers as indicated in table 23 show that in the private and public schools, all the student prefects are satisfactorily involved in supervision. This means that all the aspects of supervision from the public and the private schools had a mean value above 3.00. However, where student leaders are involved in supervision and whether teachers are satisfied with the performance of student leaders in supervision showed significant differences between the public and the private schools. The impression is that student leaders from the public schools perform rather better in these aspects of supervision than their counterparts from the private schools.

The other aspects of supervision responded by teachers showed no significant difference between the public and the private schools. This means that teachers from both public and private schools recognise and support the work of students in supervision.

Students themselves were asked to rate their involvement in supervision using the following;

1.   Involvement of school prefects in supervision,

2.   Ability of student prefects to check punctuality of fellow student to class,

3.   Ability to check absenteeism of students,

4.   Student prefects able to prevent students from staying in the classrooms,

5.   Students involved in extra curricula activities,

6.   Class prefects able to maintain order in their classes,

7.   Class prefects able to record accurately punctuality and attendance of both students and teachers,

8.	Students cooperate with prefects in their work as student leaders,

9.	School administration support student prefects' work in supervision.

**Table 27:	Students' Responses on their own Involvement in Supervision**

	School Type	N	Mean	T	Sig.
Students leaders	Public	200	4.0750	-.867	.386
	Private	100	4.1900	-.940	.348
Check punctuality	Public	200	3.6650	3.150	.002
	Private	100	3.1700	3.154	.002
Check absenteeism	Public	200	3.1950	6.449	.000
	Private	100	2.0400	7.140	.000
Prevention in staying	Public	200	4.1050	-2.669	.008
	Private	100	4.5400	-3.008	.003
Extra curricula supervision	Public	200	3.3150	4.172	.000
	Private	100	2.5500	4.026	.000
CP maintenance of order	Public	200	4.1700	8.452	.000
	Private	100	2.8800	7.807	.000
Record of punctuality and teacher attendance	Public	200	3.6800	7.111	.000
	Private	100	2.4400	7.041	.000
Punctuality and attendance of students	Public	200	3.3950	6.862	.000
	Private	96	2.1667	7.300	.000
Students cooperation in supervision	Public	200	3.4300	6.810	.000
	Private	100	2.2100	6.953	.000
Administration support	Public	200	3.8300	3.252	.001
	Private	100	3.2800	3.308	.001

From the table, whether student leaders (prefects) are involved in supervision generated a mean value of 4.0750 and 4.1900 from the public and

private schools respectively. Using the t-test statistic, it was realised that their difference is not significant. This is because the T-test had a value of -.867 and the 2-tailed significant level was .386 which is more than the alpha level used.

Where student prefects are able to check on punctuality of their fellow students to class had a mean value of 3.6650 from the public schools and 3.1700 from the private schools. The T-test statistic used showed that the difference is significant and that the T-test generated a value of 3.150 and the 2-tailed significant level was .002 which is below or less than the alpha level used.

From the table, where student prefects are able to check on absenteeism generated a mean value of 3.1950 from the public schools and 2.0400 from the private schools. Using the t-test statistic, the difference here is significant. This is because the t-test had a value of 6.449 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is less than the alpha level used.

To check on whether student prefects are able to prevent their fellow students from staying in their classrooms during assemblies and other school gathering, generated a mean value of 4.1050 from the public schools and 4.5400 from the private schools. The t-test also had a value of -2.669 and the 2-tailed significant level was .008 which is less than the alpha level used. This means that their difference is significant.

Again, whether student prefects are used for extracurricular activities supervision generated a mean value of 3.3150 and 2.5500 from the public and the private schools respectively. The t-test statistic used showed that their difference

is significant. This is because the t-test had a value of 4.172 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is less than the alpha level used.

Where class prefects are able to maintain order in their classes, a mean value of 4.1700 from the public schools and 2.8800 from the private schools were realised. The t-test statistic also showed that their difference is significant since the t-test recorded a value of 8.452 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used.

From the table, whether class prefects are able to record accurately punctuality and attendance of teachers had a mean value of 3.6800 and 2.4400 from the public and the private schools respectively. The t-test statistic showed that their difference is significant. This is so because the t-test generated a value of 7.111 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used.

Where class prefects are able to record accurately punctuality and attendance of their fellow students also generated a mean value of 3.3950 and 2.1667 from the public and the private schools respectively. The t-test statistic also showed that their difference is significant because the t-test recorded a value of 6.862 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is less than the alpha level used.

To check on whether students co-operate with prefects in their work of supervision generated a mean value of 3.4300 and 2.2100 from the public and private schools respectively. Using the t-test statistic, it was realised that their difference here is significant since the t-test recorded 6.810 and the 2-tailed

significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used. This implies that students from the private school do not enjoy the cooperation of their fellow students in their work of supervision.

