UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

ASSESSING THE NATURE AND CHALLENGES OF SUPERVISION

IN THE ABLEKUMA NORTH SUB METROPOLITAN

EDUCATION AREA OF ACCRA

RABIANA HAZARA AMANDI

2009

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

ASSESSING THE NATURE AND CHALLENGES OF SUPERVISION

IN THE ABLEKUMA NORTH SUB METROPOLITAN

EDUCATION AREA OF ACCRA

BY

RABIANA HAZARA AMANDI

Dissertation Submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and

Administration, of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, in

Partial Fulfillment for the Award of Master of Education Degree in

Educational Administration

FEBRUARY 2008

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to ascertain the nature and challenges of supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis. The study population was 662 teachers, 46 head teachers and 5 circuit supervisors. Simple random, purposive and stratified sampling procedures were used to select 271 respondents comprising 220 teachers, 46 head teachers and five circuit supervisors. The researcher used questionnaires to collect data and the response rate was 92.3%. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics with SPSS version 15 software.

The study found out that both internal and external supervisions were practiced in the schools but internal supervision was preferred. It was observed that Circuit Supervisors (C/S) visited schools more than other external supervisors and Headteachers and teachers were satisfied with their supervision. The study also showed that Headteachers supervisory activities influenced and facilitated teaching and learning better.

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showed there were statistical significant differences in the level of supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub Metropolis and the Tamhane's T2 post-hoc test, revealed that differences in supervision existed in Odorkor, Dansoman and Kwashieman circuits.

Challenges of supervision identified were lack of logistics, equipment and materials, teacher's failure to heed to advice, low follow-up visits, teachers problem of underrating the competences of supervisors.

It was recommended that adequate logistics, equipment, materials, means of transport, regular in service training and special incentives should be provided for supervisors to enhance effective supervision.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my grand-son Seda Elvis Zibrim (Jr).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADP	Accelerated Development Plan
ANOVA	Analysis Of Variance
BECE	Basic Education Certificate Examination
C/S	Circuit Supervisor
CRT	Criterion Reference Test
FCUBE	Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education
GES	Ghana Education Service
IEPA	Institute for Educational Planning and Administration
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
MoFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
PMT	Performance Monitoring Test
SPAM	School Performance Appraisal Meeting
SPSS	Statistical Product for Service Solutions
STF	Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation
UNESCO	United Nations Education and Scientific Organisation

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Studys

The school is the spearhead of educational revolution in all countries including Ghana; thus a tremendous responsibility is placed on schools to make the teaching/learning process effective. This is possible only if there is a continuous growth which can be achieved through continuous monitoring, guidance and evaluation, hence the need for supervision.

This need has been necessitated more by the fact that there is a pressing need to improve the tone, standard and quality of education imparted in schools in the country. The quality of educational supervision is a key factor in determining the quality of the whole educational enterprise. Anamuah-Mensah Daily Graphic (2006, September 21). pp 16 stated that, various educationists as well as research findings have established the fact that supervision is a critical element in quality education delivery and as such, serves as a relevant tool to ensure an effective and reliable educational system in a country. There is therefore the need for an efficient and effective supervision of the content of the academic curriculum of schools in order to improve on the quality of teaching and learning in the country.

Over the years, various strategies have been put in place to improve the supervision of teaching and learning in Ghana but it appears it has not achieved the intended impact. The researcher was a schools supervisor in the

Ablekuma North Sub-metropolis and is familiar with the academic problems of the Sub-Metropolis hence the choice for the study.

The Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis which comprises schools in Dansoman, Odorkor, Mataheko, Abbosey- Okai and Kwashieman is made up of sixty-five (65) public schools which are divided into five circuits. The schools are well resourced and accommodated in terms of staffing teaching/learning materials and classrooms, but the academic performance of students in the schools cannot be said to be the best, judging from their performance in the Basic Education Certificate Examinations(BECE) over the years. For instance, for four consecutive years:1999-2003, 85% of students obtained between aggregate 24 to 32 hence could not get their choice of schools (Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis Education Directorate, 2001).

Education, however, serves as the driving force behind all national development, plans, efforts and strategies and so, to under estimate its importance, according to the Presidential Committee on Education Reforms (2002) is to toy with the future of the society since the goals of education are inextricably linked to those of the nation. To salvage the declining standard of education in a bid to achieve educational objectives therefore, the government, and for that matter educationists, saw the need to put certain mechanisms in place. One of the mechanisms was the emphasis on the supervision of the teaching and learning process which was deemed very vital to guide and monitor the process towards the achievement of educational goals. Infact, the idea of tailoring and monitoring the teaching and learning process in the right direction makes supervision imperative in our schools (Ablekuma North Education Office, 2001).

It was in this vein that Harris (1975) clarified the supervisor's role by asserting that supervision is directly related to helping teachers with instruction and indirectly to instructing students. Infact, according to Carron, De Grauwe and Govinda (1998), many researchers have established that there is a link between supervision and effective teaching/learning since supervision tends to strengthen teacher high performance; hence, low academic performance could be blamed on inadequate school supervision. It is in view of this that the teaching/learning process needs to be constantly monitored to keep learning abreast with modern changes and development. Instructional supervision has therefore become more crucial, and for the education system to live up to expectation, there must be a machinery for the continuous evaluation of teaching/ learning.

In Ghana today, increasing emphasis on the importance of supervision as a means of monitoring and evaluating educational provision stems from the fact that, the decade before the take off of the 1987 educational reforms could be considered as a period of accelerated disquiet with regard to the state of the public education system. Policy makers, parents and all other stakeholders in education became increasingly worried, thereby giving rise to the emphasis and re-definition of the structure of supervision and the responsibilities of supervisors. Consequently, at various levels throughout the country, supervisors do the supervision of the educational system which is basically concerned with the achievement of quality and effectiveness of the educational process.

Supervision is viewed as a stimulus that enables teachers to assess themselves and improve upon their own individual and collective achievement

(Wood & Thompson, 1993). In view of this, supervision is therefore expected to offer assistance and serve as encouragement to local efforts in order to ensure the achievement of educational objectives. In supervision, it is the teaching process that is supervised and not the individual teacher per se.

Thus, according to Beeby (1997), supervision is an example of a method of evaluation where evaluation as an explicit activity may be defined as the systematic collection and interpretation of evidence in the school system, leading as part of the process, to a judgment of value with the view to action. It is in this vein that Enus (1963) asserted that the purpose of supervision is to maintain and improve the quality of instruction. However, the attitude of teachers to supervision has always been a source of concern to educationists, for as Mosher and Purpel (1972) have stated that although, there are undoubtedly many instances of good supervisory practices, a common response of teachers to supervision seem to suggest that it is ineffective, and at worst, a form of interference to the work of the teacher. Observations have shown that the view of Mosher and Purpel (1972) is common among teachers in recent years and has been a strain to the effective cooperation that should exist between the supervisor and the supervisee. If teachers view supervision as an interference in their work, then it only means that most of the new ideas and innovations which are imparted to them at in-service training courses will either not be well implemented or never be implemented at all. Deducing from what has been discussed so far, it is clear that there is a link between supervision and effective teaching and learning which goes to enhance academic performance.

This means that poor academic performance could be blamed on inadequate or improper supervision hence, the need to enhance the mode of supervision in the quest to improve academic performance. This study was therefore an attempt to assess the nature and challenges of supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis in order to ascertain how best it could be reviewed to make it achieve desired teaching and learning outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

The poor performance of pupils at the Basic Education level, the poor results of the Criterion Reference Test as well as various Performance Monitoring Test (PMT) conducted by the Ghana Education Service in primary schools are ample indicators to the fact that academic performance in basic schools is poor. Wales (1986) contended that supervision is an effective tool that could be used to promote good teaching/learning outcomes, However, despite the supervision in schools, pupils continue to perform poorly in the Basic Education Certificate Examination as well as other Performance Monitoring Test country wide. For example, Anamuah-Mensah (2006) observed that, the 2005 BECE results indicated that 7,000 Candidates nationwide did not pass a single subject and many rural schools scored zero percent. In Accra and for that matter, the Ablekuma North Sub-metropolis, the problem is not different; since for five (5) consecutive years, best scores at the BECE in the Sub- metropolis was aggregate 08 with five ones (BECE results from 1999-2004).

Judging from the poor performance of pupils as stated above, it can be said that despite the fact that strategies had been put in place to improve

supervision, it appeared as though, it was not making the desired impact. This is because a close observation of teachers' attitude to work in most parts of Accra seem to indicate that supervision has no bearing on their work ethics. Furthermore, the continuous low performance in the BECE and other performance monitoring tests affirm that supervision has not made an impact on teaching and learning. Infact, Anamuah-Mensah (2006) observed that, ineffective supervision in our schools over the years has resulted in the situation where most candidates attain aggregate 30 and above in the Basic Education Certificate Examination.

Furthermore the resuls of 1992   criterion reference test (CRT) indicated that 95% of basic six (6) did not achieve mastery of the basic skills in mathematics and English, for out of 11,586 pupils who wrote the English test, only 614 (representing 5.3%) scored 50% or above. Out of 11, 488 participants who wrote the test in mathematics, only 241 (representing 2.1%) scored 50% or above. This meant 94.7% of the participants failed in mathematics (Accra Metropolitan Education Office. Planning, Research, Data and Monitoring Unit, 2005). It was therefore the assumption of the researcher that there could be something wrong with the supervision in place since it had failed to achieve the purpose for which it was instituted. There was therefore the need to investigate the nature of supervision and its possible challenges.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to ascertain the current state of supervision and how best it could be enhanced to bring about improvement in the academic performance of pupils in basic schools. Furthermore, the purpose

was to assist the researcher suggest a model for an effective and efficient supervision that could achieve desired teaching and learning outcomes in order to improve academic performance.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were to:

1. ascertain the trend and present functioning mechanism of the present school supervision system

2. find out the perceptions of C/S, head teachers and teachers on the types of supervision in the metropolis.

3. find out the approach used in supervision and the preferences of respondents.

4. identify the challenges of the current model of supervision in terms of management and functioning.

5. determine if there are differences in supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis circuits, and

6. suggest a model for effective and efficient supervision that could achieve desired teaching and learning outcomes.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What type of supervision is carried out in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis?

2. What type of supervision do teachers and head teachers in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis prefer?

3. What is the perception of teachers and head teachers on the kind of supervision that could promote effective teaching/ learning?

4. What is the perception of C/S on the type of supervision that could promote effective teaching/learning

5. What are the challenges of supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis?

6. Is supervision the same in all circuits of the Sub-Metropolis?

Significance of the Study

Firstly, the findings from the study will provide documented evidence for policy makers and educational authorities when designing models of supervision that could promote effective teaching and learning for the improvement of the academic performance of pupils.

Secondly the findings would enhance the knowledge of supervision officials in the performance of their work.

Thirdly, the findings would serve as a source of reference to school authorities and students who would undertake studies on supervision in Cape Coast University.

Finally, challenges impeding the effectiveness of supervision could be identified for intervention.

Delimitation

The study was restricted to only the Ablekuma North sub-metropolis Education area even though, it would have been worthwhile covering a larger area in the Accra metropolis. Also the findings of the study was delimited to only the studied metropolis even though the recommendations from the study may benefit other educational areas with similar characteristics.

Limitations

Due to the limited time frame for teachers end of school term work load, questionnnaires were hurriedly answered. Secondly, most of the headteachers and teachers had assignments from their distance education course so open ended questions were not paintakingly answered. This could affect the exact picture of respondents preferences and opinions since answers might lack details.

Definition of Key Terms

For the purpose of this study, certain terms used are explained below:

Basic School: Primary up to junior high school under one head teacher.

Independent School: only primary or only junior high school with separate headteachers.

Supervision: Supervision is the comprehensive set of services provided and processed to help teachers facilitate their own professional development.

Ocassional Supervision: once or twice unannounced visit in a term to briefly ascertain how the school is faring. This could last between thirty minutes to one hour.

Regular Supervision: The normal supervision of lesson preparation, presentation and general school work conducted on weekly basis by head teachers.

Brief visit: Entails a short visit to the school to deal with an identified problem. It could take an hour or two depending on the nature of the problem.

Intensive visit: Is a more comprehensive visit that could take up to three days or more in a school.

Routine supervision: Involves scheduled weekly or fortnightly visits by C/S to have discussion with teachers on specific issues and casual or check-up visits. These visits could take the officer half a day in a school.

Organization of the Study

The study is organized in five chapters. Chapter one consist of an introduction to the study, the background of the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study and objectives of the study. In addition, the research questions, significance of the study, delimitation, limitations, definition of terms as pertains to the study as well as organization of the study, are discussed.

Chapter two dealt with the review of related literature to the study from documents published and unpublished, including books, journals, news papers, the internet and other materials that were relevant to the study.

Chapter three dealt with the methodology used in the study. Content of this chapter included the research design, population, sample and sampling procedure, instrumentation, data collection procedure and analysis plan as well as the pre-test of the instrument.

Chapter four focused on the data presentation analysis and discussions.

Chapter five dealt with the summary and conclusions drawn from the study, recommendations and suggestions for practice and for further research studies.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Summarizing what supervision entails, Sergiovanni (2000) maintained that "we supervise for good reasons; we want schools to be better, teachers to grow and students to have academically and developmentally sound learning experiences, and we believe supervision serves these and other worthy ends". Other researchers have done studies on similar themes and have come out with findings that could guide the review of literature on the present study.

The litereature in this chapter is reviwed under the following headings:

1. The concept and scope of supervision.

2. The history of supervision

3. Types and models of supervision

4. Functions of the school supervisor.

5. Function of school supervision.

6. Problems/challenges of school supervision.

The Concept of School Supervision

Supervision of instruction at the school level is considered as a key factor in ensuring the good functioning of the educational system or programme. In this vein, Glickman (1990) asserted that behind every successful school is an effective supervision programme, for supervision, Glickman stressed, is the glue that holds a successful school together. Supervision has many different meanings, for each person interprets it in terms

of his experiences, needs and purposes. For example, a supervisor may consider it as a positive force for programme improvement. One teacher may see it as a threat to his/her individuality, another teacher may think of it as a source of assistance and support. Teachers' feelings about supervision differ because of the various ways in which supervisors they have come in contact with interpreted their roles. For instance, according to Blumberg (1974) cited in Stones (1984) in a study on teachers perception of supervision, came out that some teachers see supervision as a complete waste of time and the majority of them think that supervision is part of the system that exists but plays no important function in their professional lives, hence, it is an irrelevant organizational ritual.

Similarly, Augustyn (2001) in a study found out that in England, teachers view supervisors as less help to them than the mentoring teachers and that the key aspect of the supervisor's role was that of assessment which they also perceive as less valid to them than that of the teacher mentors. Buttressing this, Partington (1982) cited in Stones (1984)   investigating a system of supervision in which school teachers acted as supervisors found out that anxiety related to supervision was reduced. However, Musaazi (1985) perceived supervision as primarily concerned with actions taken to ensure the achievement of instructional objectives. He was therefore of the view that supervision involves all actions taken to improve or ensure the achievement of instructional objectives in the teaching learning process. In this regard, by the mid 1990s Hopkins and Ainscow (1994), drawing from their experiences in researching on and working with schools came out with the findings that educational supervision enhances student outcomes as well as strengthening

the school's capacity in management since school improvement is about raising student achievement through focusing on the teaching and learning processes and the conditions that support it, hence, it is about strategies for improving the school capacity and providing quality education.

In that respect, Bolin and Panaritis (1992) opined that supervision is primarily concerned with the improvement of classroom practice for the benefit of students, regardless of what may be entailed, be it curriculum development or staff development. In view of this, Glickman, Gordon and Jovita (1998) maintained that supervision is the glue of a successful school, for it is the function in the school that draws together the discrete elements of instructional effectiveness into whole school action.

Thomas, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002), therefore maintained that supervision should be viewed as a role-free process; and for teachers to be active participants in knowledge and collaborators in creating new knowledge about teaching and learning, they must assume roles not only as co-supervisors with headteachers and Circuit Supervisors but also co-supervisors with other teachers. They conclude that in future, supervision involving heads and circuit supervisors, as lead people will be less important than collegial supervision involving peers. Wanzara and Dacosta (2000) in furtherance to this position, have suggested that the purpose of supervision was to enhance teachers' professional growth by providing them with feedback regarding effective classroom practices, as such teachers should be viewed as active constructors of their own knowledge about teaching and learning and supervisors viewed as collaborators in creating knowledge about teaching and learning.

In this vein, Beach and Reinhartz (2000) cited instructional supervision as a process that focuses on instruction and provides teachers with information about their teaching so as to develop instructional skills to improve performance.

