

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

EVALUATION OF THE ONE YEAR INTERNSHIP  
PROGRAMME OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION,  
WINNEBA

MARMAH ALEX AMARTEI

2009

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

EVALUATION OF THE ONE YEAR INTERNSHIP  
PROGRAMME OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION,  
WINNEBA

BY

MARMAH ALEX AMARTEI

Thesis submitted to the Department of Educational Foundations of the Faculty  
of Education, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for award of Master of Philosophy Degree in Measurement and Evaluation

SEPTEMBER 2009

## DECLARATION

### Candidate's Declaration

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

Candidates Signature: ..... Date.....

Name: Marmah Alex Amartei

### Supervisors' Declaration

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

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

Name: Dr. (Mrs.) Mfonobong Umobong

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

Name: Prof. Y. K. A. Etsey

## **ABSTRACT**

The views of mentees, mentors, and University supervisors about the one year internship programme of the University of Education, Winneba were examined. The views of a total of 333 respondents made up of 177 mentees, 91 mentors and 65 University supervisors in the Ashanti region were gathered by means of a self- designed questionnaire consisting largely of the likert-type items. The data was then subjected to frequency, percentage and chi-square analysis to address the 6 research questions formulated to guide the study.

The result of the chi-square test indicated that mentees, mentors and the university supervisors were adequately prepared for the internship, although the preparation did not equip them with all the skills they needed for the internship. The study also revealed that respondents preferred one semester duration of the internship instead of the one full academic year. Although, both mentees and mentors have some apprehension about the university supervisors, they feel that the supervisors should continue to supervise the mentees.

The study revealed that the absence of link coordinators, difficulty in getting schools to undertake the internship, low allowances paid to mentors, difficulty in writing the project while outside campus were some of the problems hindering the internship. Respondents were also of the view that the internship programme has a better potential of training competent teachers than the four weeks off-campus teaching practice.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to place on record my sincere gratitude to my mentor and Principal supervisor Dr. Etsey, for his love, devotion and meticulous scrutiny of this thesis. I am equally grateful to Dr. Mrs. Mfonobong Umobong who came on sabbatical at the Department of Educational Foundations, University of Cape Coast, for readily agreeing to supervise my work when she was asked to be the principal supervisor.

Mr. Kobina Impraim Adentwi, of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, University of Education of Winneba, Kumasi campus, deserves special mention for promptly making research materials and textbooks available to me upon request. I also thank him for useful corrections and suggestions. I am also grateful to many others for their help in diverse ways; especially Messers Peter Eshun, Paul Effraim, Dela Francis for helping with the data reduction and analysis process. I am similarly thankful to Miss Vera Arhin for her encouragement and proof reading.

My greatest appreciation also goes to Gifty and Golda for doing the secretarial work.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation to all who have contributed in the writing of this thesis.

I remain responsible for any error(s) that may be detected in this work.

## **DEDICATION**

To my mother, Victoria Amuah Doudoo

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	10
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions	13
Significance of the Study	13
Delimitation of the Study	14
Definition of Terms	15
Organization of the Study	16
2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	18
Meaning and Purposes of Programme Evaluation	18
Models of Programme Evaluation	21
Evaluation of Educational Programmes in Ghana	32
History of Teacher Education in Ghana	34
Objectives of Teacher Education	36
The Concept of Teaching Practice and its Importance	39

	Preparation of Student Teachers for Teaching Practice	41
	Teaching Practice Supervision and Mentorship	43
	Timing and Duration of Teaching Practice	46
	Problems of Teaching Practice	47
	The Student Internship Programme at University of Education, Winneba (UEW)	50
	Theoretical Framework	55
	Summary	56
3	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	57
	Overview	57
	Area of Study	57
	Research Design	58
	Population	59
	Sample and sampling procedure	60
	Research Instrument	61
	Data collection procedure	64
	Coding and Data Analysis	65
4	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	66
5	<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	140
	Summary	136
	Findings	137
	Conclusions	138
	Limitations of the study	139
	Recommendations	139