To assess whether school administration supports student prefects in their work of supervision generated a mean value of 3.8300 from the public schools and 3.2800 from the private schools. The t-test statistic used also recorded that the difference is significant. This is because the t-test had a value of 3.252 and the 2-tailed significant level was .001 which is below or less than the alpha level used.

The results in Tables 23 and 24 coming from teachers and students respectively show clearly that even though students are involved in supervision and are supported by school administration, they do not enjoy the cooperation of their fellow students so their work is largely ineffective. It would therefore be a mistake for school administration to assign them supervisory work without monitoring closely to find out how effectively their work is performed.

Challenges Faced in Supervision

Research Question 3: What are the challenges confronting supervisors in conducting their work at the Private and Public junior high school level in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

The researcher began inquiry by seeking through items in the questionnaire the position of teachers with regards to some negative perceptions that hinders supervision. Respondents were given the following alternatives to choose from.

-      Strongly Agree   (S A)

-      Agree   (A)

-      Uncertain   (U)

-      Disagree   (D)

-      Strongly Disagree   (SDA)

The responses were collated using the students' t-test statistic at a 0.05 significant level. The statements respondents were to choose from are the following.

1.   "Supervision is an unnecessary interference in the work of the teacher and it succeeds only in finding faults."

2.   "A professional teacher does not need supervision but rather an adequate supply of the materials needed for teaching."

3.   "Many of the available supervisors lack the expert knowledge needed to undertake supervision."

4.   "The time chosen for supervision is often inconvenient because the teacher is not consulted."

The responses of teachers to these statements are presented in table 22. The responses to the statements are classified as "agree" where the mean is above 3.00 and "disagree" where the mean is below 3.00.

Table 28:   **Challenges in Supervision**

	School Type	N	Mean	Std. Devi.	Std. Error Mean	T	Sig.
Work interfer	Public	199	2.31	1.372	.097	-.419	.676
	Private	100	2.38	1.254	.125	-.431	.667
Proftr	Public	200	2.38	1.561	.110	1.750	.081
	Private	100	2.07	1.094	.109	1.963	.051
Expert	Public	200	3.30	1.269	.090	5.661	.000
	Private	100	2.45	1.158	.116	5.837	.000
Time chosen	Public	198	3.79	1.312	.093	2.886	.004
	Private	100	3.32	1.340	.134	2.886	.005

Where supervision is an unnecessary interference in the work of the teacher and it succeeds only in finding faults generated a mean value of 2.31 from the public schools and 2.38 from the private schools. The t-test statistic used also generated -.431 and the 2-tailed significant level was .676 which is above the alpha level used. Therefore the difference between these two schools is not significant.

Where a professional teacher does not need supervision but rather an adequate supply of the materials needed for teaching generated a mean value of 2.38 from the public schools and 2.07 from the private schools. From the t-test statistics, it was realised that the difference is not significant because the t-test statistic gave a value of 1.963 and the 2-tailed significant level was .081 which is above the alpha level used.

Where many of the available supervisors lack the expert knowledge needed to undertake supervision generated a mean value of 3.30 from the public schools and 2.45 from the private schools using the t-test statistic, the difference is significant because the t-test statistic generated a value of 5.837 and the 2-tailed significant level was .000 which is below the alpha level used.

Where the time chosen for supervision is often inconvenient because the teacher is not consulted had a mean value of 3.79 from the public schools and 3.32 from the private schools. The t-test statistic recorded a value of 2.886 and the 2-tailed significant level was .005. This signifies that the difference between the public and the private schools is significant.

The results from Table 22 shows that teachers from both public and private Junior High School disagree(mean 2.31 and 2.38 respectively) with the stereotype view that supervision is an unnecessary interference in the work of the teacher and a means of finding fault. Respondent teachers from both public and private Junior High School also disagreed (mean 2.38 and 2.07 respectively) with the notion that professional teachers do not need supervision. The implication is that teachers know the value of supervision and are open to it. Their attitude to supervision per se is not a problem.

However, it is quite significant that teachers from the public school (mean 3.30) felt that many of the available supervisors lack the expert knowledge needed for effective supervision. What would be their attitude to such supervisors then? How much would they be willing to learn from them? Would they cooperate with such supervisors? This obviously poses a challenge.

Apart from answering the above questionnaire, respondents (circuit supervisors) were given the chance to state whatever they considered to be challenges facing the supervision work. The responses given were categorised into two. Challenges with external supervision and those with internal supervision.

External:

a.   Lack of adequate and qualified personnel. The point here is that it is because we do not have enough qualified supervisors at the metro and regional offices that external supervision is so infrequent. External supervision must possess expert knowledge to be able to help the classroom teacher.

b.   Lack of adequate logistics. The main problem seems to be that of means of transport to enable supervisors move easily from school to school.

c.   Delay in the payment of financial claims submitted by supervisors to higher authorities.