From the views expressed so far, instructional supervision is about improving the professional skills of teachers. As Alfonso, Firth and Neville (1984) observed, instructional supervision is behaviour officially designated by an organization that directly affects teachers behaviour in such a way as to facilitate pupils learning and the achievement of organizational goals. It is in view of this that Glatthorn (1990) asserted that supervision is the comprehensive set of services provided and processed to help teachers facilitate their own professional development so that the goals of the school might be better attained. In this respect, Sergiovanni (2000) came out with the findings that the teacher's role is central to improving the quality of learning for students. For him, teacher development is key because "the quality of teachers' understandings influences to a large degree what teachers do in classrooms." Good teacher-development programmes and efforts, he therefore reasoned, should be based on the assumption that "the best source for teachers to learn more about teaching and learning, child growth and development, materials and methods is through an examination of one's own practice." Glatthorn concludes that intrinsic to all the concepts and definitions of supervision is the fact that supervision is viewed as a set of services and processes aimed at improving the effectiveness of instructions and the professional development of teachers; he therefore suggests that for the goals of supervision to be achieved, both parties involved in it must understand the

characteristics of effective supervision and enthusiastically enter into the process (Glatthorn, 1990).

Bhatt and Sharma (1992) emphasized that modern educational supervision is based on the assumption that educational supervision is an organizational behaviour system that interacts with the teaching behaviour system for the purpose of improving the quality of education. In this vein, Bhatt and Sharma again, asserted that supervision is a combination or integration of processes, procedures and conditions that are continuously designed to advance the work effectiveness of the individuals or groups.

In line with the above assertion, Carron, De Grauwe and Govinda (1998) in a study on supervision for school improvement maintained that supervision is a component of the educational system aimed at improving pedagogical practices in the classroom, giving teacher pre-services and in-service training, carrying out pedagogical research at curriculum centers and examinations and evaluation units with the aim of improving the quality of teaching and leaning in the classroom.

From the above, it can be said that supervision as a process, is a series of decisions, actions and interactions, with teachers and it connotes a continuity of relationship in contrast to one that is sporadic or disjointed. By indication, supervision could be described as professional support with a direct impact on school and teacher performance.

In line with the above description of the concept of supervision, Oliver (1976) stated that supervision is conceived as a service to teachers, both as individuals and in groups; for supervision is a means of offering to teachers specialized help in improving instructions, hence Oliver concludes there is no

doubt that effective supervision of instructions can improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom. Furthermore, Gadgil (1982) asserted that the purpose of supervision is to guide, direct, motivate and control educational efforts in the classroom to increase the efficiency of the staff and enhance the standard of education; as such he maintains that supervision helps to keep the personnel alert in their daily routine and up-to-date with modern trends. Again, Vashist (1994) highlighted the theoretical aspect of supervision as a tool to improve the teaching/learning situation and help the children learn better. Vashist therefore opines that the first factor in supervisory work is the teacher who helps the student/pupils to grow with the help of the curriculum; hence, educational supervision, in order to improve the pupils, must improve the teacher as well. It is in view of this fact that Kochar (1981) asserted that the concept of supervision is more professionally oriented, democratic in its procedures, dynamic and cooperative, as such, a supervisory programme would succeed only to the extent that each participant is considered to be a human being with a particular contribution to make to the education process; hence, there is a mutual give and take in supervision between the supervisor and the supervisee.

In line with the above assertion, Kochar (1981) defined supervision as an expert technical service primarily aimed at studying and improving cooperatively, all factors which affect the teaching and learning situation. Kochar concludes that supervision should foster freedom, experimentation, and should act as a lever for lifting teachers above themselves and generate leadership by providing opportunities to more and more teachers to exercise

leadership. In this respect, the supervisor's role is to co-partner with the teacher in the joint task of improving the educational programme.

Writing on the concept of supervision, Glatthorn (1990) portrayed supervision as the process of bringing about improvement in instruction by working with people who are working with pupils; supervision to Glatthorn, is therefore a process of stimulating growth and a means of helping teachers to help themselves in order to impact on pupils.

Hyman (1975) described the characteristics of a modern supervisor as a person of vision, an integral member of the school who is in touch with the teachers, who cares about them and the students/pupils they teach, who is able to and willing to lead others in self-improvement a person who is understanding and who can communicate effectively, be qualified and up-to-date in knowledge with curricula content and methods of teaching. In this respect Neagley and Evans (1970) contended that supervision is a possible dynamic and democratic action planned to improve instruction through the continued development of all concerned with individuals involved in the teaching and learning process, thus, children, teachers, supervisors and administrators.

Baldrige (1971) however was of the view that supervision achieves its goals by equipping teachers with ideas that enhance teaching and learning. Hence Johnson (1996) maintained that students whose teachers are adequately supervised whiles teaching could perform better than students whose teachers are not adequately supervised. It is in view of this that Musaazi (1985) opined that supervision involves all actions taken to improve or ensure the

achievement of instructional objectives when teaching and learning is in progress.

All the concepts on supervision outlined by the various authorities above is indicative of the fact that instructional supervision has a positive impact on teacher performance hence the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (STF) (2002) asserted that teacher supervision in modern schools is a planned developmental process that is intended to support the career-long success and continuing professional growth of each teacher.

In summary, instructional supervision has been identified as a means to enhance the performance of teachers in their professional roles since being a true professional requires that a teacher has to be fully capable of making appropriate or sound decisions and providing high quality services. It also requires that the teacher should be in constant pursuit of better understanding and more efficacious in teaching methodologies; supervision of instruction is therefore closely connected with professional development. This connection has been the theme of a thorough study in recent decades Beach and Reinhartz cited in Kutsyuruba (2003). Deducing from the above views on the concept and scope of supervision, implies that supervision involves operating at close range by actually overseeing, motivating, controlling and monitoring the teaching process with the aim of making a positive impact on the learning outcomes of pupils. To achieve this positive impact, Supervision should stimulate, coordinate and guide the continued growth of teachers both as individuals and collectively in a better understanding and performance that is more effective.

History of Supervision

Supervision has taken different shapes at different areas through the decades in all countries. Thus, talking on the devolution of instructional supervision, Bhatt and Sharma (1992) asserted that in the 1910s and 1920s, the scope of supervision in Bangladesh, Bhuttan, Tanzania as well as most countries was directing and telling people what to do, and then checking to find out whether they had done as directed.

In the 1930s, Bhatt and Sharma also said the emphasis was on democratic supervision and in the 1940s supervision was seen as a cooperative enterprise in most of the Asian countries so all the people in a school system were seen to be supervising each other, for teachers were helping each other, counseling and planning with each other or talking about how to improve the teaching and learning situation and the role of the supervisor was to facilitate this cooperation.

Bhatt and Sharma (1992) contended that during the 1950s, the role of supervisors in developing countries was to convince teachers to adopt national programmes, and to develop the information and skills necessary to implement the programmes and success was interpreted to be changing teachers in the desired direction.

Bhatt and Sharma (1992), further observed that in the 1970s, the scope of supervision in most countries was directing the process of change, but there were others who saw supervision as helping professional people solve their instructional problems, as such, supervision meant working for improvement in the process of decision making, decision sharing and curricular change.

Narrowing down to Ghana, supervision of instruction began as inspection by educational inspectors. The British Colonial Government introduced supervision in Ghana into the school system in the mid 19th century. The government then appointed the colonial chaplain Rev. C.S. Hassells as superintendent and inspector of schools to supervise the schools established by the government. The Colonial government wanted rapid development of the country so the legislative council in 1882 passed an ordinance for the promotion of education in the country, this was to create more awareness for the people to access education, (Mcwilliams and Kwamena–Poh 1975). Mcwilliams and Kwamena-Poh further said the ordinance made provision for the appointment of an inspector who was to report to the Board of Schools established to oversee all schools in the British Colonies in the West African Region, but it failed. In 1877, another Education Ordinance was passed and an inspector of schools, solely for the Gold Coast was appointed. The government encouraged the missions to appoint local managers at the centers to act as supervisors for the schools and this paved the way for more regular and effective supervision of schools.

Again, they said when Governor Guggisberg took the reins of government in 1919, another Education Ordinance was passed and this led to the appointment of more inspectors of schools to oversee the work of both assisted and non-assisted schools in the system. The passing of this ordinance they continued, made inspection and supervision of schools a regular issue and that promoted the efficiency and effectiveness of the schools in the country. However, the work of the inspectors they intimated, was mainly evaluation, hence in 1902, the Board of Education introduced into the country, a system of

inspection known as "payment by results" which had been abandoned in England in 1895. School grants depended on this system and salaries of teachers depended on the number of pupils in a teacher's class as well as those who passed the annual examination which was supervised by these inspectors (McWilliams and Kwamena -Poh, 1975). This method, they asserted was used to ascertain whether government was deriving adequate returns from the money used in paying teachers.

This system of instructional supervision according to McWilliams and Kwamena-Poh (1975), was began in the Cape Coast schools by visiting officers who were referred to as school inspectors and their purpose was to inspect teachers work and recommend remuneration. Formal visits however, began in the 1940s, when the mission schools' authorities appointed visiting officers to schools to help in the provision of syllabi, time table, teach untrained teachers how to prepare lesson notes and give demonstration lessons. McWilliams and Kwamena-Poh further said in 1952, after the Accelerated Development Plan (ADP) of 1951, the then government found it expedient to appoint assistant education officers to visit the schools and help teachers. These officers were to assist in training on the job the large numbers of untrained teachers recruited in the large number of primary schools which had resulted from the introduction of the fee-free education in 1951.

According to Zimpher, Devoss and Nott (1980), principal teachers were appointed from the ranks of senior teachers as supervisors of primary and middle schools. Their duties among others included improving the teachers' standard of teaching, and by so doing, raise the standard of the pupils in the schools assigned to them by the District Education officer. Again, by 1974

when the Ghana Teaching Service, now Ghana Education Service was established, the Assistant Education officer and the principal teacher were also appointed in the system with the responsibility to raise the standard of the teachers and the education officers who inspected the schools. From the above, it is evident that the basic aim of school supervision, which is to give guidance and advice to teachers in order to raise their standard of teaching, was reinforced with the establishment of the Ghana Education Service.

In 1987, according to the report of the New Education Reform Committee, the introduction of the Reform Programme also saw the need for an effective school supervision to ensure that the content of the newly introduced curriculum was strictly followed and its objectives achieved. The circuit monitoring assistants who were later known as district monitoring assistants were put in place. They were also to ensure adequate supervision.

The latest development in the field of supervision is the appointment of the circuit advisors or supervisors who, in the same vein, are responsible for the supervision of the instructional process and also to give professional guidance and advice within the circuit assigned to them.

Again by 1987, with the introduction of the Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education (FCUBE), the need for improved supervision became even more crucial than ever. It is needed not only to ensure the new curriculum is on course, but also to ensure an appreciable level of academic attainment in the face of the falling standard of education in the country.

From the above, it goes without saying that in Ghana, the supervision of the teaching/learning process has been an integral part of the educational system since the Gold Coast era. One could also contend that the aim of

supervision has always basically been to ensure the achievement of instructional objectives for improved academic performance.

However, making an inference from the history of supervision in Ghana, it is evident that over the years, educational systems have relied on supervision to control and improve the quality of teachers and the achievement of learners but in the recent decade, it seems as though, its impact on schools is felt to be far from positive because of a perceived preference to criticise rather than give support and a tendency to focus on petty administrative matter. (UNESCO Report, 1998,; Rue and Byars, 1996).

Types of Supervision

Supervision per se is a support oriented service close to the teacher and the school. In order to be able to understand the role of effective supervision in the improvement of academic performance, one needs to know exactly what supervision entails. To that effect, two main types of supervision have been identified in the education system; these are: Internal/school based supervision and External supervision.

Elsbree and Harold (1967) asserted that internal supervision is where internal measures are taken in the school by teachers and headteachers to ensure the attainment of school objectives. Elsbree and Harold (1959) also talked about coercive supervision as where teachers are visited by the principal head for an observation period. This is an aspect of internal supervision. Following the observation of the lesson, there is a conference between the teacher and the principal head in which the teacher is commended for those aspects in which his lesson coincides with what the principal "knows" is good teaching. Then errors are pointed out to him as his errors of

omission and commission. Elsbree and Harold (1959) again talked about laissez-faire supervision as where teachers are allowed to do as they like with little direction and coercive supervision. This involves a situation where a teacher is observed teaching and after teaching, his errors are shown to him.

Carey (1953) on the other hand was of the view that internal supervision deals with all the activities performed by teachers and principals in the schools to enhance teaching and learning. Educational researchers and educationists are interested in the types of supervision that exist and how they help in achieving educational targets. Hence, Neagley and Evans (1970) posit that internal supervision refers to supervision within the various institutions by the heads of the institutions.

From the above it implies that Internal/school-based supervision is the type which takes place within the school itself. Head teachers, teachers and pupils/student's leaders are involved in this supervision. The teacher's role as the base contact supervisor is to ensure that pupils pay attention whiles teaching is going on, evaluate the learning process by giving and marking exercises and other forms of assignments and ensuring that correction are done. This measure, to a large extent, enhances academic work. It also behooves on the teacher to identify the bottlenecks that impede the teaching/ learning process and discuss them with the head teacher and the external supervisor in order to find solutions that will improve upon teaching and learning. The head teacher is also to ensure that adequate teaching/ learning takes place in the school. he/ she is expected as the first line school supervisor to give professional guidance and advice to the teachers and also organize in service training courses as well as on the job training for them. Again, the

head is expected to observe teachers' teaching, go through pupils/ students' exercises at least, once a week.

With respect to internal supervision, Bhatt and Sharma (1992) postulated that teacher-teacher help or supervision can reduce the amount of threat and stress that can be generated in a relationship that is perceived by the participants as subordinate to subordinate, hence, they identified collegial supervision. This has been defined as a process involving teachers in the supervision of each other as a type of internal supervision that produces positive outcomes. Furthermore, Bhatt and Sharma assert that collegial supervision makes it possible to broaden the base of expertise and creativeness that is available as a source of psychological and technical support. Internal supervision, if dedicatedly done is therefore expected to give the first line of teacher support that can go a long way to enhance the professional development of the teacher at work. The second type of supervision, which is external supervision, is that which is undertaken by officers from the district, regional and headquarters of the Ghana Education Service. This supervision takes the form of brief, intensive and follow-up visits which are all geared towards improving school instruction and hence, teaching and learning. In external supervision, officers are expected to give professional guidance to the head and teachers all in an effort to meet educational objectives.

External supervision can take the form of brief visits or intensive visit; Brief visit entails a short visit to the school to deal with an identified problem but an intensive visit is a more comprehensive visit that could take up to three days or more in a school. In this visit, the totality of the school, thus, the assessment of teaching, the inspection of the environment and school records

is done in this visit. Furthermore, dilating on types of external supervision, Musaazi (1985) outlined three types of supervision namely: Full supervision where all aspects of instructional work and the school organization are carefully examined, Routine supervision which involves discussion with teachers on specific issues and casual or check-up visits which is one usually informal but the supervisor forms an opinion on what he sees and notes them for further action.

Agezo and Baafi (2000) in a study on school supervision described the three types of external supervision as: Intensive supervision entails a detail supervision of all aspects of the school as a place of learning. Brief visits on the other hand looks at some aspects of the institution like looking only at teaching and learning. Lastly, follow-up visits mean a visit to an institution previously visited. The main focus of such a visit is to assess the extent of progress at the institution since the initial visits. Brickell (1961) further explained the three types of external supervision in the following ways; Brief visits are where the officer goes to acquaint himself with the school and hold discussions with the headteacher and teachers. Follow-up visits on the other hand are done to find out how far recommendations and suggestions given at an earlier visit have been implemented and to make further recommendations where the need arises.

Finally, when intensive supervision is done, every effort is made to fulfill the objectives of the visit by diagnosing all the environmental conditions necessary for effective teaching and learning and giving the school guidance and advice as well as encouragement.

Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1980) in Bhatt and Sharma (1992) maintained that clinical supervision is the most appropriate type of external supervision that can achieve the objectives of supervision. Elaborating on what clinical supervision entails, they identified five stages, thus, pre observation conference, the observation, analysis and strategy, supervision conference and post-conference analysis as the constituents of clinical supervision.

Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski(1980) concluded that clinical supervision eliminates the traditional superficial observation followed by evaluation and focuses on meticulous observation to describe what is happening in the classroom in an effort to obtain teacher-supervisor agreement so as to enable the supervisor analyse the data and work with the teacher to improve instruction or his/ her teaching.

Carron, De Grawe and Govinda (1998) opined that external supervision consists of all those service whose main function is to inspect, control, evaluate, and/or advice, assist and support school heads and teachers; these services they conclude, are carried out by actors located outside the school at the Central Regional or District levels of the education system. External supervision therefore, is supposed to further support and enhance the cooperative work of the school heads and teachers who are the first line supervisors.   In line with this view, Haller and Keenan (1999) saw external supervision as playing a complementary role in the supervision process. He looks at external supervision as a complementary role to the duties of the internal supervisior by providing professional advice and guidance to teachers. But Beecher (1958) 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.