Suggestions for further research	141
REFERENCES	146
APPENDICES	151
A. Questionnaire for mentees	151
B. Questionnaire for mentors	161
C. Questionnaire for university supervisors	172

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of years mentees have taught	67
2. Numbers of year's mentors have been teaching	67
3. Professional Rank of Mentees	68
4. Number of years as a mentor	69
5. Preparation of mentees	71
6. Preparation of mentors	76
7. Preparation of university supervisors	79
8. Duration of the internship ( mentees response)	83
9. Duration of the internship ( mentors response)	86
10. Duration of the internship ( supervisors response)	88
11. Responsibilities of mentors (mentees response)	91
12. Responsibilities of mentors (mentors response)	94
13. Mentees views about the university supervisor	97
14. Mentors views about the university supervisor	101
15. Benefits of the internship (mentees response)	105
16. Benefits of the internship (mentors response)	108
17. Benefits of the internship (supervisors response)	111
18. Problems of the internship ( mentees response)	115
19. Problems of the internship ( mentors response)	119
20. Problems of the internship ( supervisors response)	122



## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **Background to the Study**

Education plays a vital role in shaping the destiny of a nation. It is therefore, crucial for the system to be developed in such a way that the youth could be helped to acquire sophisticated skills that the country can fully utilize. It is in this direction that Ghana felt the need for reforms in her formal education in 1987. Any system of education should aim at serving the needs of the individual, the society in which he lives and the country as a whole.

Society is not static, but dynamic. Its social institutions are also not static but liable to changes. Education is therefore subject to change and therefore its practitioners should be innovators who are adaptable to the changing needs of the society. In order to achieve this all important goal, the most important ingredient is a cadre of well -educated, trained, dedicated, and knowledgeable teachers to man effectively the content under which students learn (Tamakloe, 1996).

Djangmah (1986) was of the view that the nation's dreams about educational system to cater for all pupils would not be realized if little or no attention is paid to the production of quality teachers who will be in daily contact with the students. The importance of quality teacher education has been recognized since the introduction of formal education in the country. The Basel,

Catholic, Ahmadiyya, Evangelical Presbyterian missionaries all established teacher training colleges in the country to help foster quality education. The government also established a number of teacher training colleges to run courses for teachers. All these efforts were aimed at equipping Ghanaian teachers with competencies and skills that will enable the teacher to teach effectively.

There has always been a debate within professional circles and even among politicians as to the best way to train teachers. Arguments have been advanced that there is dissatisfaction with existing pre- service provision. Knowledge has been seen as supreme and skills subservient in the training of teachers. By its very nature, the teacher education programme which is top heavy with academic component, cannot equip intending teachers with the specific role expectation in the classroom.

There is the general perception that academic standards have fallen or are falling in the country (Mensah, 1991). The quality of teaching and learning is observed to be very low (Owolabi, 1991). Statistics released by the Ghana Education Service confirm the perception by the general public that the standard of education is falling (Opare, 1999). While parents blame poor students learning outcome on teachers, teachers on the other hand blame educational managers and parents for lack of the necessary support to facilitate students learning.

Most contemporary writers on enhancing academic performance of students agree that the teacher is the pivot of classroom instructional activity. They agree that teachers play a vital role in the achievement of quality education and therefore require adequate training. (Farrants, 1992; Hargreaves, 1996).

Akyempong, Fobih, and Koomson (1999), were of the view that a

significant part of the problems facing pupils low academic performance has to do with teacher quality. This view is in line with the study carried out by Akyempong and Lewin (2002) which concluded that “teacher education programme in Ghana lacks the necessary content in producing teachers capable of improving the quality of education.”

Most studies have attributed the non-performance of teachers to three major sources. One, the academic attainment of the teachers is so low that they do not have adequate knowledge of the subject matter they teach. Two, the teachers are not exposed to real classroom situation or do not acquire the minimal pedagogical skills required for effective teaching of the subject matter to their students. Thirdly, low morale among teachers as a result of poor conditions under which they work. The challenge facing teacher education is how to develop effective programmes to achieve the desired goals.