Internal:

a.   Poor conditions of service. Many teachers resort to all kinds of jobs outside the classroom to supplement their incomes. They hardly have the time and attention for effective supervision.

b.   High student-teacher ratio. Enrolment levels have risen tremendously in all schools. Unfortunately staff quotas have not matched the student population. The result is that the students do not receive adequate attention and supervision.

c. Lack of active involvement of head teachers in supervision. The head teachers are expected to play leading roles and also coordinate the work of others. If all they do is to delegate their functions, then subordinates will tend to lose their enthusiasm.

d. Lack of recognition for hardworking teachers who undertake supervisory roles all the time. Such teachers soon lose their enthusiasm if no form of reward – intrinsic or extrinsic is forth coming.

e. Lack of sanctions for teachers who fail to engage in supervision. The absence of any sanctions make teachers think they can always get away with shirking their responsibilities. Those who are serious may begin to feel cheated.

f. Lack of effective support for student prefects by authorities. Students tend to arrogate authority to themselves and often times begin to abuse it. Their peers also tend to undermine their work.

Views on Enhancing Supervisory Practices in the Basic Schools

Research Question 4: How can the supervisory practices be enhanced in the Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Some useful suggestions were put forward by respondents to help improve supervision in the Metropolis. Some were general whilst others sought to address specific problems. Heads of institutions must play leading role in supervision to:

i. Improve the condition of both teachers and supervisors so that everyone is well motivated to do their jobs.

ii.   Provide adequate logistic support for supervisors. The main headache of supervisors appears to be transport.

iii.   Increase the number of qualified supervisors. That is more people must be trained and equipped for the task. This implies that the schools would be better catered for.

iv.   Reward hardworking staff who are actively involved in supervision and those who fail in their assigned duties must be reprimanded.

v.   Provide in-service training for teachers, heads and supervisors to increase their skills.

vi.   Give orientation to student prefects on jobs assigned to them and they must be monitored constantly to ensure that they do the right thing.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview of the Study

The aim of the study was to find out the state of supervision in the public and private Junior High Schools in Cape-Coast Metropolis. The critical research questions were the following.

1.   What are the types of supervision being emphasised in the public and private Junior High School?

2.   How are those responsible for supervision actually doing what is expected of them at the public and private Junior High School level?

3.   What are the challenges confronting supervisors in conducting their work at the public and private Junior High School level?

4.   How can supervisory practices be enhanced in Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

The design used in the collection of data was descriptive survey. The study included twenty private Junior High Schools and forty public Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

The target population included the following; all the six Circuit Supervisors, the headteachers, the assistant headteachers, teachers and student prefects in the public and private JHS in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The sample

included all the six circuit supervisors, the headteachers, the assistant headteachers, three teachers each from the selected JHS from the public and the private schools, five student prefects each from the public and private Junior High Schools selected. In all there were six hundred and six (606) respondents engaged in the study.

The instruments used in the collection of data were guided interview, questionnaires and documents. A pilot study was conducted at the Peter B. A. Holdbrook Smith Academic Complex (private) and Elmina Methodist .A. Junior High School (public) to test the validity of the instruments used for the study.

For each of the schools, the researcher administered the questionnaires and collected them on the same day except for a few teachers that personal follow up had to be made at a later date and the return rate was 100%. Percentages and the student T-test statistic at a 0.05 significant or alpha level were used in the analysis and discussion.

Summary of the Findings

Analysis of the data revealed the following:

1.   The first research question sought to find out the types of supervision being emphasised in the public and private Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The study shows that it is both internal and external supervision even though, internal supervision is much common and intensive in the private Junior High School in the Metropolis as against both internal and external supervision in public Junior High School. External supervision is however uncommon in private Junior High

Schools. This situation appears to conform to the view held by Boardman et al (1953) that both internal and external supervision must be emphasised if educational goals are to be attained. Brickel (1961) also thinks that it is the external supervision that sets the tone for instructional improvements in the schools. Again Halpin (1956) maintains that external supervision must complement the role and duties of the internal supervisor by providing professional advice and guidance to teachers.

2. The second research question sought to find out how those responsible for supervision were actually doing what was expected of them. The study shows that whereas Headteachers, Assistant headteachers, teachers on duty, class teachers and student prefects from both public and private Junior High Schools were all involved in supervision in one way or the other, their performance ratings were quite a different matter.

a. Headteachers from the public schools were judged not to be involved directly in supervision but rather relying on delegation of authority for work to be done. For instance, the study shows that they do not visit the classrooms to obtain first hand information about teaching and learning activities. The G.E.S Council (1999) outlined ten main tasks for school heads as chief executives of their institution. The tasks could be summed up as the provision of efficient and effective supervision of instruction in the schools. Musaazi (1982) defined supervision as "all actions taken to improve or ensure the achievement of instructional objectives when teaching and learning are in progress."

b.   Assistant headteachers from both private and public Junior High Schools are shown by the study to be the most effectively involved in supervision. Most of school activities are sustained by their supervisory activity. They are effectively the symbols of authority and discipline. They are simply indispensable. However, functions normally expected of the assistant headteachers from the public Junior High Schools such as the inspection of scheme of work of teachers, conduction of teachers' appraisal and the facilitation of in-service training and refresher causes of teachers were scarcely or poorly carried out.