In summary, whatever form supervision takes or no matter the type of supervision, it must not be for fault finding or mere criticism. The aim must be to advise, inspire, modernise and to give assistance in every way possible in order to maintain good relationship and attain desirable standard in schools, for as Eye and Netzer (1975) posited, supervision is done to test the effectiveness of teaching as well as that of the teacher in achieving the objectives of education in schools. However, Zimpher, Devoss and Nott (1980) agreed that supervision as it existed, was ineffective but it was simplistic to take this as a reason to abolish it. They rather argued that supervision was an extremely complex activity that certainly needed reconsideration towards changing but not abolishing. On the strength of the above, Partington (1984) as cited in Stones (1984) observed that teaching would be enhanced if supervision were to be school based.

Functions of School Supervision

According to an International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) Research report 1998, **t**here was a growing consciousness confirmed by research results that improving the quality of education was not simply a question of injecting more resources into the system, but that management of these resources at the school level was fundamental. In this regard, the research findings pointed out, interaction between in-school actors and the relationships with their immediate supervisors were decisive factors.

According to, various studies (Partington, 1982,; Augustyn, 2001,**;** Sergiovanni and Starrat, 2002), one important determinate of the deterioration

of the functioning of primary schools precisely relates to the weakening of the professional supervision and support structures for teachers. In a study on teachers expectations from supervision, McQuarrie and Wood (1991) found out that teachers expect supervision to help and support them as they adapt, adopt and refine the instructional practices they are trying to implement in their classrooms. Furthermore, Banak and Waks (1997) and Garret and Blwes (1997) have all come out with the finding that one major tool for improving school effectiveness and educational outcomes is school-based supervision of instruction. Their research findings suggested that supervision could impact on the quality of instruction or teaching and learning.

Wiles (1986) maintained that "supervision consists of all the activities leading to the improvement of instruction, activities related to morale, improving human relations, in-service education and curriculum development" (p.5). To him, supervision also entails keeping teachers on their toes to do what is expected of them and also pointing out their strengths and weaknesses in the teaching and learning process. He adds that supervision is also connected with bringing good human relations among teachers and supervisors. Again, it provides teachers with new ideas and innovations that would help them improve their methods of teaching. Two other scholars, Neagley and Evans (1970) gave a description of modern school supervision as "positive democratic action aimed at the improvement of the classroom instruction through the continual growth of all concerned. In line with this, Bhatt and Sharma (1992) asserted that modern supervision involved the systematic study and analysis of the entire teaching-learning situation utilizing a carefully planned programme that has been cooperatively derived from the

situation and which is adapted to the needs of those involved in it. In view of this, supervision gives special help to individual teachers who encounter problems that cannot be ordinarily solved. In this regard, White cited in Mankoe (2002) observed that the purpose of supervision of instruction is to engage teachers in mutual inquiry aimed at the improvement of instruction. The supervisor and teacher should share perceptions of instructional problems, exchange suggestions for solving those problems and negotiate an improvement plan.

Making an inference from the above, it implies that supervision gives help to teachers to improve upon their professional skills and outlook. In this vein, Stroller (1978) postulated that the primary aim/ function of supervision is to release the coherent value in each person so that the full potential will be realized. Buttressing this fact, Campbell (1977) asserted that the central function of supervision is guiding as much as possible the efforts of the teachers who serve the children in the school. This function, Campbell maintained, can be achieved by assisting individual teachers with their personal and professional problems, by consulting the schools over their programmes, fostering good staff work, supporting in-service training and by judicious stimulation and guidance of the teachers. In a study on performance of teachers, Stones (1984), Anderson (1972) and Blumberg (1974) found out that diagnostic evaluation makes possible the identification of strengths and weaknesses and enhances the former whiles eliminating the latter. Hence, they conclude that the helping function of supervision should provide the conditions for the enhancement of performance by helping the teacher to

develop skills of diagnosis in respect of their own performance so they can be capable of self-mentoring.

It is in view of this function of supervision that Bhatt and Sharma (1992) maintained that the contemporary view of supervision requires that supervisors move ahead with teachers fully involved; hence, consolidating this dynamism, the supervisor should promote cooperative social action, recognizing that change and growth in people are critical to instructional growth. Furthermore, Thomas, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) postulated that human relationship between supervisor and supervisee contribute to successful school improvement; for in a study on teachers expectation on supervsion, they found out that teachers expect to feel they have a say in matters that influence them, they want to be considered important and when these conditions do not exist, morale sinks. When teachers are satisfied and morale is high, they are more co-operative, more willing to comply and their performance improves. In view of this, instructional supervision has been identified as a means to enhance the performance of teachers in their professional roles. In line with this function, Swearinger (1962) indicated that supervision focuses upon the improvement of instruction and it is concerned with the continuous redefinition of goals with the wider realization of human dynamism for learning and cooperative efforts as well as with the nurturing of a creative approach to the problems of teaching and learning.

In view of this, Wood and Thompson (1993) opined that the function of supervision is to promote school effectiveness by helping teachers to acquire new skills and new teaching methods. In that respect, Bannak and Waks (1997) and Garret and Blwes (1997) all agreed that school based

supervision is a major tool for improving school effectiveness and educational outcomes. Rue and Byars (1996) also said that the function of supervision is to motivate members of a unit to give off their best towards the achievement of organizational goals and objectives.

Though the functions of supervision entails a lot, the main functions as can be deduced from all the literature reviewed is to compliment the efforts of the teacher towards the performance of his or her roles in the teaching and learning process. However, according to Elsbree and Harold (1967), modern day supervision should not be limited to mere classroom visits, individual teacher conferences, rating of teachers and writing of reports. It should also include the curriculum, materials for instruction, the school community and other administrative functions. For him, the administrative functions should cover curriculum organisation, policies on pupils' progress, method of pupil assessment and reporting to parents, allocation of funds for materials and equipment, morale and staff motivation. They concluded that these affect teaching and learning process and cannot be devolved from supervision, hence, the scope of supervision is very broad covering all the factors that affect the teaching and learning of pupils in schools. Many authorities have identified supervision as a catalyst that enhances teaching and learning since the services provided primarily aim at improving all factors that go into ensuring growth and development in the teaching/learning process. Moorer, (1956) Musaazi, (1982) and Weiss, (1998), all agree with this assertion.

Functions of the School Supervisor

The concept of supervision is instructional leadership that relates perspective to behaviours, classifies purposes, contributes to and support organizational actions, coordinates interactions, provides for maintenance and improvement of the instructional programme and assesses goal achievement.

From the foregoing discussion on supervision, it implies that it is a process of overseeing the ability of people to meet goals of the organization in which they work. The job of the supervisor therefore is to provide assistance, support and professional development opportunities to teachers since when teachers respond to professional norms, their performance becomes more expansive. To perform these functions therefore, Woodward and Bhatt (1992) maintained that the supervisor must know his or her job, be able to explain, demonstrate and recommend modifications of practices out of knowledge, superior technical ability and actual work experience.

In respect of this, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) observed that "the heart of supervisory leadership is designing opportunities for its teachers to continuously expand their capacity to learn, to care, to help each other and to teach more effectively".   In this vein, Musaazi (1985) was of the view that since the supervisor must take the lead in providing a pleasant stimulating and wholesome environment in which teachers feel secure, it is his responsibility to ensure that teachers have opportunities to share ideas and to work together effectively as a team in order to achieve the stated goals of the school. He adds that the supervisor should strive to broaden the base of leadership by utilising the full potential of teachers since the supervisor of education is a person responsible for working with others to increase the effectiveness of a

school's teaching and learning processes. In line with this view a study by Chapman (2005), revealed that supervisory practice based on professional authority seeks to promote dialogue among teachers that makes explicit professional values and accepted tenets of practice. And these are then translated into professional practice standards, and with this, teachers are provided with as much discretion as they want and need and when professional authority is fully developed, teachers will hold each other accountable in meeting performing targets.

Given this supervisory role of supervisors, it is evident that the supervisor is an advisor and a guide who provides by every possible means, concrete and constructive advice to teachers so that the quality of education in schools can improve. In view of this assertion, Musaazi (1985) observed that the supervisor's role is to counsel constrained teachers about better teaching methods and inform them about recent development in the teaching process.

Beach and Reinhartz (2000) also emphasized that the supervisor is a catalyst, a guide, a supporter and an encourager who together with the teachers move along an infinite growth continuum. Considering this fact, Salisburg and Spencer cited in Reynolds (2005), maintained that the prime justification for the position of the supervisor in schools is to give leadership to the teaching and learning processes, hence if the principal spends the major portion of his time in supervision, he is placing the emphasis where it rightly belongs. In the recent decade, the role of the school supervisor has become very challenging, for he or she has to truly function as a catalyst for accelerating the professional growth of both heads of schools and teachers working under him or her.

In this vein, a UNESCO (1998) report stated that the role of the supervisor is a cooperative endeavour in which all the teachers participate and the supervisor is the educational leader who acts as a stimulator, guide and consultant in an effort to improve instructions and not as a critic or director.

Furthermore, the report maintained that the inspecting supervisor is expected not only to identify deficiencies, but he or she is also expected to take up new responsibilities particularly with reference to universalities of elementary education, linking education with environment and work and being familiar with the school based administrative and academic practices so as to be close with the point where teaching and learning take place.

Summarizing the above-described functions of the supervisor, the 1998 UNESCO report identified four functions of the supervisor as;

1. Diagnosis or identification of problems.

2. Information dissemination of technical knowledge.

3. Evaluation and process control.

4. In-service training of teachers.

However, as the main objective of school education is the pupils growth, Kochar (1981) maintained that it is imperative that the supervisor should ensure pupil's growth by checking their weaknesses, how they can be motivated, the particular field the pupils have distinguished themselves in and the special school programmes for the gifted as well as the slow learners.

From the above, it is imperative that supervisors are close to and involved in the instructional process, for it is part of their responsibility to teach, analyze teaching and learning, model different teaching styles and contribute to the development of teaching materials.

In support of this assertion, an International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) research and study programme report (1998) stated that the core task of the supervisor is to visit schools under their jurisdiction for pedagogic and or administrative purposes. The extent of this task, the research report states, is made clear by specifying the number of schools to be inspected, the number of times each school should be inspected or the number of days to be used for supervision visits.

As school visits and inspection is a component of the supervisors role, writing on the issue of school visits and inspection, Hyman (1995) contended that appraising staff members with a view of providing guidance to them is a vital function of the supervisor, for it is essential that the supervisor should promote the professional growth of teachers, and in so doing he would find out the weak teachers and provide special guidance to them. Buttressing this fact in the role and functions of a supervisor, Kochar (1981) observed that the primary importance of supervision is curricular programme or instruction – process; hence during school visits, the supervisor should check the effectiveness of teaching methods, audiovisual aids used to make teaching effective and interesting, the way the teacher ensures participation of the students in the learning situation, the written work or home work and their evaluation. In furtherance, Kochar maintained that if it is the supervisor's role to check the time table, the distribution of work among staff and teachers lesson notes.

In another development, Musaazi (1985) was of the view that supervision of school instruction is meant to improve the teaching and learning process in schools; in his view therefore, the function of the

supervisor is to play a leading role in providing a pleasant, stimulating and wholesome environment in which teachers will feel satisfied, happy and secure to work, it is the responsibility of the supervisor to ensure that teachers have the opportunity to share ideas and work together effectively as a team to achieve the goal of the school.

To achieve the objectives of supervision, Carron and De Grauwe (UNESCO, October 1997) stated that the official job description of most supervisors contains a number of support–related tasks in particular through in service training and demonstration lessons. For example, the report has it that in Bangladesh, supervisors are demanded to improve the professional ability of teachers through demonstration lessons and sub-cluster training, give guidance to schools on school curriculum and do other several administrative tasks including the collection of statistical data and information.

The role of the supervisor is to release the potential of group members by increasing the degree to which each member is responsible for his/her own self direction, for a pupil learns more when he/she assumes- responsibility for his /her learning, and similarly, a teacher is more effective when he/she is responsible for making the final decision on what constitutes an appropriate teaching procedure for his class. (Wiles in Bhatt and Sharma, 1992). To this effect, Wiles (1986) maintained that the function of the supervisor is to release the potential of the teacher by sharing his/her authority to make decisions with the teacher in order to enable him/her take action concerning the effectiveness of the teaching/learning process. The instructional supervisor, Wiles concludes, is therefore expected to transform principles of human relations into substantive programmes of action by making teachers feel comfortable,

creating lines of communication and fostering security that contributes to the study and improvement of teaching.

From the literature reviewed so far, since supervision covers all those services whose functions are to inspect, control, evaluate, advise, assist and support school heads and teachers, it can be concluded that the functions of the school supervisor is in line with the assertion of Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) that:

1) It is the supervisor's role to provide leadership among teachers. That is, the supervisor's skills and experiences should readily be placed at the service of teachers.

2) The supervisor looks for a teacher's hidden talent and encourages it to come out.

3) The supervisor should establish good rapport between his co-workers since that would ensure the smooth running of the school.

4) The supervisor must have great respect for a teacher's initiative, experimentation and sense of creativity. Thus, the circumstances under which every teacher's action takes place in the classroom needs clear understanding before any relevant advice can be given by the supervisor.

Challenges of School Supervision

Every human institution, not excluding school – supervision, is bound to face challenges of one form or the other. But in the case of supervision, this seriously undermines school effectiveness and morale, for as carron, De Grauwe and Govinda (2001) maintained these challenges diminish the ability of the supervisor in the performance of his/her duties. For instance they

38

postulated that lack of adequate and appropriate office accommodation and transport has been a major challenge to school supervision in Bostwana and this problem in addition to the multiple functions of supervision greatly impose a big work load that can go a long way to diminish the effectiveness of the supervisor.

In addition to this, a UNESCO (2001) report stated it was sad to note that some supervisor were appointed to the position with them being ignorant about their environment and functions, yet they were saddled with too many schools to cover, and equally too many teachers to supervise. The report further indicated that in most developing countries including Tanzania and Namibia, teachers seemed not to follow the suggestions and recommendations of supervisors, as such, it was difficult to convince them to accept new ideas and changes. For instance in another development, Eye (1975) contended that supervision itself had a history of subservience to administrative convenience which caused teachers to view supervisors as system executioners. In view of this, in a research to find out who teachers looked to for assistance when they had problems,

Haller and Keenan (1999) found out that teachers went to other teachers for help and sources of new ideas and they believed in each other more. This therefore gives potent reason for supervisors to provide support for informal teacher growth and staff development approaches rather than criticisms.

In this regard, informal approaches suggested by Haller and Keenan (1999) are low-keyed, classroom-focused and teacher-oriented. Hence the supervisor enters into a relationship with the teacher on an equal footing and

assumes an active role along with tearchers. Teachers capacities, needs and interests are paramout but sufficient planning and structure is introduced to bridge the gap between these interests, school programmes and instructional needs.

Another problem confronting supervision according to Unruh (1973) was that of the supervisor balancing the process of directing and controlling the supervision process. This greatly affects the inter-relationship between supervisors and teachers; since teachers do not have the time and opportunity to go beyond their own curriculum, it is the supervisor who normally initiates improvement of teaching and learning. In doing this, the supervisor must be willing to hear and evaluate teachers' ideas, since supervision involves a process of analysing and appraising views of others. Even though evaluating the teaching/learning process should be consistent with the criteria set by the educational authorities, the supervisors' role of making assessment and judgements about the instructional programme in the school should not be in isolation from analysing and appraising other teachers' views, however, balancing this role has been a source of problems between supervisors and teachers.

Also Annoh (1997) was of the view that another challenge facing supervision is the fact that a supervisor is expected to possess the competence, confidence and expertise to do his job of supervision effectively. These job requirements are dependent on the supervisor's academic qualification and professional experience. A supervisor's qualification and experience should on the normal circumstances be higher than those of the other teachers whose job he is supposed to assess. What happens in a situation when an Assistant

Director with certificate "A" visits a Graduate Principal Superintendent, for example? A feeling of insufficiency on the part of this supervisor and perhaps a feeling of superiority on the part of the teacher whose work is to be inspected may arise. As a result, there can be negative feelings which can render the supervisory exercise ineffective.

Neagley (1962) pointed out that to this effect, there was a conclusive negative relationship between the extent of confidence held by teachers in the supervisor and the supervisor's conformity with bureaucratic practice. Furthermore, Sergiovanni and Starrat cited in Mankoe (2002) claimed that economic constraints make teachers and for that matter, supervisors face the problem of making ends meet. This situation induces some supervisors to seek for monetary favours indirectly and teachers in the schools readily accede to the supervisors' request. In return for teachers' favours, supervisors tune down professional sanctions which could otherwise be served or offered. The result is ineffective supervision at the end of the transaction.