The concern about teacher quality in many parts of Africa and the role teacher education should play has attracted a lot more concern in recent times. This concern is partly due to the increasing realization that despite gains made in enrolment in basic schools, gains in student achievement have been at the low side (Lockheed and Vespoor, 1991). For example, the educational reforms of 1987 has led to gross enrolment ratios at the primary school level by about 37%, but the gains in student achievement expected from the overall reforms has been less impressive (Akyeampong, 2002). Akyeampong concludes, ‘the yearly criterion referenced test which began in 1992 and were designed to monitor progress in pupils achievement paint a picture of continuing under achievement and a slow rate of progress.

The key to educational quality is the quality of its teaching force. The quality can be achieved mostly through effective training of the teachers. Most beginning teachers are seen as woefully unprepared for the complex and demanding tasks of the classroom. Pre-service teacher education has been regarded as pathetically weak and beginning teachers are found wanting and desperate in their initial experience.

Teachers as professionals have several roles and responsibilities. These include service to pupils, service to parents and service to the community. For teachers to be able to discharge their duties as expected of them, they have to be trained and qualified. As Arends (1991) puts it “modern society needs schools staffed with expert teachers to provide instruction and to care for children while adults work”. In like manner, Brew- Riverson (1972) contends that “the ability to teach is regarded as the foremost requirement and qualification for a good teacher. This is central to the teacher training programmes and we consider all other arrangements as subordinate, supplementary and contributory to it”.

There is the need therefore to bridge the gap between teacher education and real classroom situation. There is the need to increase trainees’ school experience during their period of training for school experience is seen as a transition from the world of academic preparation to that of full professional responsibility. This need has led to the designing and implementation of teacher education models that have all been abandoned at one time or the other.

Teaching occupies a central position in our educational system and as a result teachers are expected to effect positive change in the students they teach. Teachers are the live wires in the development of human resource. Education

should, therefore, be given the necessary support in order to produce high quality teachers. Without highly competent and motivated teachers, quality education would elude the nation. It is this conviction which urged Ekuban (1972) to enunciate the principle that “what you would put into the state, you must first put into the school”. President F. Kennedy, as quoted by Sadker and Sadker (1998), believes that, “A child miseducated is a child lost” (p. 12).

It is in this respect that the University of Education, Winneba, was established in September 1992 as College of Education. The University was established by the Government of Ghana under PNDC Law 322 as a university college with the amalgamation of seven specialized diploma awarding institutions, namely, the Specialist Training College (STC), the Advanced Teachers Training College (ATTC), the National Academy of Music (NAM)- all at Winneba, the school of Ghana Languages at Ajumako, the college of Special Education at Mampong- Akwapim, St. Andrews Agricultural College at Mampong - Ashanti and the Kumasi Advanced Technical Teachers College (KATTC). The aim was to meet the growing demand for qualified teachers resulting from the nation’s wide-ranging educational reforms. The university was charged with the responsibility of fostering the systematic advancement of the science and art of teacher education, providing teachers with professional competence for teaching in pre tertiary institutions and the non-formal sector and organizing in - service training (INSET) programmes for various categories of educators.

The pre-service teacher education for graduate teachers consists of three interrelated components:



- i. Academic Studies (subject content)
- ii. Educational Studies (psychology, sociology, philosophy, testing, assessment etc).
- iii. Professional Studies (teaching practice \ school experience).

In the training of teachers, these three components are not proportionally combined to give the trainees balanced professional and academic expertise. There is more academic orientation to the detriment of the actual professional training. For example, in the four years of the pre-service teacher education, the teacher trainees spend seven percent in teaching practice. In effect, they spend only 8 weeks out of 128 weeks in the four-year academic calendar. Currently in the University of Cape Coast, the out of school teaching practice has been reduced to 4 weeks as the other 4 weeks is for peer teaching (popularly called On- Campus Teaching Practice - OCTP).