c.   Class teachers from both the private and the public Junior High Schools performed well in punctuality, regularity to class and teaching for the whole period. However, in all the schools, the performance of teachers with regards to the use of teaching and learning aids, giving exercises and assignments, marking and discussing exercises and having time for weak students needed to be improved.

d.   Student prefects in all the schools covered by the study are involved in supervision if supervision means controlling and directing others. The role is important in so far as it helps to make students available for effective use of instructional time. The study revealed that teachers do not consider the record keeping of students on punctuality and regularity of both students and teachers as reliable enough. Student prefects feel handicapped in many ways and do not think they enjoy the fullest co-operation of the authorities.

3.   Challenges confronting the work of supervision are categorised into two-challenges with external supervision and those with internal supervision.

External:

Lack of adequate and qualified personnel; Lack of logistics, like means of transport and the maintenance of it; Heavy work load that is large number of schools to be visited by same team of inspectors-leading to fatigue; Delay in payment of financial claims by supervisors.

Internal:

High student-teacher ratio; Poor condition of service; Lack of motivation; Lack of recognition for hardworking teachers; Disunity among staff and heads; Lack of sanctions for teachers failing to participate in supervision.

4.   Some useful suggestions were put forward by respondents to help improve supervision in the metropolis. Some were general whilst others sought to address specific problems. Heads of institutions must play leading role in supervision to:

i.   Improve the condition of both teachers and supervisors so that everyone is well motivated to do their jobs.

ii.   Provide adequate logistic support for supervisors. The main headache of supervisors appears to be transport.

iii. Increase the number of qualified supervisors. That is more people must be trained and equipped for the task. This implies that the schools would be better catered for.

iv.   Reward hardworking staff who are actively involved in supervision and those who fail in their assigned duties must be reprimanded.

v.   Organize in-service training for teachers, heads and supervisors to increase their skills.

vi.   Give student prefects orientation on jobs assigned to them and they must be monitored constantly to ensure that they do the right thing.

Conclusions

From the data collected and analysed and the findings made, the following conclusions were reached. Both internal and external supervision exist at the private and public Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. However, internal supervision is more commonly practiced especially in the private Junior High Schools relative to external supervision. Besides, internal supervision was both intensive and effective in private Junior High Schools as compared to both internal and external supervision in public Junior High Schools.

Besides the aforementioned both public and private Junior High Schools in the Metropolis lack adequate human and material resources to effectively conduct school supervision. Transport for external supervision is lacking and there are inadequate training workshops to equip supervisors with competent supervisory skills.

Another major conclusion worth stating is the fact that there is lack of adequate motivation for the actors in the supervisory process. Award schemes and other incentives are worth considering if actors in the supervisory process are to give up their best.

Also worth mentioning is the widespread use of traditional methods of supervision which tend to perpetuate master-servant relationship between supervisors and teachers rather than a co-operative relationship. Clinical supervision should be the better alternative.

Lastly but not the least is the need for the serious involvement of government and all stakeholders of education to ensure an effective and efficient supervision of private and public Junior High Schools in the Metropolis.

Recommendations

Taking into consideration the findings and the conclusion drawn, the following recommendations and suggestions are being proposed:

1. That supervision in the Junior High Schools should be restructured to embrace new trends of supervision which emphasises teacher growth rather than teacher defects. This new trend in supervision commonly referred to as clinical supervision is diagnostic and would require intensive visits to enable supervisors and teachers to go through the pre-observation conference, observation analysis and strategy and the post observation conference stages. The short visits commonly used in the Junior High Schools as revealed by the study, pre-supposes that the traditional form of Supervision was in use.

2. Also supervisors should not be overloaded with work to enable them find adequate time to perform their supervisory duties effectively and efficiently. If supervisors have sufficient time they would be in a position to undertake intensive visits thereby adopting the clinical approach to

supervision which centres on teacher growth and diagnostic in nature. Alternatively, more supervisors should be appointed to supervise the schools.

3. It is further proposed that resident supervisors should be appointed and trained for the purpose. This would eliminate the difficulty by supervisors to reach schools located far away in rural areas for purposes of supervision to strengthen external supervision in the private Junior High Schools. Dedicated supervisors should be made responsible for the supervision of private schools to avoid the situation where the same supervisors are made responsible to both public and private schools; they tend to concentrate their attention on the public Junior High Schools to the detriment of the private Junior High Schools.

4. It is also recommended that headteachers be required to have regular appraisals of teachers and to provide timely feedback: This should be effectively monitored from the Metropolitan Education Offices. School awards should be given to best appraised teachers in order to make the appraisal system effective. Appraisal results should also be used as part of the process for selecting the Metropolitan best teacher.

5. The attitude of teachers in the public school could be tackled with motivational strategies that are more satisfying. The School Management Committee and the Parent- Teacher Association through the effort of the headteacher could decide on very simple package for teachers with the

best attitude which could be given at very short intervals so that they would be keenly competed for.