Mosher and Purpel (1972) were of the view that "although there are undoubtedly many instances of well-received supervisory practices, a common response of teachers to supervision is expressed in the suspicion that surrounds supervision as ineffectual and at worst, a harmful form of interference with the work of the teacher" (pg. 151-153) This view from Mosher and Purpel is very common among teachers and has been a strain on the effective cooperation that should exist between the supervisor and the supervisee. Mosher and Purpel therefore concluded that if teachers view supervision as interference in their work, then it means most of the new ideas and innovations which might be given them at in-service training courses would either not be

41

implemented or if anything at all, not well implemented. This has undoubtedly been one of the challenges in supervision.

Again, Mankoe (2002) postulated that owing to the lack of official vehicles, supervisors have to rely on public means of transport. In this case, schools in the very remote areas may not be visited for many months. Officers who are able to travel to the schools use their own money expecting re-imbursement shortly after that. Usually, such re-imbursements are deferred until quarterly government subventions are paid. These subventions are sometimes delayed or are seen as inadequate to cater for full refund of monies spent. Another problem according to Mankoe emanates from the conditions under which staff development programmes are organised for supervisors. Sometimes staff development programmes are jumbled with the result that participants are invited to seminars without prior notice which would enable them to make prior preparation. This is particularly true to staff development programmes organised and sponsored by some non-government organisations. Participants are not given opportunity to experiment or practise the ideas learned at staff development programmes. Also, there are usually no follow-up visits to determine how the skills or knowledge acquired in seminars are being utilised. Under such conditions, supervisors may attend many staff development programmes which may not actually be of benefit to themselves and the teachers they are supposed to mentor.

Lastly Mankoe stated that one good strategy to achieve effective supervision is demonstration and that it is not adequate for supervisors to always admonish teachers towards effective teaching. Hence, it is more appropriate for supervisors to actually demonstrate by teaching in one full

period since example is better than precept. Unfortunately, supervisors only turn to "preach" to teachers and much of such frequent "preaching" can hardly register on the minds of teachers. They therefore revert to their old method of doing things soon after their interactions with supervisors. For instance, Tanko (2004) in a study on supervision in basic schools found out that supervisors do not give demonstration lessons to teachers during visits but rather criticize lessons and teachers performance without giving suggestions for improvement. Furthermore, a study on school supervision by Bone (1991) established that even though majority of both teachers and headteachers acknowledge the usefulness of some aspects of supervision, they complained that supervisors often give instant criticisms of teachers' work and also fail to offer ideas and practical demonstration which will help them in teaching. Bone therefore suggests that an urgent need of re-orientation on the part of the inspectorate officials is necessary.

Summary

The related literature above focus on the concept of supervision, history of supervision in Ghana, types of supervision, functions of school supervision, functions of the school supervisor and the challenges of supervision.

From the literature reviewed, supervision has been given different interpretations by various authors but in all, they seem to agree on the view that it is a service which primarily aims at improving all factors that come into play in ensuring the growth and development of the teaching/learning process Musaazi (1985) Glathorn (1990) Bolin & Panaritis (1992), and Carron, De Grauwe & Govinda (1998) all agreed with this assertion.

It can also be deduced from the literature reviewed that the various writers and researchers have identified supervision as a major catalyst that enhances teaching and learning, (Swearinger, 1962, Rue & Byers 1990, ; Wood & Thompson 1993,; Bannak & Waks, 1997). And for that matter, supervision as a tool for improving educational attainment has been used since from the colonial era to date in educational systems in all countries including Ghana (McWilliam & Kwamena-Poh, 1975, ; Zimpher et. al, 1990, ; Bhatt & Shamma, 1992)**.**

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methods and procedures used to generate data for the study. The chapter outlines and discusses the methodology used to conduct the research, hence it dealt with the description of the research design, the population for the study, sampling size and sampling procedures, instrumentation, pre-testing, data collection and analysis procedures.

Research Design

According to Gay (1992), a research design indicates the basic structure of the study, the nature of the hypothesis and the variables involved in the study. In every research, answers are obtained to the research questions or hypothesis formulated through a plan or research design which specifies how the data relating to the study should be collected and analyzed. There are many research designs, but for the purpose of this study, the descriptive research design was used. Agyedu, Donkor and Obeng (2007) observed that the descriptive research has become the most widely used research method. This type of research, they further said, described 'what is', hence it involves describing, recording, analyzing and interpreting conditions as they exists. This implies that descriptive reseach involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer research questions concerning the current status of the subject of study.

The most commonly used descriptive method in educational research is "survey" which was employed in this study. The survey design according to Alonge (1989) involved collecting data to assist the researcher to anwser the research questions formulalted about the problem. It is therefore best for this study because its aim is to provide accurate quantitative information about certain designated characteristics such as opinions and perceptions of the population under study in relation to supervision.

Furthermore, this design is preferred because Gay (1992) opined that it deals with issues as they stand and it also gives an accurate description of the issues under study. This implies that the research design helps to provide a comprehensive picture of supervision in the area of study without altering it, which gives room for effective examination of the situation.

Aborisade (1997) observed that the design is one in which the researcher is interested in studying certain characteristics, attitudes, feelings, beliefs, opinions, behaviours, perceptions etc of a group of people or items, which means that as Amedahe (2004) asserted, descriptive survey specifies the nature of a phenomenon, determines and reports the way things are. Thus, its use in this study brought into fore the types and nature of the supervision in the Sub-metropolis, its challenges and the current level of satisfaction and how it positively impacted on the academic performance of pupils/students.

Consequently, in this survey, data was typically collected through questionnaires as instruments developed for the study. This study was cross-sectional, thus, it involves the collection of data at one point in time or over a short period of time from a pre-determined sample or a cross-section of the

population, hence the study encompassed all the key elements involved in the supervision of teaching and learning.

The survey design also followed the description by Sarantakos (2005), Fraenkel and Warren (2002) that, surveys are methods of data collection in which information is gathered through oral or written questioning and could be structured, more informal, or a mixture of approaches. They further said that whatever the tools used to collect the information, it was essential to maintain consistency throughout the exercise to avoid errors. Newmann (2003) has indicated that, surveys systematically ask many people the same questions about a situation or a programme and measure many variables which infer about past behaviour, experiences or characteristics. The use of survey had an added advantage of requiring fewer resources in terms of time, participants and funds.

Population

The population of a study is the entire aggregate of all cases to which one wishes to generalize (Jaccared, 1983 cited in Key, 1997). In this study therefore, the target population was all head teachers, teachers and circuit supervisors in the Ablekuma North sub- metropolis.

Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis has sixty-five (65) public schools comprising five (5) circuits located in Dansoman, Mataheko, Abossey- Okai, Odorkor and Kwashieman. The Sub-Metropolis has a total population of five (5) Circuit Supervisors, forty-six (46) head teachers and six hundred and sixty-two (662) teachers. In some of the schools, one headteacher is responsible for both primary and Junior Secondary schools (Basic) whilst others have separate heads for primary and Junior secondary (Independent schools). Hence

the number of headteachers being less than the number of schools. Table 1 shows the population distribution in the Ablekuma North Sub- Metropolis.

Table 1

Population Distribution of Study Area

Circuit	Number of schools	Number of C/S	Number of Head teachers	Number of teachers
Dansoman	15	1	8	123
Abosey-Okai	10	1	6	134
Mataheko	12	1	8	104
Odorkor	11	1	11	140
Kwashieman	17	1	13	161
Total	65	5	46	662

Source: Ablekuma North Sub- Metropolis Education Office, 2008

Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

The accessible population was circuit supervisors, head teachers and teachers from twenty- two (22) selected schools comprising one-third (1/3) of the schools from each of the five circuits in the Sub-Metropolis.   These schools were randomly selected because, they were a representation of the five (5) circuits in the Sub-Metropolis.

According to Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh (1990), sampling is indispensable to the researcher because it is sometimes virtually impossible to use the entire population for a research. Amedahe (2004) opined that sampling involves the process of selecting a portion of the population to represent the entire population. Sarantakos (2005) postulated that a sample consists of a

carefully selected unit that comprises all the categories of the population. However, many researchers use different sampling methods to determine the sample size based on a given confidence level of precision required (Israel 1992).

The general notion of researchers however is that, the larger the sample size, the smaller the sampling errors, but Best and Khan (1998) asserted that sample size depends on the nature of the population, the data to be gathered, the analysis to be done and the funds available for the study.

A sample size of two hundred and seventy one (271) respondents was used for the study and a combination of simple random, purposive and stratified sampling procedures were used to select the sample size for the study. The strata groups were the circuits already formed by the Accra Metropolitan Education Directorate. The simple random sampling was used to select both the participating schools and the teachers. This was because according to Godwin (1995), this sampling procedure is often an effective practical way to create a representative sample. Furthermore, with the method, each member of the population has an equal chance of being picked and above all, random sampling method has a high reliability, high degree of representativeness and generalization of research findings (Kumar, 1999, Sarantakos, 2005)   Stratified sampling was employed to select the circuit used in the study because Ablekuma North sub metropolis schools are already in stratas and as Agyedu, Donkor and Obeng (2007) observed, it is the most convenient way to sample from a large and scattered population. Purposive sampling was used slect the head teachers and circuit supervisors because, the

technique allows the picking of subjects who are likely to provide the right information for the study (Osuala, 2005).

The total population of Ablekuma North sub metropolis is divided into five circuits; the Dansoman, New Abossey – Okai, Odorkor, Mataheko and Kwashieman circuits. In all, there are five (5) circuit supervisors, forty-six (46) headteachers and six hundred and sixty – two (662) teachers. With regard to the schools used for the study, 1/3 of the total number of schools in each circuit was used, and gave a total of twenty-two (22) schools. To select the schools, the names of the schools were written, folded and put into bowls according to circuits and the teacher from each circuit was asked to pick 1/3 of the total number of schools from each bowl.

For the purpose of the study, all the circuit supervisors and head teachers were used because their number was not large. The population of the teachers was large and all could not be used for the study. Therefore, two hundred and twenty (220) teachers being 1/3 of the total teacher population were randomly selected using the lottery method. The teachers used in the study were selected from the twenty-two (22) schools. To select the 220 teachers from the selected schools, ten (10) "Yes " and "No" for the rest were written on pieces of papers, folded and put into a box and shaken vigorously to mix them for each school in the circuits. Hence ten(10) teachers were selected from each school.

In total, a sample size of 271 respondents comprising of 5 circuit supervisors, 46 head teachers and 220 teachers was used for the study. Table 2 shows the sample size of respondents for the study.

Table 2

The Sample Size of Respondents

Circuit	Number of schools	Number of Circuit Supervisors	Number of Head teachers	Number of teachers
Dansoman	5	1	8	50
Abosey-Okai	3	1	6	30
Mateheko	4	1	8	40
Odorkor	4	1	11	40
Kwashieman	6	1	13	60
Total	22	5	46	220

Source: Survey Data, 2008

Instrumentation

All research studies involve collecting data. Data collection instrument therefore indicates how the researcher intends to obtain the relevant information with regards to the research questions guiding the study (Gay 1992,; Amedahe, 2004).

There are several methods used in data collection in descriptive survey but in this study, written questionnaires were employed. This is because as Amedahe (2004) asserted, questionnaire is the most commonly used instrument in Social Science and educational research. The questionnaire was preferred because respondents were literates. The questionnaires were researcher designed based on the research questions and consisted of open and close ended questions and a four likert scale for all respondents. The close ended questions provided opportunity for all respondents to answer the same set of questions from given alternatives and also facilitate processing of responses. The open ended questions allowed respondents the liberty to give insight into the issues that might not be thought of by the researcher.

51

Three different questionnaires were administered, one for the circuit supervisors, one for the head teachers and one for teachers.(See Appendices 1, 2 and 3). Each of the questionnaires consisted of questions pertaining to the research questions. Areas covered were:

1. Types of visits by supervisors.

2. regularity of the visits

3. types of supervision undertaken in schools

4. how these supervision impact on teaching and learning

5. views/perceptions on supervision

6. the usefulness and effectiveness of supervision

7. suggestions to improve supervision

The questionnaires covering the above issues were designed to solicit respondents' views and establish a model of supervision that could achieve desired learning outcomes. In the case of usefulness and effectiveness of supervision, respondents responded to rating scales to indicate their level of agreement with each response.

Pre-Testing of Instrument

Validity and reliability are essential to the effectiveness of any data gathering procedure (Best & Khan, 1998). Validity is the appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of specific inference made from the instrument and reliability is the degree of consistency that the instrument or procedure demonstrates (Gall et. al, 1996). Sarantakos (2005) has indicated that, a measure is said to have content validity if it covers all aspects of the researcher's topic. In addition, the content of the measure must be relevant to the traits and representative of traits that are being looked at. The content

validity of the instruments was ensured by the dissatation supervisor and other lecturers in the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration for corrections and suggestions.

A pre-test of the questionnaires was done to establish the internal consistency of the instruments in the Teshie circuit. This circuit was chosen because, it has similar characteristics as the study area. The pre-test was conducted in April 2008 with two (2) circuit supervisors, eight (8) head teachers and twenty (20) teachers. The data on sub-scales collected from the pre- test was entered into the SPSS version 15 data file for computer analysis to generate alpha coefficient. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the scales of the instrument ranged from 0.73 to 0.96 (See Table 3). The sub-scales were reliable for the main data collection because as suggested by Pallant (2005) and Gupta (1999), a reliability coefficient of 0.70 and above of an instrument is considered as reliable.

Table 3

Reliability Co-efficients of Sub-scales of the Research Instruments

Sub- Scale	Number of Items	Cronbach's alpha
Frequencies of C/S activities	12	0.73
Usefulness of C/S activities	8	0.89
C/S steps for improvement	12	0.96
Frequencies of headteachers activities	7	0.77
Usefulness of headteachers activities	7	0.76
Headteachers steps for improvement	12	0.73
Frequencies of visits by categories of supervisors	3	0.82

n=30.   Source: Field Survey data, 2008

Data Collection Procedure

The administration and collection of data was done by the researcher with the assistance of the head teachers. Permission was however sought from the officer in-charge of the sub-Metro of the selected schools before administering the questionnaires. The researcher had to explain the purpose of the study to respondents after which copies of the questionnaires were given out to the selected circuit supervisors, head teachers and teachers. The purpose was to ensure that respondents understood the questions properly. The researcher established a very good rapport with all the respondents to give off their best and also made sure that all questionnaires were given back to her after completion. This ensured a high response rate (92.3%). Though some of the respondents were demanding money, with tactful strategy most of the answered questionnaires were collected from them. The collection of information started from July ending and ended in the middle of August 2008.

Data Processing and Analysis

According to Hopkins and Ainscow (1994) cited in Amedahe (2004), descriptive statistics involve tabulating, depicting and describing data collected. The field data was collected, edited and scrutinized to ensure consistency in the responses provided by respondents. An overview of the open-ended responses was done and responses that expressed similar ideas were grouped together and described. The coded responses were entered into the computer using the Statistical Product for Service Solutions (SPSS) application software for analysis.

Guided by the research questions, descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to describe the data from close ended questions. Means and standard deviations were also generated to find the trend of some of the questions. A one -way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test whether there were any statistically significant differences in the level of supervision in the sub-Metropolis and between circuits.

Tamhane's T 2 post hoc analysis test was used to determine where the differences actually existed between the circuits. This test was used because the number of respondents in the circuits were not equal. According to Pallant(2005), Tamhane's T 2 post hoc analysis is the most rigorous among equal variance not assummed and is also used by most researchers. The A priori value for significance was set at 5% alpha level.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter discusses sequentially the results of the study based on the set research questions. The analysis of the data collected from the study are presented and discussed below.

Research Question 1: What types of supervision is carried out in the Ablekuma North Sub- Metropolis?

The study sought to assess the nature of supervision carried out in the Ablekuma North Sub- Metropolis. Table 4 summarises the general types of supervision practiced in schools from the perspective of C/S, head teachers and teachers. Majority 195 (77.2%) of the respondents said both types of supervisions were practiced in schools.

Table 4

Types of Supervision Practiced in Schools as Reported by C/S, Head teachers and Teachers

Type of supervision	C/S		Headteachers		Teachers		Total freq	%
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
External	-	-	1	2.4	7	3.4	8	3.2
Internal	1	20	5	11.9	43	21	49	19.6
Both	4	80	36	85.7	153	75	193	77.2
Total	5	100	42		203	100	250	100

n= 250   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

From the results in Table 4, supervisors were carrying out their work as expected. This is consistent with Hopkins and Ainscow's (1994) view that external supervision plays a complementary role to internal supervision by providing professional advice and guidance to teachers. This is ascertained from the fact that internal supervision also takes place in the sub metropolis.