Teaching practice is important since it helps would-be teachers to acquire teaching skills. Similarly, an artisan cannot learn a trade based on theory alone. In the same way, a medical practitioner who does not have field exposure (housemanship) cannot perform effectively. Perhaps, that is why Adams and Dickey (1956) feel that “theory without ultimate practical application is educational jargon, and practice without sound theory behind it becomes empty, time wasting activity” (p. 4).

One can discern, therefore, that theory and practice are opposite sides of the same coin. Theory and practice are considered to be two socially related and interlinked factors, which together form the whole learning process. It has become common knowledge among professionals that the knowledge they acquire from

practice is far more useful than what they acquire from most types of education. Learning from practice or experience is a cardinal way by which people create their world and meaning. Teaching is oriented more towards practical, useful activity, which is more effective than theorizing severed from reality. One must understand that practical knowledge is distinct from abstract knowledge and in their work; professionals heavily rely on practical knowledge. Friedson (1986) echoes this when he reiterates that “to assume that textbooks and other publications of academics reflect in consistent and predictable ways the knowledge that is actually exercised in concrete human setting is either wishful or naïve” (p. 229).

It is an undisputable fact that the quality of any educational programme in a country depends on the teachers who implement it. Great importance should, therefore, be attached to the teaching practice component in teacher preparation. Any teacher education programme which does not take cognizance of teaching practice can be likened to a ship without radar or a baby who attempts to walk suddenly without first of all having the art of balancing. He cannot succeed. As Everett cited in Adentwi (2002) says, ‘of the many experiences organized for the prospective teachers during their period of preparation, the student teaching experience emerges as a crucial activity in the induction process’ (p.7).

Student teaching is the most widely accepted component of teacher preparation. Very reknown educators such as Conant (1963) and (McIntyre, 1988) have described school experiences as the most important element in professional education and student teaching as the most universally approved education course. Despite the massive support given to student teaching

worldwide, it has also come under heavy attack for lack of theoretical and conceptual framework and for not fulfilling its aims (Zeichner, 1980). This contradiction is more evident in the curriculum and organization of the student teaching practice and school experience programmes.

In the 2001/2002 academic year, the University of Education introduced a new system of training teachers. Under the programme, students are to spend the first three years on campus doing course (academic) work and the fourth year on internship originally (referred to as out segment) in partnership schools. Students are sent to schools as mentees to teach for a period of one academic year. They work closely under qualified teachers/tutors called mentors in the various schools.

The underlying principle of this new programme is to overcome the problems and inadequacies associated with the old programme. The inadequacies of the old programme include:

- i. Teacher education programme was not geared directly to what teachers would do in real classroom
- ii. There was little exposure to actual work in the school
- iii. Emphasis on academic knowledge based on passing written examination as means of assessment rather than on professional skill acquired through the process and development of teaching skills.

Ultimately the restructuring of the teaching practice component was meant therefore to overcome these inadequacies and thereby improve the quality of education in the country. The expectation from this change was that through the programme, mentees will learn to teach by teaching and thus become competent

and efficient teachers.

However, of late, many students pursuing the various four year bachelor of education programme at the University of Education have expressed misgivings about the organization and practice of student teaching (internship) being run by the university. Some students have even gone further to question its effectiveness. There are those who think by virtue of their long years of teaching experience prior to their degree course, do not need any more teaching practice. Others also feel that they derive very little, if not at all, benefit from the programme. The following is an extract from the petition sent to the vice-chancellor by the students' representative council about the internship programme.

1. The current situation affects students adversely as far as their long essay is concerned. Students during their one year internship have little access to libraries which is very important for the quality of work they produce. Students have little time to travel to see their supervisors and even when they come they are not able to see the supervisors
2. The need to travel down periodically to see their supervisors poses a lot of risk to students as they ply the dangerous road networks of the country.
3. The need to travel down to see their supervisors affects their output and disturbs the training of the pupils and students and a number of headmasters and mentors have expressed their concern about this.