6. A pool of resource personnel in the various subject areas should be appointed in the metropolis so that office in charge of school supervision would depend on them to support demonstration lesson and their assessment whenever there is the need for such in the organisation of in-service training.

Areas for Further Research

The current study examined the supervisory practices of public and private Junior High Schools of the Cape Coast Metropolis of Ghana. The following recommendations for further studies are suggested;

1. A replication of the study should be carried out in a different region in the country. In such a study, the interview schedule and the questionnaire should be the main research instruments. The instruments should be made more elaborate to facilitate the research. This, it is hoped, will provide a more in-depth study into issues relating to supervision.

2. Further researchers should find out the influence of supervision on academic achievement in the basic schools.

REFERENCES

Acheson, A. A., & Gall, M. D. (1987). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teacher*. (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Addendum to Headteacher's Handbook. (2002). Accra: Ministry of Education.

Alfonso, R. J. Firth, G., & Neville, R. (1981). *Instructional Supervision: A behaviour system*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G., & Neville, R. (1984). The supervisory skill mix. *Educational Leadership, 41* (7), 16-18.

Anderson, L. W. (1984). *Time and school learning*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Andrew, W. H. (1965). *Theory and research in educational administration.* New York: The Macmillan Company.

Annoh, K. (1977). *Education*. Kumasi: Michael Adu Printing works.

Appleby, C. R. (1994). *Modern business administration*. (3rd ed). London: Pitman.

Arhin, A. K. (2001). *Supervision of instruction in Junior Secondary Schools in the Techiman District of Ghana*. Unpublished Thesis, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C.D. & Razavieh, A. (1990). *Introduction to research in education.* (4th ed.). Forth Worth: Holt Rinehart & Winston Inc.

Asiedu, B. D. (1997). *Supervision of Junior Secondary Schools in the New Juaben District of the Eastern Region of Ghana*. Unpublished Thesis, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.

Baldrige, J. V. (1971). *Theory and research in educational administration.* New

    York: Macmillan.

Becker, J. W. (1999). *Process used by superintendents for improvement of*

    education in selected schools Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Temple

    University, USA.

Beeby, C. E. (1977). *Planning and the educational administration*. Paris:

    UNESCO Publications.

Best, J. & Khan, J. (1989). *Research in education* (7th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice

    Hall.

Boafor, A. (1995). A strategy for quality education. *News letter of the Ghana*

    National Association of Teachers, 5 (10), 10-11

Boardman, W. C. (1953). *Democratic supervision in secondary schools*.

    Cambridge: Houghton Miffive Company.

Bolam, R. (1982). *In-service and training: A condition for educational change*.

    Paris: CERIOECD.

Brickell, H. M. (2000). *Organising New York State for educational change.* New

Burton, S. A., & Bruckner, J. R. (1995). *Supervision: A social process*. New

    York: Appleton Century Crafts Inc.

Campbell, R. F., Brigges, E. M., & Nystrand, R. O. (1977). *Introduction to*

    educational administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Chipman, J. N. (2001). *Research review on assessment of participatory*

    supervision. Wave of the future or oxymoron. Stephen P. Gordon

Chung, K. H. (1988). *Motivational theories and practices*. Columbus: Prentice.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical supervision.* Boston: Houghton Miffin Co.

Corey, S.M. (1990). *Action research to improve school practices*. New York: Teachers College, Colombia University.

Cubberly, E. N. (1990). *The principal and his school.* New York: Houghton Miffin Co.

Doll, R. C. (1983). *Supervision for staff development, ideas and applications*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Duncan, E. (1980). *Supervision-A phase in administration and supervision.* Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Elizabeth, B. (1998). *Improving learning through partnerships*. (ILP). Accra: The Mitchell Group Inc.

Elsbree, W. S., & Harold, J. M. (1967). *Elementary school administration and supervision.* New York: Litton Educational Publishing Inc.

Enus, F. (2000). Purpose of supervision. *The Canadian Administrator*, *2* (7).

Eye, G. G., & Netzer, L. A. (1972). *Supervision of instruction.* New York: Harper.

Eye, G. G. (1975). Problems in supervision. *The Canadian Administration, 15* (19).

Fagbulu, A. (1972). *Foundations of educational administration*. London: Collier Macmillan.

Farrant, J. S. (1986). *Principles and practice of education*. (6th ed.). London: Longman Group, UK limited.

Fielder, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Fink, A. (2001). *How to sample in survey*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fraenkel, J. K., & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Fraenkel, J. K., & Wallen, N.E. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Boston: McGraw-Hill

Giandomenico, M. (1988). *Performance monitoring and evaluation*. Accra: The Mitchell Group. Inc.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). *Supervision of instruction a development approach.* (2nd Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon. London Sydney Toronto.

Goldhammer, R. (1980). *Clinical Supervision.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Good, C. V. (1945). *Dictionary of education*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc.