The results in Table 5 revealed that, a little over half 133 (53.2%) of the respondents maintained that internal supervision was being emphasised.

Table 5

Types of Supervision Emphasized in Schools as Perceived by

C/S, Head teachers and Teachers

Type of supervision	C/S		Headteachers		Teachers		Total No	%
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
External	-		3	7	5	2.5	8	3.2
Internal	1	20	29	69	103	50.7	133	53.2
Both	4	80	10	23.8	95	46.8	109	43.6
Total	5	100	42	100	203	100	250	100

n=250   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

C/S who are employed to carry out external supervision in the study area said both types of supervision were emphazised, this goes to confirm the views of teachers and headteachers that internal supervision and external supervision were given more emphasis. This implies that, the complementary role that external supervision was expected to play in schools was felt. This is in consistent with Hopkins and Ainscow's (1994) view that external

supervision plays a complementary role and duties to the internal supervision by providing proffessional guidance and advice.

Furthermore, summarising the results on visits to schools by categories of external supervisors in Table 6, it shows that, a little over half 105 (51.7%) of the teachers stated that C/S visited their schools often. Only a few 21(10.3%) of the teachers stated that C/S visited their schools sometimes. However, 132 65% of the teachers said Directors never visited their schools.

Table 6

Visits to Schools by Categories of External Supervisors as Reported by Teachers

Ext'nal Sups	V O		O		So		S		N	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq	%
Director	-	-	3	1.5	13	6.4	54	26.6	132	65
Sch.										
Insp	4	2.0	43	21..2	90	44..3	58	28.6	8	3.9
C/S	72	35.5	105	51.7	21	10..3	2	1.0	3	1.5

n=203   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

Note: VO = Very Often, O = Often, So = Sometimes, S =   Seldom, N = Never.

Majority of the teachers 132 (65%) indicated that they have not had any direct contact with external supervisors except the C/S because a little over half 105 (51.7) posited that, their interaction with C/S was more than the other external supervisors. This mean that, most teachers are left out without

external supervision as it is not always possible to reach all teachers in the schools.

The study also found out that, supervision as reported by C/S and headteachers were either intensive, regular or occassional. Table 7 summarises the forms that supervision takes in schools and the results showed that about half the respondents (50%) stated that they made regular visits to schools and a few (19.1%) of them said they made intensive and occassional visits to schools.

Table 7

Forms of Supervision as Reported by C/S and Head teachers

Visits	C/S		Head teachers		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	No	%
Intensive	1	20	4	9.5	5	10.6
Regular	3	60	21	50.0	24	51
Occasional	-	-	3	7.1	3	6.4
Intensive and Occasional	1	20	8	19.1	9	19.1
Occasional and Regular	-	-	6	14.3	6	100
Total	5	100	42	100	47	100

n=47   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

Responses from C/S and head teachers showed that intensive and ocassional visits constituted 19.1%. This low percentages could be due to the fact that these visits take longer days in schools since they involve a more intensive inspection. In line with what Musaazi (1985) states, intensive

supervision is ocassional and it could take 3-5 days since in this type of visit, supervisors examine the subjects taught, time tables, scheme of work, lesson preparation, the physical and whole organizational structure of the school and finally dicuss the content, difficulties and weakness of the whole school set up with the staff. Whatever form supervision takes, it is expected to compliment the efforts of teachers towards the acheivement of the objectives of the teaching/learning process (Musaazi, 1985). However, the low percentage of the intensive and ocassional visits is an indication that its low performance could be as a result of lack of transport for C/S, too many schools under the jurisdiction of an for an inspection team/C/S and other burdens of administrative duties for supervisors.

Table 8 summarises the frequency of external supervisors visits to schools as perceived by head teachers. From the study, more than half of (½) the respondents 24 (57.1%) indicated that, the C/Ss made more regular visits than the Director and Inspectorate division.

Table 8

Frequency of External Supervision as Reported by Head teachers

Frequency	Director		School Inspectorate		C/S	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Weekly	-	-	-	-	24	57.1
Fortnightly	-	-	5	11.9	10	23.8
Monthly	2	4.8	3	7.1	5	11.9
Quarterly	2	4.8	13	31.0	2	4.8
Once a year	38	90.5	21	50.0	1	2.4
Total	42	100	42	100	42	100

n= 42   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

The distribution pattern is not a good indicator for GES because first line supervisors (C/S and headteachers) turned to relax in their supervisory roles; when C/S and school heads know external supervisors will visit, they step up supervision and hence, teachers work better. The low percentage of supervision could therfore be attributed to the less frequent visits made by the Director and inspectorate Divsion. Johnson (1996) maintained that students whose teachers are adequately supervised offen perform better than students whose teachers are not adequately supervised. In this study however, the head teachers reported having less contacts with external staff and as such have less supervision. According to Carron, De Grauwe and Govinda (2001) external inspection visits lead to improvement in preparation and use of teaching/learning materials, evaluation of pupils work and general school administration.

The study also sought to find out the differences of level of satisfaction to external supervision by school heads. It was found out that majority (91%) of the respondents claimed they were not satisfied with external supervisors visits in their respective areas. Table 9 shows means and standard deviations on headteachers level of satisfaction with external supervision.

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations on Headteachers Level of Satisfaction

with External Supervision

Visits	Head teachers	
	$\overline{x}$	Sd
Weekly	4	0.4.
Fortnightly	4	0.5
Monthly	3	0.7
Quarterly	2	0.5
Once a year	2	0.5

Scale: 1=highly dissatisfied, 2= dissatisfied, 3= somehow satisfied, 4=satisfied and 5= highly satisfied.

n=42   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

   i. Head teachers were satisfied with once a week and once every fortnight

  ii. Head teachers were somehow satisfied with once a month

 iii. Head teachers were dissatisfied with quaterly and once in a year visits.

The respondents were generally dissatisfied with the external supervisors quarterly and once a year visits. However, they were satisfied with the weekly and fortnightly visits. They were somehow satisfied with the monthly visits

The less frequent visits may be due to less number of staff in the system or the large number of schools especially for the C/S who work directly with headteachers. This could also be due to the fact that even though the C/S could be categorized as an external supervisor, he/she is more regular with school visits than the Education director and the head of

inspectorate. This could imply that teachers feel the impact of C/S supervision better and are more at ease with the C/S. This is in line with the assertion that teachers are satisfied with supervision that makes them feel they are human beings with a particular contribution to make in the educational process, hence the teacher feels there is a mutual give and take between him/her and the supervisor (Kochar, 1981). Their responses were consistent as the SD was less than one.

Research Question 2: What type of supervision do teachers, headteachers and C/S in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis prefer?

With regard to preference of type of supervision, it was found out that, half (50%) the respondents preferred internal supervision. Both external and Internal supervision was preferred by 43.2% of the respondents. See Table 10 below.

Table 10

Type of Supervision Prefered by C/S, Headteachers and Teachers

Type of supervision	C/S		Headteachers		Teachers		Total	%
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
External	-	-	7	16.6	10	4.9	17	6.8
Internal	2	40	23	54.8	100	49.3	125	50
Both	3	60	12	28.6	93	45.8	108	43.2
Total	5	100	42	100	203	100	250	100

n= 250   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

From Table 10 above, C/S preferred both types of supervision and did not want external alone. The headteachers on the other hand preferred internal

supervision to the other types, whilst the teachers took to internal and both. They did not want external alone.

Those who preferred internal supervision said their problems were better understood and solved immediately by headteachers than C/S or other external supervisors. Also, headteachers supervisions were more regular and continous without intimidations as that of external supervisors. Those who preferred external supervision said new policies and methods of teaching were communicated to them and headteachers and teachers work harder when external supervisors come around. In addition, there is general improvement in school attendance as drunkeness and absenteeism in schools are suspended.

In view of this, it was found out that, majority of teachers were comfortable with internal supervision by C/S and heads. This could imply that, some supervisors use partnership and collaboration between them and teachers, hence making teachers feel at ease, while the others use prescribed set of rules thereby making them more of bosses than collaborators . This might mean that majority of the teacher respdents viewed supervisors as helpers and consultants. This is in line with the UNESCO (1998) findings which said the supervisor was an educational leader who acts as a stimulus, a guide and a consultant but not a critic or a director. Those who were not comfortable when being supervised view supervision as faults finding. This collaborates with Bones (1991) findings that even though both teachers and headteachers acknowledge the usefulness of some aspects of supervision, supervisors often give instant criticisms of teachers' work and also fail to offer ideas and practical demonstration which will help them in teaching. UNESCO (1998) , Rue and Byars (1996) also reported that, though supervision is to

control and improve the quality of teachers and the achievement of learners, supervisors tend to criticise rather than give support to supervisees and at times focus on petty administrative matters.

Research Question 3 What are the perceptions of the partees involved on the kind of supervision that could promote effective teaching/ learning?

Majority 179 (71.6%) of respondents said headteachers activities influenced teaching and learning. 42 (16.8%) said C/S activities influenced teaching and learning whiles a few 16 (6.4%) said peers activities influenced teaching and learning.and only 13 (5.2%) said external supervisors' activities influenced teaching and learning. Table 11 presents the results of respondents.

Table 11

Supervision that Promoted Effective Teaching and Learning as Reported by C/S, Head teachers and Teachers

Supervision	C/S		Head teachers		Teachers		Total	%
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
External	-	-	2	4.8	11	5.4	13	5.2
C/S	1	20	5	11.9	36	17.7	42	16.8
Headteachers	4	80	32	76	143	70	179	71.6
Peers	-	-	3	7	13	6.4	16	6.4
Total	5	100	42	100	203	100	250	100

n= 250   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

Though respondents earlier indicated that internal and external supervisions were carried in schools, Table 11 showed that, majority 179

(71.6%) of them said headteachers activities facilitated and influenced teaching and learning. What is significant about the results is that, four out of the five C/S who were to carry out external supervision maintained that headteachers activites influence teaching and learning. This implies that headteachers activities were seen to be very important as their duties among others might help to improve teachers' standard of teaching, and by so doing, raise the standard of the pupils in the schools. This result collaborated with Bhatt and Sharma's (1992) findings that the headteacher ensured that adequate teaching/ learning took place in the school by being the first line school supervisor to give professional guidance and advice to the teachers as well as organise in-service training courses for them. This result is also in consistent with Bannak and Waks' (1997) and Beeby's (1997) findings that school based supervision was a major tool for improving school effectiveness and educational outcomes.

The result might also mean that, the presence of external supervisors who are suppose to use their experiences and knowledge to complement and support headteachers were not well felt in the study area. It could also mean that, external supervisors were either not well resourced to carry out their duties or that their attitude to work was appalling. This could imply that, the collaborative effort that should exist between external and internal supervisors for enhancing teaching and learning effectiveness in the schools was lacking. Few respondents said peers activities influenced teaching and learning. This may be true because people learn better when their friends teach them. According to Bhatt and Sharma (1992), teacher-teacher help or supervision could reduce the amount of threat and stress that could be generated in a

relationship and make it possible to broaden the base of expertise and creativeness that could be available as a source of psychological and technical support.

In assessing the supervision that could promote effective teaching and learning, the study sought to find out the frequency and usefulness of activities performed by C/S and headteachers. The results showed that, most 193 95.2% of the respondents claimed to perform their activities frequently and only a few 2 (4.8%) said they do not perform their activities frequently. In view of this, one would have expected a mark improvement in the teaching/learning process, hence a positive impact on the academic performance of pupils/Students. This is because Glickman, Gorden and Jovita (1998) maintained that supervision consitutes activities that enable teachers to improve instruction for students and hence, not a one shot activity but a process and a function. Kochar (2001) supported this when he said supervision has to do with the performance of activities like guiding, explaining, advising, stimulating and leading teachers in order to bring about continuity of improvements in instructional programmes for the acheivement of instructional objectives. However, if academic performance of pupils was still poor, then other factors could be responsible. Headteachers and C/S who claimed they did not perform their supervisory activities frequently were only a few. This could be explained from the point that in every organization there were bound to be people who had negative attitudes towards their work. Here again, factors such as poor attidute to work, lack of transport, accessibility to the schools as well as other administrative duties could have been accountable for that. However, whatever the contraints, they could have done better for

Wiles (1986) said that supervisors need to provide effective leadership within their staff by seeking constantly to improve their sensitivity to the feeling of others, increase the accuracy of their estimate of group opinion on important issues, become more cooperative to their work, establish higher goals for themselves and interract more frequently with those they work.

With regard to usefulness of the activities performed by by C/S and Headteachers, the results showed that, most 190 (90.5%) of respondents claimed their activities were useful. Only a few 4(9.5%) said not all their activities were useful. This implies that C/S and headteachers see the activities they perform in supervision as useful to the acheivement of the goals of supervision. Perhaps, this is because, teachers are of the view that good supervisory practices (activities) help improve instructions, hence make lessons more interesting and productive and pupils are well motiovated. There was also a general notion that good supervisory practices helps teachers reach their potential since they work harder and prepare for lessons better. This is in line with Carron, DeGrauwe & Govinda's (2001) findings in Tazania and Bostswana which revealed that teachers were of the view that when good supervisory activities are performed by supervisors, it leads to improvement in areas like:

    i. The preparation of good lessons plans

    ii. The preparation and use of teaching/learning materials (T/LMS).

    iii. Evaluation of pupils work and

    iv. General school administration.

Furthermore, for example, vetting of lesson notes, observation and staff development activities are well appreciated by teachers; and C/S as well

as headteachers see activities performed in supervision as helpful to the management of schools since it can be an additional tool in their attempt to ensure discipline among teachers Carron, DeGrauwe & Govinda, 2001).

In summary, the study looked at the means and standard deviations on C/Ss and headteachers level of frequency and usefulness of activities in supervision.(See Tables 12 and 13).

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations on C/S' frequency of supervisory activities and their usefulness

Activities	Frequency		Usefulness	
	$\overline{x}$	SD	$\overline{x}$	SD
1. Observe the lessons of all teachers.	2.0	0.5	1.2	0.4
2. Administer achievement tests on pupils.	2.0	0.5	1.4	0.5
3. Examine the written work of Pupils.	1.4	0.4	1.2	0.4
4. Examine before commencement of inspection the lesson notes prepared by teachers for the day of inspection/supervision.	1.2	0.5	1.2	0.5
5. Give feed back to the individual Teachers after observation.	1.0	0.5	1.4	0.5
6. Conduct demonstration lesson.	1.4	1.0	1.4	0.5
7. Send inspection report to higher authority and head teachers for action	2.0	0.5	1.6	0.5
8. Check whether actions have been taken on the remarks made	1.4	0.5	1.6	0.5

Table 12 Cont.	Activities		Frequency	Usefulness	
	$\overline{x}$	SD	$\overline{x}$	SD	
9. Invite suggestions from staff for improvement of the school.	1.6	0.5	1.6	0.5	
10. Convene meetings with PTA if any, to discuss importance of school performance.	1.6	0.5	1.6	0.5	
11. Fix targets for performance for the next year.	1.6	0.5	1.6	0.5	

Note: Means was computed on a 3 – point Likert –scale

Frequency: 1-Always   2 – sometimes   3 – Never

Usefulness: 1 – Very Useful   2 – Useful   3 – Not Useful

n= 5   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008.

From the results in Table 12, based on group means,C/S perceived:

i. Most(10) of the activities were done sometimes. Mean scores ranged from 0.6 to 2.0 and nine (9) of the supervisory activities were done always. Mean scores ranged from 1.0 to 1.4.

ii. most(10) of the supervisory activities were useful as far as facilitation was concerned and nine (9) of them were very useful. Mean scores ranged from 1.6 to 1.8 and their responses were consistent as the standard deviation was less than one.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations on HeadTeachers' frequency of supervisory activities and their Usefulness

Activities	Frequency		Usefulness	
	$\overline{x}$	SD	$\overline{x}$	SD
Observe the lessons of teachers	1.5	0.5	1.3	0.4
Give feed back to individual teachers after observation	1.4	0.5	1.1	0.5
Conduct demonstration lessons for teachers	2.0	0.5	1.5	0.6
Invite suggestions from teachers	1.4	0.5	1.4	0.5
Convene PTA meetings to discuss improvement of school performance	1.4	0.5	1.2	0.4
Fix targets for performance termly	1.5	0.6	1.3	0.4
Encourage peer supervision among teachers	1.8	0.7	1.4	0.6

Note: Means was computed on a 3 – point Likert –scale

Frequency: 1-Always   2 – sometimes   3 – Never

Usefulness: 1 – Very Useful   2 – Useful   3 – Not Useful

n= 42   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

From the results in Table 13, based on group means, head teahers perceived:

i. most of the activities were done always and only three activities were perceived to be done sometimes. These activities were: conducting demonstration lessons for teachers, observing the lessons of teachers and encouraging peer supervision among teachers. Mean scores ranged

from 1.3 to 2.0. Their responses were consistent as the standard deviation (SD) was less than one.

ii. most of the activities were very useful as far as the facilitation was , only two of the activities were not useful as far as the facilitation was concerned. Mean (x) scores ranged from 1.4 to 2.0. Their responses were consistent as the standard deviation (SD) was less than one

In soliciting the perception of supervision by school heads, teachers, and C/Ss, the study looked at their views on the importance of supervision. To ascertain this, Circuit supervisors, head teachers and teachers were asked to rate the importance of supervision. From Table 14, more than half 193 (77.2%) of the respondent agreed that supervision was important and 26 (10.4%) of them highly agreed. While 15 (6.0%) disagreed that supervision was important, 10 (4.0%) of them highly disgreed. 6 (2.4%) of the respondents were uncertain.

Table 14

Importance of Supervision as Perceived by Circuit Supervisors, Head teachers and Teachers

Responses	C/S		Head teachers		Teachers		Total	%
	Fre.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
Highly Agree	3	60	7	16.6	16	7.9	26	10.4
Agree	1	20	27	64	165	81	193	77.2
Undecided	-	-		2.4	5	2.5	6	2.4
Disagree	1	20	4	9.5	10	4.9	15	6
Highly Agree	-	-	3	7.1	7	3.4	10	4
Total	5	100	42	100	203	100	250	100

n= 250   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

From Table 14, it can be seen that majority 193 (77.2%) of the respondents agreed that supervision was important in schools. Those who highly agreed and those who agreed said supervision helped in the sharing of ideas, views and experiences among supervisors and supervisee which led to skills and knowledge acquisition thereby improving instructions and making lessons more interesting leading to children's motivation to learn. This collaborates with Carron, DeGrauwe and Govinda (2001) assertion that, supervision improves the preparation and use of teaching materials, evaluate pupils work and general school administration. Also, supervision allows the sharing of ideas, views and experiences among supervisors and supervisees and ensures disciple in schools. This is in consistent with Wood and Thompson (1993) findings that, supervision promotes school effectiveness by helping teachers to acquire new skills and new teaching methods. Those who highly disagreed and disagreed perhaps see supervision as a threat to their individuality for a UNESCO (2001) report said some supervisors were too harsh on teachers and even pointed out their mistakes to them in the presence of pupils.

Research Question 5: What are the challenges of supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub- Metropolis?

Table 15 summarizes the challenges of supervision as perceived by circuit supervisors, head teachers and teachers in ascending order. It was found out that the main challenge to supervision was lack of logistics, equipment and materials and under rating of supervisors' competencies was the least challenge.

Table 15

Challenges of Supervision as Reported by C/S, Head teachers and

Teachers

Challenge	C/S		Head teachers		Teachers	
	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)
Lack of logistics, equipment and materials.	5	100	42	100	203	100
Less follow-up visits	5	100	38	90.5	203	100
Less number of supervisors	5	100	32	76.2	190	93.6
Heavy workload(Many schools to supervise)	5	100	27	64.3	180	88.7
Teachers failure to heed to advice	4	80	25	59.6	150	73.9
Underrating of supervisors competencies	4	80	20	47.6	103	50.7

n=250   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008   (Multiple Responses)

Lack of logistics, equipment and materials was their major challenge. This is true because for supervisors to perform effectively, they need to be well equipped with materials and resources. This is in consistent with Carron, DeGrauwe and Govinda's (2001) assertion that, recuiting officers and paying their salaries without giving them the posibility to go out and visit schools is hardly a good venture. Mankoe (2002) postulated that owing to the lack of official vehicles, supervisors relied on public means of transport and as such, schools in very remote areas may not be visited for many months. Harris

(1975) contended that supervision could be effectively carried out when materials and logistics were provided. According to Elsbree and Harold (1967), modern day supervision should not be limited to mere classroom visits, individual teacher conferences, rating of teachers and writing of reports. It should also include the curriculum, materials for instruction, the school community and other administrative functions.

Respondents also mentioned low follow-up visits by external supervisors. According them, external supervisors are to come round and see if the skills or knowledge acquired during trainings are being utilised as expected. This collaborates with Mankoe's (2002) findings in a study on effective school management that, there were usually no follow-up visits to determine how the skills or knowledge acquired in seminars were being utilised.

Circuit Supervisors complained of having too many schools under their jurisdiction to supervise, as such they were not able to cover all of them. UNESCO (2001) noted that some supervisors were appointed to the position with them being ignorant about their environment and functions, yet they were saddled with too many schools to cover, and equally too many teachers to supervise.

Some teachers' failure to heed to advice was another challenge respondents mentioned. If teachers who are suppose to ensure better methods of lessons delivery in classroom fail to heed to advice of their supervisors, then pupils achievements may definitely become low. According to a UNESCO's (2001) report, teachers seemed not to follow the suggestions and recommendations of supervisors and as such, it is difficult to convince them to

accept new ideas and changes, hence what was taught at in-service trainings and workshops were rarely put into use.

Some supervisees underrate the supervisors' competencies with the view that they have higher qualifications than them. Annoh (1997) is in the view that, supervisor's qualification and experience should on the normal circumstances be higher than those of the other teachers whose job he is suppose to assess. Also a supervisor is expected to possess the competence, confidence and expertise to do his job of supervision effectively.

Some supervisors blame rather than help supervisees in a bid to cover up their lack of expectise and competence.

Research Question 5: Is supervision in all circuits of the Sub-Metropolis the same?

This section describes whether differences existed in the levels of supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis. Analysis of the Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the differences. Table 16 shows the results.

Table 16

ANOVA on Levels of Supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub Metropolis

Characteristic	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
levels of	Between	1.461	4	.365	5.562	.000
supervision	Groups					
	Within	16.092	246	.066		
	Groups					
	Total	17.553	250			

*$p<0.05$ n= 250   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

Table 16 shows that, there were statistical significant differences in the Ablekuma North Sub Metropolis as far as levels of supervision were concerned.

Tamhane's T2 post hoc multiple comparisons was done to show where the differences existed. Table 17 shows the results.

Table 17

Tamhane's T2 post hoc Multiple Comparisons in the Ablekuma North Sub Metropolis Circuits

Circuits		Mean Difference	Standard Error	Sig
Abossey-Okai	Dansoman	.17861	.06353	.065
	Kwashieman	.16502	.59387	.075
	Odorkor	-.00337	.06546	1.000
	Mataheko	.09578	.06323	.766
Dansoman	Abosey- Okai	-.17861	.06323	.065
	Kwashieman	-.01359	.04521	1.000
	Odorkor	-.18198*	.05290	.007
	Mataheko	-.06924	.05015	.738
Odorkor	Abossey-Okai	.09578	.06546	1.000
	Dansoman	.08253*	.05294	.009
	Kwashieman	.06924*	.04788	.007
	Mataheko	-.09916	.05251	.476
Kwashieman	Abossey-Okai	.00337	.05938	.075
	Dansoman	.18198	.04521	1.000
	Odorkor	.16839*	.04788	.007
	Mataheko	.09916	.04478	.738
Mataheko	Abossey-Okai	-.09578	.06323	.766
	Dansoman	.08283	.05015	.658
	Kwashieman	.06924	.04478	.738
	Odorkor	.09916	.05257	.476

*p<0.05   n= 250   Source: Field Survey Data, 2008

The post hoc analysis in Table 17 indicated that, differences exsisted between Odorkor, Dansoman and Kwashieman circuits. This means that supervision in Dansoman and Kwashieman circuits was more effective than in Odorkor circuit. The results might also mean that, Dansoman and Kwashieman circuit supervisors organize regular meetings and trainings and this might have exposed them to new information and improved methodologies as the level of involvement in meetings and training schedules is very important for effective supervision. Moreover the training sessions might have built their self-confidence and motivated them to perform their duties. The difference could also mean that the schools were within reach of Circuit supervisors and hence location or proximity of the C/Ss to the schools might have allowed them to visit schools often and make the headteachers and teachers in these circuits to access information more easily than those in Odorkor circuit. However, it is important to note that, for supervision to be effective there should be a two-way communication to enable supervisors to identify and understand teachers needs and concerns. Wiles (1986) shared similar views when he maintained that, the function of the supervisor is to release the potential of the teacher by sharing his/her authority to make decisions with the teacher in order to enable him/her take action concerning the effectiveness of the teaching/learning process. In addition Thomas, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) postulated that human relationship between supervisor and supervisees contributed to successful school improvement; for in a study on teachers expectation on supervision. They found out that teachers expect to feel they have a say in matters that influence them. This means that, teachers in Dansoman and Kwashieman circuits who were regularly involved

in meetings and trainings with their supervisors might have been more involved in their work as compared to teachers in the Odorkor circuit.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the research problem, objectives, methodology and the major findings. It also presents the conclusions drawn from the study and recommendations made for application towards improving supervision in general and included areas for further studies.

Summary

Supervision is a critical element in quality education delivery and as such, serves as a relevant tool to ensure an effective and reliable educational system in a country, hence, the need for an efficient and effective supervision of the content of the academic curriculum of schools in order to improve on the quality of teaching and learning in the country. The quality of educational supervision is a key factor in determining the quality of the whole educational enterprise.

The standard of education has continued to decline in recent years in Ghanaian Basic schools in general and for that matter Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis. The purpose of the study was to ascertain the nature and challenges of supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis. Furthermore, the purpose was to assist the researcher suggest a model for an

effective and efficient supervision that could achieve desired teaching and learning outcomes in order to improve academic performance.

The study population was 662 teachers, 46 head teachers and 5 circuit supervisors in the Ablekuma North sub metropolis of the Greater Accra Metropolitan Education Directorate. Simple random and stratified sampling methods were used to ensure representation of respondents. A descriptive survey design was used to conduct the study involving two hundred and seventy-one (271) respondents. The researcher used content validated structured questionnaires to collect the data. Data collection was accomplished by the researcher herself through personal contacts. The response rate was 92.3%. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics with SPSS version 15 software.

All the respondents said both internal and external supervisions were carried out in schools, however, internal supervision was emphasized and preferred. Head teachers, were not satisfied with external supervision with particular reference to the external inspectorate's and the Director's visits to schools but were satisfied with the circuit supervisors' visits. There was concensus from circuit supervisors, head teachers and teachers that, internal supervision influenced teaching and learning better with particular reference to head teachers' activities.

Challenges of supervision identified were, lack of logistics, equipment and materials, teachers failure to heed to advice, low follow-up visits, teachers' problem of underating the competences of supervisors. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showed that, there were statistical significant differences in supervision in the Ablekuman North Sub Metropolis circuits

and the Tamhane' T2 post-hoc test revealed that, differences existed between Odorkor, Dansoman and Kwashieman circuits.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were made:

1. Both internal and external supervisions were practiced in the circuits and half 125 (50%) the respondents preferred internal supervision because, they saw internal supervision as the type that the supervisors understood the teachers' problems more and were willing to offer them the needed help. Teachers were therefore more comfortable when supervisors came to supervise them hence emphasis in the circuits was more on internal supervision since external sources were irregular.

2. The study showed that though both external and internal supervisors were responsible for supervision of schools, external sources were not regular except C/S' who regularly visit schools. They perform a laison function between the schools and the Education Directorate. This implies that, any laxity they display in their duties in the schools could affect teaching and learning processes negatively. The Director and Head of inspectorate do not pay visits at all, and where they even do visit, the visits were never regular. However, the irregularity of external supervision did not affect the effectiveness of supervision in enhancing teaching and learning.

3. From the study, it could also be concluded that, C/S visited schools more than any of the other external supervisors and headteachers and

teachers were not satisfied with the brief and follow up visits by external supervisors.

4. Though internal and external types of supervision were being carried out in schools, internal supervision was said to influence teaching and learning with particular reference to head teachers' supervision.

5. It was observed that respondents faced a lot of challenges which made their work less effective. The main challenges of respondents were: lack of logistics, equipment and materials, failure to heed to advice, low follow-up visits, problem of underating the competences of supervisors.

6. There were statistical significant differences in the level of supervision in the Ablekuman North Sub Metropolis. The differences exxisted between Odorkor, Dansoman and Kwashieman circuits.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Most of the respondents maintained that internal supervision and external supervision was mostly used in the study area. It is therfore recommended that supervisors should be given greater recognition in the form of attractive awards than they are presently receiving so that they would be motivated to put in their best.

2. Teachers preferred internal supervision more than external supervision because they see internal supervision as less intimidating. It is recommended that, headteachers should be well resourced and

motivated in the form of chalk, textbooks, decent accommodation, and allowances among others to continue to deliver their good work. Also, in-service education and training programmes should be organized more often for teachers to educate them to understand that supervision is not meant to find faults but meant to receive professional advice, guidance and direction from supervisors. This could also up-grade their knowledge and skills in their areas of work since most of the teachers' activities are outmoded.

3. It is recommended that external supervision particularly by C/S should be regular. Also, their salaries and allowances should be more attractive and adequate logistics be provided for them to perform their duties as required.

4. Further, Circuit supervisors should be encouraged to perform better by reducing the number of schools they supervise and their other administrative workload. If this is done, it would be clearly seen that external supervision would be complementing internal supervision to improve the instructional processes.

5. Adequate logistics and materials for supervision should be provided to enhance the discharge of duties of supervisors. Furthermore, supervisors should ensure regular visits to schools by changing their attidude to work and be more committed and dedicated. This will help consolidate skills and knowledge given to supervisees at training programmes. Special incentive packages should be instituted for circuit supervisors, head teachers and teachers who work in very remote areas.

6. Recommendations outlined to improve supervision should be prioritised and addressed by GES from time to time in order to make supervision effective. If this is done, the work of the Circuit supervisors and headteachers would go on smoothly and its multiplier effect would be felt in the acheivement of good academic performance.

Areas for Further Research

New areas of research necessary are:

1. The study could be conducted in other parts of the Accra Metropolitan Education Directorate.

2. The study could be conducted in private schools in the study area.

3. The study could be conducted in the study area to compare teaching headteachers with detached headteachers.

References

Ablekuma North Sub-Metropolis Education Direactorate (2001): Sub-Metro
    BECE Examination Report

Accra Metropolis Education Office (2001) Exam Unit Report

Aborisade, F. (1997). *Research methods*. Lagos: Multifirm Ltd Publishers.

Agezo, C & Baafi , F. (2000). *Basic school administraion and supervision*.
    Cape Coast: UCC Printing Press.

Agyedu, J. O., Donkor, F. & Obeng, F. (2007). *Research methodology*.
    Unpublished manuscript. Kumasi. University Printing press.

Alfonso, R. J. ; Firth, J. & Neville, R. (1984). *The supervisory skill mix*
    educational leadership. Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Alonge. E.W. (1989). *Qualitative evaluation methods.* Newbury Park, CA:
    Sage Publicans Inc.

Amedahe, F. K. (2004). *Research methods notes for teaching*. Unpublished
    Manuscript.

Anamuah-Mensah, J. (2006). Promoting effective monitoring and supervision
    in schools: The Role of Stakeholders. *Daily Graphic.*   (No.
    167890, Sept.21st , 2006 pp 4)

Anderson, H.O. (1972). The supervisor as a facilitator of self-evaluation:
    Schoool Science & Mathematics (72), 603-606.

Annoh, K. (1997). *Education.* Kumasi: Michael Adu Printing Works.

Ary, D.E., Jacobs, L C.& Razavie, A. (1990). *Introduction to research in* (4th
    ed.) forth worth: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Aseidu–Akrofi, K. (1978). *School organisation in modern Africa*. Tema:
    Ghana Publishing Corporation.

Augustyn, G. J. (2001). *Teacher supervisory preferences*. Unpublished

    Master's Thesis, University of Saskachewan, Saskatoon, Saskachewan

    Canada.

Banak, C.A. & Waks, D. F. (1997). Culturally responsive teaching and

    supervision: *A Handbook for Staff Development*. New York Teachers

    Press.

Baldridge, J. V. (1971). *Planning and the educationa administrator*. Paris.

    UNESCO Publications

Beach, D. M. & Reinhartz, J. (2000). *Supervisory leadership: Focus on*

    Instruction. Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Beeby, C. E. (1997). *Planning and the educational adminitrator*: UNESCO

    Publications, Palace de Fontenoy, 75 Paris.

Beecher, J. W. (1958). *Process used by superintendents forimprovement of*

    education in selected schools.(Doctoral Dissertation). U.S.A Temple

    University.

BECE Results (1995-2000). *Accra metropolitan education examination unit.*

Best, J. W. & Khan, J. U. (1998). *Research in education*. (8th ed.) Allyn &

    Bacon. 160 Gould Street, Needham Hights. MA02194, Boston, USA.