Halpin, A.W. (1977). *The leadership behaviour of school superintendents.* The School Community Development Study Monograph, 4. Columbus: The Ohio State University.

Hammock, R. C., & Owings, R. S. (1955). *Supervising instruction in secondary schools.* New York: MacGraw Hill.

Harman, A. C. (1947). *Supervision in selected secondary schools* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Philadelphia, USA: University of Pennsylvania.

Harris, B. M. (1963). *Supervision behaviour in education.* Eaglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall in Eaglewood Cliffs.

Headteacher's Handbook (1994). Accra: Ministry of Education.

Hornby, A. S., Gatenby, E. V., & Wakefield, H. (1967). *Advanced learner dictionary of current English*. London: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, N.C. (1988). *Teachers supervision and evaluation practices 49* (12), 1-2.

Kahn, W. J. (1988). Cognitive-behavioral group counseling: An introduction. *The School Counselor 35,* 343 - 35 I.

Kelvin, L. S. (1991). *Educational Psychology* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kimbel, W. (1967). *Supervision for better schools* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall,.

Kinhart, H. A. (2000). *The effect of supervision on high school English.* Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Knezevich, S. H. (1983). *Administration of public Education.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *Leadership challenges*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leedy, P. D. (1985). *Practical research.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Manu, S.Y. (1983). *In-service training and education for teachers (INSET) in Ghana*. Unpublished pamphlet. Accra.

Matsudaira, N. (1982). The evaluation of teacher education in universities and colleges. A *study of the practical strategies on the improvement of teachers education,* 2, (4), 130-144.

McMillan, J. H. (1996). *Educational fundamentals for the consumer* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Merchoir, W. T. (1950). *Instructional supervision.* Boston: DC Health and Co.

Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory in education.* New York: The Free Press.

Michael, S. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus* (4th ed.). C.A: Newsbury Park Publishing.

Morant, R. W. (1981). *In-service education within schools.* London: George, Allen and Urwin.

Musaazi, J. C. S. (1985). *The theory and practice of education administration.* London: MacMillan Publishers Ltd.

Neagley, H. H. (1962). *Effectiveness in supervision of social studies in relation to practice of supervisor, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,* Indiana University, Indiana.

Neagley, R. L., & Evans, N. D. (2001). *Handbook for effective supervision of instruction.* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice – Hall Inc.

Nwagwu, N.A. (1984). *Primary school administration.* London: Macmillan Publishing.

Nwana, O. C. (1993). *Introduction to educational research for student teachers.*

Osuala, E. C. (2001). *Introduction to research methodology* (2nd ed.). Onitsha, Nigeria: African EEP Publishers Ltd.

Ozigi, A. O. (1981). *A handbook on school administration*. Lagos: Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited.

Pritenard, M. W. (1975). *Primary school inspection in Nigeria.* Paris: UNESCO. Publishing Limited.

Reed, K. (1986). Teaching Tasks and Beginning Teachers, the South-Pacific *Journal of Teacher Education*, 14, (1) 1-12.

Robinson, K. R. (1981). *A handbook of training management*. London: Kogan Page.

Rukare, D. (1974). *Planning human resources development in Africa*. Chicago: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, J. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1979). *Supervision*: *Human perspective on practice and research.* New York: Harper & Row

Sproul, H. L. (1988). *Handbook of research method: Guide to practitioners and students in the social sciences.* New Jersey: Score Crow Press.

Steers, R. M. (1977). *Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view*. California: Santa Monica Good year.

Swearingen, M. E. (2001). *Supervision of Instruction, foundation and dimensions.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Tom, W., & Rebecca, C. (2000). *Changing the quality of education*. Accra: The Mitchell Group. Inc.

Turner, C. E., Morley, C., Sellery, S., & Smith, L. (1976). *School health and health education* (5th ed.). Saint Louis: Mosby Company.

Turner, D. (1976). *Discipline in schools*. New York: Word Look Educational.

Tyler, R. W. (1992). *Basic principle of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: The
University of Chicago Press.

Unruly, G. G. (1977). Instructional supervision. *Trend and Issues of Educational
Leadership, 34(8),* 563-592.

Van Dalen, D. (1979). *Understanding educational research: An introduction*.
New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Weiss, C. (1998). The stakeholder approach to evaluation, origin and promise.
New direction for programme evaluation, 2(11), 8-13.

Wiles, K. (2000*). Supervision for better schools.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
Prentice Hall.

William, H. R., & Thelbert, L. D. (1980). *Supervision of schools.* London:
Macmillan Publishing Co.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire for Headteachers, Assistant Headteachers and Teachers

Dear Respondent,

The purpose of this study is to collect and collate information on the state of supervision in selected Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. You are kindly entreated to provide candid and honest responses by ticking and/or completing the items on the form. Be assured that responses given will be treated confidentially.

SECTION A – PERSONAL DATA

Indicate by ticking (√) the appropriate response where applicable or supplying briefly the information required.