Bhatt, B. D. & Sharma, S. R. (1992). *Educational supervision*: Theory and

    Practice. Kamshkia Publishing House, Kailash Nagar, New Delhi

Blumberg, A. (1974). *Supervisors and teachers: A Private Cold War*. Berkey,

    Calif, McCutchan.

Bolin, E. & Panaratis, R. N. (1992). Clinical supervision and psychological

    functions: A new Direction for Theory and Practice. *Journal of*

    curriculum and Supervision, 7(3) 1809-2005.

Bone,T. L. (1991). Supervising schooling not teachers. *Educational Leadership Journal,4* (7) 78-83.

Brickkell, H. M. (1961). *Organising New York State foreducational change*. Albany, New York; State Education Department'

Campbell, R. (1977). *Introduction to educational administration*.   Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

Carron, G, De Grauwe. A. & Govinda, R.(1998). *Supervision and support services in Asia.* Vol.II: National diagnosis. TIEP Research study Programme.

Carron, G, De Grauwe. A. & Govinda, R.(2001) *Supervision and support in developing countries.* TIEP Research study report.

Carey, S. M. (1953). *Action research to improve school practices*. Columbia University: New York: Bureau publications.

Chapman, J. D.(2005). *Building capacity for a leraning community*. New York: Prentice Hall Inc.

Elsbree, E. L. & Harold, J. M. (1959). *Elementary school administration   and supervision.* New York: Litton Educational Publishing Inc. Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Elsbree, E. L. & Harold, J. M. (1967). *Elementary school administration   and supervision.* New York: Litton Educational Publishing Inc. Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Enus, F. (1963). Purpose of supervision; *The Canadian Administrator (April 1963)* Vol. 1.2, No.7.

Eye, G. &.Netzer (1975). Problems in supervision; *The Canadian Administrato*r (April, 1975) Vol. 15, No.9, pp.19.

Fraenkel, F. J. & Wallen, N. E. (2002). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* (4th ed.). Boston. New York: McGraw-Hill. Company.

Gadgil, A.V. (1982). *Supervision in education; Pure* Saraswath Publication.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An Introduction.*White Plains, NY: Longman

Garret, D. & Blwes, S. J. (1997). *Supervision for schools today.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Gay, L. R. (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for Analysis and Application.* (4th ed) New York. Merril Macmillan.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1990). *Supervisory leadership: Introduction to Instructional Supervision.*Glenwiew,IL:Sedt,Foresman/Little,BrownHigher Education.

Glickman, C.D. (1990). *Supervision in transition.*USA,Ventura Publishers.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P. & Jovita, J. M. (1998). *Supervision of instruction: A Developmental Approach.* (3rd ed) London, Allyn and Bacon.

Godwin, C. J. (1995). *Research in psychology: Methods and Design.* John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Goldhammer, R. ; Anderson, R. H. & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). *Clinical supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers(3rd ed.).* Toronto, ON: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Gupta, V. (1999). *SPSS for beginners.* VJ Books Inc. Georgetown.

Haller, J. C. & Keenan, G. (1999). *Effective supervision: Theory Into Practice.* New York: Random House.

Harris, B.M. (1975). *Supervisory behaviour in education*. Engle wood Cliff

    N.J. Printic Hall Inc.

Hopkins, J. & Ainscow, H. (1994). The impact of peer and principal

    collaborative supervision on teachers' trust, commitment, desire for

    collaboration and efficacy. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,*

    14(4), 351-378.

Hyman, R.T. (1995). *Administration: Hand book of Teacher Supervision and*

    Evaluation Needs. New Jersey. Englewood Cliffs, Printice   Hall Inc.

International Institute for Educational Planning (1998). *Changing Schools*

from   Within: An Intervention for Improving School Performance in Sri

    Lanka. A Research and Study Programme Report, New Delhi.

Israel, G. D. (1992). *Sampling: The Evidence from Extension Program*

    Impact. Gainesille. FL: University of Florida.

Jaccard, K.N. (1983). *Hand book of research.* Columbus, Ohio: Prentice -Hall

Johnson, S. D. (1996). *An alternate vision for assessment in vocational*

    teachers education. Columbia: University of Missouri.

Kutsyuruba, R.L (2003). *Administration of public education.* (4th ed.) New

    York, Herper Collins Publish.

Kochar, S. K. (1981). *Successful supervision and inspection*. Sterling

    Publications. New Delhi.

Kochar, S. K. (2001). *Secondary school administration*. New Delta. Sterling

    Publications Private Limited

Kumar, R. (1999). *Research methodology. A Step by step Guide for*

    Beginners. New Delhi SAGE Publication. India PYT.

Mankoe, J. O. (2002). *Educational adminitration and management in Ghana.* Madina- Accra. Progressive Stars Printing Press.

McQuarrier,F.O.Jr.,&Wood, F. H. (1991).*Supervision,Staff Development and Evaluation Connections.*Theory into Practice*, pp.*30 (2),91-96.

McWilliams, H.O.A & Kwamina Poh, M.A (1975). The development of education in   Ghana*: An Outline*. Accra: Ghana.

Mosher, T. & Purpel, A. (1972). *Personnel supervision;* A Descriptive Framework, The Canadian Administrator (March, 1972).pp.151-153

Moorer, S. H. (1956). *Supervision:* "The Keystone to Educational Progress" bulletin. Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education.

Musaazi, J. C. S. (1982). *The theory and practice of educational administration.* London and Basing-- stoke: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Musaazi, J. C. S. (1985). *The theory and practice of educational administration.* London and Basing- stoke: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

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

Neagley, R. L. & Evans, N. D. (1970). *Handbook for effective supervision of instruction.* (2nd ed.) New York: Prentice Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs.

Newman, W. L. (2003). *Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* 5th ed. Pearson Edition. Inc. New York.

Oliver, P. F. (1976). *Supervision for today's school.* Harper and Row Publications, New Delhi.

Osuala, E. C. (2005). *Introduction to research methodology.* African-

First Publishers Limited. Book House Trust, 1. Africana-   First Drive,

PMB. 1639, Onitsha, Nigeria

Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data*

Analysis using SPSS for Windows (Version 10). Allen and Unwin,

Australia- p136.

Partington, J. (1982). Teachers in school as teaching practice supervisors:

Journal of Education for Teaching, 8(3), 263-274.

Presidential Committees Report (2002). White Paper: *Presidential Committees*

*Report o*n *Education Reform.* Ghana Publishing*,* Accra.

Reynolds, C. (2005). *Newsletter of saint peter'scooperative credit union, the*

supervory team. 13th edition. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc,

Englewood   Cliffs. pp. 7

Rue, C.W. & Byars, C. l. (1996). *Supervision, key to productivity*. Boston

M.A: Printice Hall, Inc.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social research*. Australia Macmillan Press Ltd.

Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (2002). *Enhancing Teacher Success.*

Report of the STF's Enhancing Teacher Success Development

Committee, Saskatoon,SK.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). *Leadership for the school house: How is it*

Different? Why it is Important? (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starrat, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: Human Perspective*

on Practice and Research. New York: Harper and Row.

Stoller, N. (1978). *Supervision and the improvement of instruction.*

Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey. Printice-Hall Inc.

Stones, E. (1984). *Supervision in teacher education*. Methenen & Co. Ltd.

   Great   Britain. University Press, Cambridge.

Swearinger, M. E. (1962). *Supervision of instructions: Foundations and*

   Dimensions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Tanko, S.C. (2004). *The role of supervision in promoting effective teaching*

   and learning in basic schools. A Case Study of Garu Circuit. A

   Dissertation Submitted to the department of Education: Univerty

   College of education Winneba.

Thomas, C., Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (1998). *Supervision: A*

   Redefinition. Fifth Edition. New York. McGraw-Hill Companies.

UNESCO (1997). *Trends in school supervision: Current Issues in Supervision*

   Paris TIEP. Printshop Eugene Delacroix.

 UNESCO (1998). *Supervision and support services in Asia* Vol.II.

   Research and study   Programme Report.

UNESCO (2001). *School supervision in four African countries: Challenges*

   and Reforms. Paris: UNESCO.

Unruh, G.G. (1973). *Instructional supervision, trend and issues of*

   educational leadership. Journal of the Institute of Education,

   University of Caep Coast, 2,1,9-14 Vol. 34, No.8. p|p 563-592.

Vashist, J. W. (1994). Removing the "super" from supervision. *Journal of*

   Curriculum and Supervision. 5(9), 168-176

Weiss, C. (1998). The stakeholder approah to evaluation, Origin and

   Promise *New Direct*

Wiles, K. (1986). *Supervision for better schools.* Englewood Cliff, New

York: Prentice- Hall. *Supervision for programme evaluation.* 2, (11),

8-13.

Wanzara, N. K. & DaCoasta, L. (2000). *Mentoring and supervision for

teacher development.* New York: Longman.

Wood, F. H. & Thompson, S. R. (1993). Assumptions about staff

development based on research and best practice. *Journal of Staff

Development,* 14(4),52-57.

Woodward, R. & Bhatt, B. D. (1992). *Becoming a qualitative teacher: An

Introduction.* New York: Longman.

Zimpher, N. L.; Devoss, G.C.& Nott, D.L. (1990). A closer look at

university students teacher supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education,

31*(4), 11-15.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONAIRE FOR CIRCUIT SUPERVISORS

The purpose of these questionnaires is to collect and collate information on the nature, perceptions and challenges of supervision in Ablekuma North Sub Metropolis and how best it could be carried out to enhance academic performance of pupils in Basic schools. The information is to assist the researcher in her study. All information provided by respondents will therefore be treated with strict confidentiality in order to ensure respondents of anonymity in whatever contributions they make towards the achievement of the purpose of the study.

PART I

Types of Supervision and Forms they Take

Please tick your choice of responses

1. Name of circuit

    a. Dansoman b. Odorkor c. Mataheko d. Abossey-Okai

    e. Kwashieman

2. What types of supervision is practiced in your Circuit?

    a. External Supervision b. Internal Supervision c. Both

3. Which of the types is emphasised most?

    a. External Supervision b. Internal Supervision c. Both

4. Which type of Supervision do you prefer?

    a. External Supervision b. Internal Supervision c. Both

Give reason for your preference

----

5. What forms do Internal Supervision in your Schools take?

a. ---

b. ---

c. ---

6. What form does external supervision in your schools take?

a. Intensive Visits b. Regular Visits c. Occasional Visits

7. Do you have a drawn plan to promote effective supervision?

a. Yes   b. No

8. If yes, how do you rate the plan?

a. Very Good   b. Good   c. Satisfactory

9. D o you have a time-table to promote effective supervision in your

schools?

a. Yes   b. No

10. If yes, how do you rate the time-table?

a. Very Good   b. Good   c. Satisfactory

11. How will you rate the supervision of teachers' work by headteachers in

your circuit?

a Very Satisfactory   b. Satisfactory   c. Not Satisfactory

12. If not satisfactory, suggest ways you think this can be improved -------

----

Part II

Activities Performed by the Circuit Supervisor

Supervisors resort to various types of activities in the course of their inspection/supervision. The following table lists some of them. Against each item there are two sets of columns to indicate your opinion. The first set enquires how often the particular activity is used by you and the second one seeks your opinion as to the utility of the particular practice. Please tick the appropriate column.

Activity	Frequency			Utility		
	Always	Sometimes	Never	Very Useful	Useful	Not Useful
13. Observe the lessons of all teachers.						
14. Observe the lessons of some teachers.						
15. Observe every teachers classes by observation checklist.						
16. Administer achievement tests on pupils.						
17. Examine the written work of Pupils.						
18. Examine before commencement of inspection the lesson notes prepared by teachers for the day of inspection/supervision.						

19. Give feed back to the individual Teachers after observation.						
20. Give suggestions to the teachers regarding reference books, journal etc						
21. Hold individual discussions with selected teachers or whole staff.						
22. Conduct one or two demonstration lesson.						
23. Send inspection report to the higher authority and the headmaster after inspection.						
24. Check whether actions have been taken on the remarks passed during last inspection.						
25. Invite suggestions from staff for improvement of the school.						
26. Physically verify the school's stock of teaching and learning materials.						
27. Convene meetings with PTA if any, to discuss importance of school performance.						
28. Verify the original certificates of teachers.						
29. Ascertain the opinion of the headmaster about individual teachers' performance.						
30. Ascertain the views of the headmaster about working of the school.						
31. Fix targets for performance in the next year. Other activities						

Please list any other activities that you carry out during supervision that are

not listed here.

PART III

Perceptions of Supervision in Schools

This is to ascertain your opinion/perceptions of the supervisory practices in your schools. Please be as sincere as possible in answering these questions.

32. Which of the following types of supervision do you think can best enhance academic performance?

   a. Internal   b. External   c. Both.

33. Which type of supervision is preferred by teachers?

   a. Internal   b. External   c. Both

34. Give reasons for their preference.

   i.………………………………………………………………………..

   ii.………………………………………………………………………..

   iii.……………………………………………………………………….

   iv.……………………………………………………………………

35. What measures do you think if put in place can assist teachers handle their problems that crop up during supervision?

   i.…………………………………………………………………

   ii.………………………………………………………………..

   iii.……………………………………………………………….

   iv.……………………………………………………………….

36. What measures have you put in place to motivate teachers in your circuit?

   i.…………………………………………………………………

   ii.………………………………………………………………..

   iii.……………………………………………………………….

iv…………………………………………………………………….

37. What is the priority attached to supervision in your schools?

    a. Very important. b. Moderate. c. Not important.

38. Do you think supervision should be an essential part of the teaching/

    Learning Process? Yes – No - Give reasons for your answer.

    i…………………………………………………………………

    ii…………………………………...

    iii……………………………………………………………………..

    iv……………………………………………………………………..

39. Do teachers resent your supervision? Yes, - No. - if Yes, give

    possible reasons.

    i………………………………………………………………….

    ii…………………………………………………………………

    iii………………………………………………………………

    iv………………………………………………………………….

40. Do you follow prepared format/guidelines in your supervision?

       Yes [   ]   No [   ]

If yes enumerate the guidelines / format you use

    i…………………………………...

    ii…………………………………………………………………

    iii……………………………………………………………………..

    iv……………………………………………………………………..

41. In the observation of a lesson, tick the characteristics you consider very

    important to enhance pupils' understanding of the lesson

    a. Objectives of the lesson.

b. Methodology of lesson.

c. Advance preparation.

d. Teaching / learning materials.

e. Evaluation of the lesson.

f. All of the above

g. Any other

42. In your opinion whose supervision should be given greater emphasis in schools?

a. External inspection team

b. Circuit supervisors

c. Head teachers

d. Teachers

43. How often are supervision reports implemented in your schools?

a. Regularly

b. Occasionally

c. Not at all

44. How will you rate teachers' attitude to supervision by headteachers?

a. Very Good

b. Good

c. Satisfactory

d. Unsatisfactory

45. In observing a teaching lesson, tick which of the following characteristics you look for:

a. Lesson notes preparation.

b. Knowledge of subject matter.

c. Voice and manner of teaching

d. Use of teaching /learning materials.

e. Questioning skills.

f. Classroom management

g. All the above

h. Any others --

46. Which of the following do you observe in the pupils during lesson observation?

a. How they are motivated

b. Their participation in the teaching/ learning process.

c. Both a and b

d. None of the above

e. Any others ---

47. Has supervision led to the professional growth of teachers in your circuit?

a. Yes [ ]   No [ ]

If yes, state in which ways.

i…………………………………………………………………………..

ii………………………………………………………………………….

iii…………………………………………………………………………

iv…………………………………………………………………………

if no, what do you think accounts for that

i…………………………………………………………………………..

ii…………………………………………………………………………..

iii………………………………………………………………………….

iv…………………………………………………………………………………………..

48. What are your suggestions for future improvement in supervision?

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

PART IV

Challenges of Supervision

49. Please rate teachers attitude to supervisor – Supervisee discussion after supervision

a. Very Good

b. Good

c. Satisfactory

d. Unsatisfactory

50. Do teachers put into practice new ideas learnt at in-service training?

a. Yes [ ]   b. No [ ]

c. Occasionally [ ]

51. If no, give two reasons why

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

52. How many schools do you have in your circuit?

a. 10 – 15

b. 15 – 20

c. 20 – 25

d. 25 and above

53. Are you comfortable with the number of schools under your jurisdiction?

a. Yes   [   ]   b. No [   ]   c. Undecided   [ ]

54. If no state three reasons why?

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

55. How do you assess the availability of logistics for your supervision?

a. Very good

b. Good

c. Satisfactory

d. Poor

56. How will you rate the accessibility to schools in your Circuit?

a. Good

b. Satisfactory

c. Poor

57. If Poor, suggest two steps to facilitate accessibility

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

58. By what means do you visit your schools?

a. Motor Bike

b. Private Car

c. On Foot

d. Public Transport

59. Please rate teachers' attitude to supervision in your circuit

a. Very good

b. Good

c. Satisfactory

d. Unsatisfactory

60. If unsatisfactory state two reasons why?

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

61. Please state three main challenges to supervision?

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

PART V: Steps for Improvement

Assume that the following steps have been decided to be taken with a view to improve the efficiency of inspection. Indicate how important these steps are, tick one of the letters 1, 2 or 3 given against each item according to your choice.

1 = Very important

2 = Important

3 = Unimportant

SL	Steps For Improvement of Supervision	1	2	3
62.	Make supervision a combined responsibility of teachers and circuit supervisors			
63.	Prescribe strict norms regarding periodicity, frequency and methods of supervision.			
64.	Circuit supervisors should receive proper professional training.			
65.	Only persons with some teaching experience should be appointed as circuit supervisors.			
66.	A meeting of representatives of local community should be convened during one of the inspection days to discuss school improvement plan.			
67.	The number of schools under one supervisor should be restricted to 15			
68.	Reports of inspection/supervision should be made available to the head of the institutions on the last days of inspection.			
69.	Reports of inspection/supervision should be made known to teachers after the completion of inspection.			
70.	A standard observation checklist should be used to observe the class of a teacher.			
71.	Lesson observation should be regular and continuous.			

72.	Every school will have apart from the formal inspection an intensive comprehensive inspection once in two weeks.			
73.	Inspection of schools should be conducted towards the middle of the academic year.			
74.	Successful innovation conducted in certain schools should be made known to other schools.			
75.	Teachers should be given the opportunity to observe lessons conducted by their colleagues in the same school and at times those of other schools.			
76.	Inspecting officers should frequently inspect those schools which are weak.			
77.	Inspection report should be followed up by external supervisors.			
78.	Any other steps			

79. State three strategies to mitigate these challenges

….……………………………………………………………………………………

….……………………………………………………………………………………

80. State three main problems you encounter in your role as a Circuit

Supervisor………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

81. Give three suggestions that could be put in place to mitigate these

problems………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

PART VI: Suggestions to Improve the System

82.   Is the present system of supervision in your opinion conducive to improve the quality of academic performance in Basic Education?

        Yes [   ]   No [   ]

If Yes, then what are the strengths of the present inspection/supervision system: ……………………………………………………………………….

…………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………..

If No, what are the weak points in the system? ………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

83.   Please give any other observations, comments and suggestions you would like to make for improvement of the present supervisory practices.

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONAIRE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

The purpose of these questionnaires is to collect and collate information on the nature, perceptions and challenges of supervision in the Ablekuma North Sub Metropolis and how best it could be carried out enhance the academic performance of pupils in basic schools. The information collected is to assist the researcher in her study. All information provided by respondents will therefore be treated with strict confidentiality to ensure the anonymity of respondents in whatever contributions they make towards the achievement of the purpose of the study.

PART I

TYPES OF SUPERVISION AND FORMS THEY TAKE

Please tick your responses

1. Name of circuit

   a. Dansoman   b. Odorkor   c. Mataheko   d. Abossey-Okai

   e. Kwashieman

2. What types of supervision are carried out in your schools?

   a. Internal Supervision   b. External Supervision   c. Both

3. Which of these supervision is given greater emphasis in your schools?

   a. Internal Supervision   b. External Supervision   c. Both

4. What form does external supervision take in your schools?

   a. Intensive Visits   b. Regular Visits   c. Occasional Visits

   d. a and b   e. A and c   f. None

5. Which type of supervision do you prefer?

   a. Internal Supervision   b. External Supervision   c. Both

6. Please give two reasons for your preference

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

7. Do you have a plan for supervision in your school?

a. Yes   b. No

8. If Yes, how do you rate the plan?

a. Very good   b. Good   c. Satisfactory   d. Unsatisfactory

9. What is your main objective for the plan?

………………………………………………………………………..

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………..

10. How will you rate the supervision carried out in your school?

a. Very Satisfactory   b. Satisfactory   c. Not satisfactory

11. What form does external supervision in your school take?

a. Intensive Visits   b. Regular Visits   c. Occasional Visits

d. a and b   e. a and c

12. How will you rate the supervision of pupils work by teachers in your school?

a. Very Satisfactory   b. Satisfactory   c. Not satisfactory

13. If not satisfactory, suggest an improvement plan

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

14. How often do the following officers visit your school?

   Please tick appropriate column:

	Staff	Weekly	Fortnightly	Monthly	Quarterly	Rarely
I	School Inspectors					
Ii	Director of Education					
Iii	Circuit Supervisor					

15. Would you agree that supervision in your school by Circuit Supervisors is

   adequate?

   a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d.   Strongly Disagree

PART II

Activities Performed by Head Teachers in their Supervision

   Head teachers resort to various types of activities in the course of

inspection/supervision. The following table lists some of them. Against each

item there are two sets of columns to indicate your opinion. The first set

enquires how often the particular activity is used by you and the second one

sees your opinion as to the utility of the particular practice. Please tick the

appropriate column.

	Activity	Frequency			Utility		
		Always	Sometimes	Never	Very Useful	Useful	Not Useful
16	Observe the lessons of teachers						
17	Give feed back to individual teachers after observation						
18	Conduct demonstration lessons for teachers						
19	Invite suggestions from teachers						
20	Convene PTA meetings to discuss improvement of school performance						
21	Fix targets for performance termly						
22	Encourage peer supervision among teachers						
23	Any others						

PART III

Perception of Supervision in Schools

This is to ascertain your opinion/perceptions of the supervisory practice in you school. Please be as sincere as possible in answering those questions.

24. In your opinion whose supervision contributes to effective learning among pupils?

a. Director   b. Inspectorate Division   c. Circuit Supervisor

d. Head teachers   e. Teachers

25. How would you rate your circuit supervisor in the following?

		Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory
i	Provisions of leadership		
ii	Competence		
iii	Provision of Sound Working environment		

26. How often do officers involve you in the planning to improve

    Teaching/learning process?

    a. Frequently   b. Occasionally   c. Rarely   d. Not at all

27. How would you rate supervision of pupils work by teachers?

    a. Very good   b. good   c. Satisfactory   d. Not Satisfactory

28. "Effective instructional supervision is a vital ingredient in promoting

    academic excellence in pupils". What is your view on the quoted

    assertion?

    a. Strongly Agree b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

29. Rate the supervision in your school in terms of its effectiveness.

    a. Very Effective   b. Effective   c. Non Effective

Give reasons for your answer…………………………………………..

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

30. Do you perceive supervision as promoting effective teaching and

    learning?

    Yes [   ]   No   [   ]

Give reasons for your answer.

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

31.   How often are supervision reports sent to your school?

   a. Very often   b. Often   c. Sometimes   d. Never

32.   Do you discuss and implement supervision reports with your staff

   Yes…… No…..

33. Will the teaching /learning be successful /effective without supervision?

   Yes [   ]   No   [   ]

Give reasons for your answer.

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

34.   How often do you supervise your teachers?

   a. Weekly   b. Fortnightly   c. Monthly   d. Occasionally

35.   Do you feel professionally competent to supervise in all the subjects

   taught by teachers in your school?

   Yes [   ]   No   [   ]

36.   Do you follow a specially designed scheme or format for supervision?

   Yes [   ]   No   [   ]

   If yes, enumerate them.

   …………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………

37. Do you entrust supervision to your assistant?

    Yes [   ]   No   [   ]

38. How often do you check / vet teachers' notes?

    a. Weekly   b. Monthly   c. Occasionally   d. Not at all

39. Do you discuss the notes with the teachers after vetting?

    Yes [   ]   No   [   ]

40. Do you give on the job in service to teachers with problems in lesson

    notes preparation?

    Yes [   ]   No   [   ]   c. Occasionally   [   ]

41. How often do you check on students exercises?

    a. Weekly   b. Monthly c. Once a term   d. Not at all

42. Do you note the following`?

		Yes	No
i	How students are motivated		
ii	Their participation in the teaching and learning process?		

43. What follow up action do you take after observing teachers' lessons?

    …………………………………………………………………………

    …………………………………………………………………………

44. What have you put in place to motivate teachers?

    …………………………………………………………………………

    …………………………………………………………………………

45. In observing teaching lessons, tick which of the following are most important.

    a. Objectives of the lesson.   [   ]

    b. Methodology of the teaching   [   ]

    c. Advance preparation.   [   ]

    d. Teaching /learning materials.   [   ]

    e. Evaluation of the lesson   [   ]

    f. Any other please specify …………………………………………

46. In observing a teaching lessons which of the following do you look for?

    a. Lesson notes preparation.   [   ]

    b. Knowledge of subject matter.   [   ]

    c. Voice and manner of teaching.   [   ]

    d. Use of teaching /learning materials.   [   ]

    e. Questioning Skills   [   ]

    f. Classroom management.   [   ]

    g. Any other please specify …………………………………………

47. Do you agree that supervision can improve the academic work of pupils?

    a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree.   d. Strongly disagree

    e. Uncertain.

48. How do you rate the utilization of instructional hours by teachers and pupils?

	V. Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Teachers				
Pupils				

PART IV

Challenges of Supervision and Suggestions for Improvement

49.   What are the challenges impeding effective supervision in your school?

……………………………………………………………………………..

……………………………………………………………………………..

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

50.   Suggest ways of resolving these challenges improving supervision

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

PART V

Steps for Improvement

Assume that the following steps have been decided to be taken with a view to improve the efficiency of inspection. Indicate how important these steps are; tick one of the letters 1, 2 or 3 given against each item according to your choice.

1 = Very important
2 = Important
3 = Unimportant

	Steps For Improvement of Supervision	1	2	3
51	Circuit supervisors should receive professional training			
52.	Only persons with some teaching experience should be appointed as circuit supervisors.			
53.	The number of school under one circuit supervisor should be restricted to fifteen (15).			
54.	Supervision report by external supervisors should be made known to lead of the school on the last day of inspection.			
55.	.A standard observation check list should be used to observe the class of teachers			
56.	Lessons observation should be regular and continuous.			
57.	Every school should have apart from the formal inspection by circuit supervisor, one intensive comprehensive inspection once in two years.			
58.	Schools inspection should be conducted towards the middle of the academic year.			
59.	Successful innovations in other schools should be made known to your school.			
60.	Teachers should be given opportunity to observe lessons conducted by their colleagues in the same school and at times those of other schools.			
61.	Supervisors should inspect only weak schools.			
62.	To improve the teacher quality, head teachers should observe the class teaching regularly.			

PART VI

Suggestions to Improve System.

63. Is the present system of supervision conclusive to improve the quality of academic performance in basic education?

    Yes [   ]   No   [   ]

    Give reasons for your answer………………………………………….

    ………………………………………………………………………

    ………………………………………………………………………

    ………………………………………………………………………

    ………………………………………………………………………

    ………………………………………………………………………

64. Please give any other observations, comments and suggestions you would like to make for the improvement of the present supervisory practices………………………………………………………………..

    …………………………………………………………………………

    …………………………………………………………………………

    …………………………………………………………………………

APPENDIX III

QUESTIONAIRE FOR TEACHERS

This questionnaire is designed to assist the researcher find out how supervision could be used to enhance/improve academic performance of pupils in basic schools. Some of the questions are close ended which means they have guided responses from which you are expected to tick and some are open-ended meaning that you will be expected to give your own opinion in response. It will be highly appreciated if the responses can be as sincere and concise as possible. Be assured that every information given will be used only for purpose of his study and will be treated strictly confidential so feel free to provide your responses.

PART I

Types of Supervision and Forms They Take

1. Name of circuit

   a. Dansoman   b. Odorkor   c. Mataheko   d. Abossey-Okai

   e. Kwashieman

2. Which type of supervision pertains in your school?

   a. Internal   b. External   c. Both

3. Which of the types is emphasized in your school?

   a. Internal   b. External   c. Both

4. Which of the supervisions do you prefer?

   a. Internal   b. External   c. Both

   Give reasons for your choice…………………………………..

   …………………………………………………………………………

5. In your opinion, which of the types promotes effective teaching and learning?

   a. Internal   b. External   c. Both

Give reasons for your choice

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

6. Rate the supervision carried out in your school.

   a. Very good.   b. Good   c. Satisfactory   d. Unsatisfactory

   Give reasons for your answer.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

7. Rate the supervision in terms of effectiveness.

   a. Very Effective   b. Effective   c. Non- Effective

   Give reasons for your answer.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

8. Rate the supervision in terms of approach.

   a. Very Satisfactory   a. Satisfactory   c. Unsatisfactory

9. How often do the following visit your school?

Staff	Very often	often	sometimes	Seldom	Never
Assistant. Director					
Officers from inspectorate					
Circuit Supervisor					

10. Are visits by these above officers adequate?

    a. Yes   b. No

PART II

Perception on Supervision

11. How do you feel when your work is supervised?

    a. Very comfortable b. Comfortable c. Uncomfortable

    Give reasons for your answer.

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

12.   What do you think about your circuit supervisors' approach to

    supervision?

    a. A fault finder.

    b. A helper and a consultant.

    c. Any other

13.   In your opinion, whose supervision facilitates your teaching?

a. External supervision b. Circuit Supervisor. c Head teacher c. Peers

14.   In your view whose supervision influences effective learning?

a. External supervision   b. Circuit Supervisor. c Head teacher d. Peers

15.   Rate the supervision by your circuit supervisor.

a. Very good. b. Good   c. Satisfactory   d. Unsatisfactory

16.   Rate the supervision by your head teacher.

a. Very good. b. Good c. Satisfactory d. Unsatisfactory

17. How often do the following plan work improvement with you?

	Very often	often	sometimes	seldom	Never
Circuit Supervisor					
Head teacher					

18. Do you agree that supervision is essential to the improvement of academic performance?

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree.   d. Strongly disagree

e. Uncertain

Give reasons for your answer.

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

19. Rate the productiveness/ usefulness of discussion with you after supervision.

a. Very good. b. Good   c. Satisfactory   d. Unsatisfactory

Give reasons for your answer.

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

20.   Are you in favour of being supervised?

Yes [   ]   No   [   ]

Give reasons for your answer.

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

21. What do you expect from supervision?

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

22. How has supervision influenced the effectiveness of your teaching?

a. Very strong   b. Strongly   c. Slightly   d. Not at all

23. Tick which of the following are the benefits of supervision to you?

a. Successful teaching   [   ]

b. New methods acquisition   [   ]

c. Systematic teaching   [   ]

d. Not beneficial.   [   ]

e. All the above   [   ]

f. Indifferent.   [   ]

24. Which of the following are the short comings of the supervision in your school?

a. Not sufficient.   [   ]

b. No Continuity.   [   ]

c. Insufficient discussion.   [   ]

d. Not Systematic   [   ]

e. All the above   [   ]

f. Indifferent.   [   ]

25. Have you had an opportunity of doing peer supervision?

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

If yes, state the benefits you derived.

………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………

26. How often does your head supervise your work?

a. Very often   b. Often   c. Sometimes   d. Seldom   e. Never

27. Rate the competence of your circuit supervisor

a. Very good.   b. Good   c. Satisfactory   d. Unsatisfactory

28. Rate the competence of your head teacher.

a. Very good.   b. Good   c. Satisfactory   d. Unsatisfactory

29. Suggest what a Circuit Supervisor can do to create a good working

relationship with teachers

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

30. Supervision promotes effective teaching/learning.

a. Strongly agree   b. Agree   c. Strongly disagree   d . Disagree.

e. Uncertain

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

31. How often does your Circuit Supervisor give an inset after supervision?

a. Very often   b. Often   c. Occasionally   d. Never

32. Has there been team supervision of your work?

Yes   [   ]   No   [   ]

If yes, state your opinion of it.

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

PART III

Challenges of Supervision and Steps for Improvement

33. Do you think supervision should be part of the teaching/learning process?

Yes [   ]   No [   ]

Give reasons for your answer.

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

34. What characteristics should be included in a school supervision format to make it more effective/functional?

i……………………………………………………………………..

ii……………………………………………………………….....

iii………………………………………………………………

iv…………………………………………………………………..

35. List the problems/ short falls of the present system of supervision in your school.

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

36. What are the challenges/problems of the present system of supervision?

…………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………

37. Suggest how these challenges /problems can be resolved to improve the

    Effectiveness of supervision.

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

PART IV

Suggestions to Improve the System

38. Is the present system of supervision conclusive to improve the quality of

academic performance in basic education?

    Yes   [   ]   No [   ]

    Give reasons for your answer.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………

39. Please give any other observations, comments and suggestions you would

like to make for the improvement of the present supervisory practices.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………