1. Gender   M   [ ]   F   [ ]

2. Professional status as a teacher

   Professional   [ ]   Nonprofessional   [ ]

3. Which of the following positions is applicable to you

   (a) Form master   [   ]

   (b) Class teacher only   [   ]

4. Level of Education:

a.   Postgraduate   [   ]

b.   Degree   [   ]

c.   Diploma   [   ]

5.   What is your rank?

a.   Director   [   ]

b.   Asst. Director [   ]

c.   Principal supt. [   ]

d.   Senior supt. [   ]

e.   Any other

f.   (specify)

                    …………………………………………………………..

SECTION B – TYPES AND MODES OF SUPERVISION

What are the types of supervision carried out in the Public and Private Junior

High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

Please tick (√) your response in the appropriate box.

6.   What are the types of supervision carried out in your school?

a.   External   [   ]

b.   Internal   [   ]

c.   Both   [   ]

d.   None   [   ]

7.   Which type of supervision is often carried out in your school?

a.   External   [   ]

b.   Internal   [   ]

c.   Both   [   ]

d.   None   [   ]

8.   What form does external supervision often take?

a.   Intensive visits   [ ]

b.   Regular visits   [ ]

c.   Occasional visits   [ ]

d.   Casual visits   [ ]

9.   How often do officials from the District and Regional Education offices

        visit the school for supervision?

District Office

a.   Monthly   [ ]

b.   Quarterly   [ ]

c.   Once a year   [ ]

d.   Rarely   [ ]

Regional Office

a.   Monthly   [ ]

b.   Quarterly   [ ]

c.   Once a year   [ ]

d.   Rarely   [ ]

10.   Choose 'Yes' or 'No' to indicate whether or not the following people are involved in internal supervision in your school.

	Yes	No
1. Headmaster		
2. Asst. Headmaster		
3. Class teacher		
4. Teachers on Duty		
4. Students		

11.   Please rate the extent of involvement of the personalities involved in supervision.

	Very Active	Active	Not Active
1. Headmaster			
2. Asst. Headmaster			
3. Class teacher			
4. Teachers on Duty			
4. Students			

Please use the following scale to rate the personnel involved in supervision in the areas indicated. Write the number that is applicable to the statements in the boxes provided.

Key: 5   to a great extent

        4   to some extent

        3   don't know/not sure

2   to a little extent

1   not at all

I Headmaster

	1	2	3	4	5
12. The head ensures discipline in the school.					
13. The head is actively involved in supervision.					
14. The head monitors staff class attendance registers.					
15. The head checks students' class attendance registers.					
16. The head involves staff in decision making.					
17. The head delegates staff to attend to other duties.					
18. The head disciplines teachers for absenteeism and lateness.					
19. The head enjoys the respect of teachers and students.					
20. The head visits classrooms to observe teaching/learning activities on regular basis.					

II   Assistant Headmaster

	1	2	3	4	5
21. The assistant headmaster ensures early release of teaching timetable at the beginning of the academic year.					
22. The assistant headmaster checks the effective use of contact hours by teachers.					

23. The assistant headmaster visits classroom to observe teaching/learning activities on regular basis.					
24. The assistant headmaster monitors staff attendance register daily or frequently.					
25. The assistant headmaster monitors student class attendance register daily or frequently.					
26. The assistant headmaster ensures that school-based assessment records are kept up to date.					
27. The assistant headmaster draws an effective exams timetable and ensures strict supervision of exams.					
28. The assistant headmaster ensures that teachers actually mark exams scripts and submit assessment records on time.					
29. The assistant headmaster sees to the prompt dispatch of students reports.					
30. The assistant headmaster ensures the provision of teaching and learning materials.					
31. The assistant headmaster uses individual and/or group meetings with teachers to discuss their work.					
32. The assistant headmaster allocates subjects and assigns teaching periods.					
33. The assistant headmaster inspects scheme of work of teachers.					
34. The assistant headmaster conducts teacher's appraisal for teachers.					
35. The assistant headmaster arranges for in-service training or refresher courses for teachers.					

III   Students

	1	2	3	4	5
36. Student leaders are involved in supervision.					
37. Authorities recognize and support the work of students in supervision.					
38. Student leaders are effective in controlling other students.					
39. Class captains report accurately on the punctuality and attendance of teachers to class.					
40. Teachers are satisfied with the performance of student leaders in supervision.					

SECTION C

Teachers' Supervision and Appraisal

Please tick (√) which of the following activities are carried out by supervisors as far as your work is concerned.

	Often	Sometimes	Never
41. Your work is supervised.			
42. Your Scheme of work is inspected.			
43. Your classroom teaching is observed.			
44. Instructional time used is checked through time book.			
45. Your punctuality and regularity to class are monitored.			
46. Your school-based assessments are inspected.			
47. Assignments and exercises given to students are inspected.			
48. Your performance is discussed with you (individually/in a group).			

SECTION D

Effectiveness of Supervision

INSTRUCTION: Please tick (√) only once the option which best suits you.

SA – Strongly Agree   U – Uncertain   SDA – Strongly Disagrees

A – Agree   D A – Disagree

	SA	A	SD	D	U
49. Supervisors must meet with each teacher after supervising his/her work.					

50. Teachers must participate freely in the discussion with their supervisors after their work have been supervised.					
51. Supervision of my work makes me tensed up.					
52. Supervisors are to make interventions when supervising teachers lesson delivery.					
53. Meeting with the supervisor(s) after the lesson helps improve my delivery in class.					
54. There is a need for a follow-up after supervising was any in-service training or further study recommended or organized as follow.					

SECTION E

Problems of Supervision

INSTRUCTION: Please tick (√) only once the option which best suits you.

SA – Strongly Agree   U – Uncertain   SDA – Strongly Disagrees

A – Agree   D A – Disagree

	SA	A	U	D	SDA
55. Supervision is an unnecessary interference in the work of the teacher, and it succeeds only in finding faults.					
56. A professional teacher does not need supervision but rather an adequate supply of the materials needed for teaching.					

57. Many of the available supervisors lack the expert knowledge needed to undertake supervision.				
58. The time chosen for supervision is often inconvenient because the teacher is not consulted.				

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire for Students

My dear student,

The purpose of the questions presented to you is to find out about the state of supervision in selected basic Junior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Kindly provide very honest and truthful responses by ticking and/or completing the items as requested in each case. Be assured that responses given will be treated confidentially.

SECTION A

Personal Data

Indicate by ticking (√) the appropriate response where applicable or studying briefly the information required.

1)   Gender   M   [ ]   F   [ ]

2)   Age

       ………………………………………………………………………………

3)   Class/form

       ……………………………………………………………………………

4)   Any post held:………………………………………………………..

SECTION B

Types of Supervision and the Personnel Involved

Please tick (√) your response in the appropriate box.

5)   How often do you see officials from the District Education office or GES

       Headquarters in the school for supervision?

Weekly   [ ]   Monthly   [ ]   Once a year   [ ]   Rarely [ ]

6)   Choose 'Yes' or 'No' to indicate whether or not the following people are

       involved in supervision in your school.

	Yes	No
1. Headmaster		
2. Assistant Headmaster		
3. Class Teacher		
4. Teachers on duty		
5. Student Prefects		

7)   How actively involved are the following people in supervision in your

       school?

	Very Active	Active	Average	Not Active
Headmaster				
Assistant Headmaster				
Class Teachers				
Teachers on Duty				
Student Prefects				

SECTION C

Appraisal of Teachers' Work

Use the following scale to rate the overall performance of your teachers in the areas indicated.

Excellent	Very good	Good	Bad	Very bad
5	4	3	2	1

	1	2	3	4	5
8)Teachers are regular in class					
9) Teachers are punctual to class					
10) Teachers teach for the whole period					
11) Teachers lessons are understandable					
12) Teachers use teaching aids to illustrate lessons					
13) Teachers answer questions well in class					
14) Teachers give exercises regularly					
15) Teachers mark and discuss exercises					
16) Teachers have time for less performing students					
17) Teachers are available to students after class hours					

SECTION D

Involvement of Students in Supervision

INSTRUCTION: Please tick (√) only once the option which best suits you.

SA – Strongly Agree   U – Uncertain   SDA – Strongly Disagrees

A – Agree   D A – Disagree

	SA	A	U	D	SDA
18) Student leaders (prefects) are involved in supervision.					
19) Student prefects are able to check punctuality of students to class.					
20) Student prefects are able to check absenteeism.					
21) Student prefects are able to prevent students from staying in their classrooms during assemblies and other school gatherings.					
22) Students prefects are used for extra curricula activities supervision.					
23) Class prefects are able to maintain order in their classes.					
24) Class prefects are able to record accurately punctuality and attendance of teachers.					
25) Class prefects are able to record accurately punctuality and attendance of students.					
26) Students cooperate with prefects in their work of supervision.					
27) School administration supports student prefects in their work of supervision.					

Interview Guide for Circuit Supervisors

1. How long have you been at post?

2. Do you have any programme or timetable for supervision in the public and private JHS in the metropolis?

3. Are you personally involved in supervision in these schools?

4. What form does your supervision take? Example, intensive visits, occasional or casual visits.

5. How regular are these visits?

6. Do officers from your inspectorate division visit both public and private JHS in the Metropolis?

7. How often do such visits occur?

8. Do you find these visits adequate?

9. Do you have records of the inspection reports written on the various schools visited? (Possible to have a copy or two)

10. Is there any feedback as to the implementation of these reports by the various schools?

11. Does your office organize in-service training courses for teachers in both Public and Private JHS in the Metropolis? (Level of participation and effectiveness).

12. What problems militate against effective supervision in basic schools in the Metropolis?

13. Please give some suggestions aimed at improving supervision and making it more effective in the Metropolis.