4. We consider the full one year out segment as too long, superfluous and not too necessary. This is in consideration of the fact that about 95% majority of the students are trained teachers who have had teaching practice during their initial teacher training and have at least two years full time teaching experience.
5. It is again pathetic to note that in the current organization, three thousand and fifty permanent teachers are rendered partially or fully redundant for a whole year as their lessons are taken over by the practicing teachers.

As teacher educators, sentiments of this nature expressed by student teachers should be of much concern. There is the need to address the issue of whether or not the students are benefiting from the programme. Since the internship programme seeks to produce quality teachers, the need to evaluate the implementation of the model and to collect views from its implementors and stakeholders about its worthiness cannot be overemphasized.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The key to the success of any educational programme depends to a large extent on the availability and provision of quality teachers. The problem facing teacher educators is how to develop effective programme to produce quality teachers. There has been the need for the development of a model that will bridge the gap between teacher education and the real classroom situation. This has led to the designing and implementation of teacher education models that have all been abandoned at one time or the other. Many a time very captivating innovations that are designed for teacher education, are virtually utopian, since

their translation into achievable objectives become a problem. The problem becomes apparent when at the end of the day; the practices and outcomes of a programme have very little in common (Tamakloe, 1997). Another problem has to do with the attitude of the implementers. Most programme implementers view these models as not being worthy.

It is therefore necessary to investigate whether the attitude that stakeholders in education usually have towards new innovations is not the same for the internship programme. The response to this question is important in finding the level of commitment the implementors have towards the programme.

There is the added problem of having a good programme like the internship on paper and implementing it successfully. However well designed a programme may seem, it is the human touch provided by the teacher and the implementers that will ensure its successful implementation. A carefully designed programme on paper may be different from the realities on ground for what the officials put on paper may be at variance with what teachers plan and provide.

The success of any innovation depends on the strategies used to implement it. Implementation becomes successful when implementers use appropriate strategies as plan which therefore makes it possible for the innovation to be evaluated to determine whether the planned outcomes have been achieved. Most programme implementers do not employ the suggested strategies to implement the programmes. This is in line with Dare (1998) assertion that the problems associated with the educational reform programme being implemented in Ghana are attributable to the non-fulfilment of certain pre-conditions.

Another reason that has necessitated this research is the factors that may

hinder the successful implementation of the internship. A programme implementation may be impeded by many factors that might not have been noticed during the planning and designing stages. It is therefore necessary to investigate the implementation process in order to know those factors impeding the programme.

To find answers to these questions it is important to make an investigation into the process of the implementation of the internship programme in order to uncover what is really going on in the field. Indeed, the future of the internship programme depends on obtaining data to know the actual strengths and weaknesses of the programme. It is only through a thorough evaluation of the programme that one can identify whether or not the programme is meeting what it was designed to achieve. This has been the motivating factor that has led the researcher to investigate what is actually going on in the field vis-a vis the programme guidelines.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The study intends to evaluate the one-year internship programme (teaching practice component) in teacher preparation of the University of Education, Winneba. In particular it seeks to achieve the following objectives.

1. Seek information on the preparation of mentees, mentors, and university supervisors for the internship.
2. Find out the views of mentees, mentors, and university supervisors about the duration of the programme.
3. Find out if the mentors are performing their roles as indicated in the Student Internship Handbook.

4. Find out the views held by the mentees and the mentors about the university supervisor.
5. Determine the benefits of the new programme in the preparation of teachers.
6. Seek information on problems facing the programme.

### **Research Questions**

1. How adequately are mentors, mentees, and the university supervisors prepared for the internship programme?
2. What are the views of mentors, mentees, and the university supervisors about the duration of the internship?
3. What are the views of mentors and mentees about the quality of supervision provided by the university supervisors?
4. How adequately are mentors performing their roles as required by the university?
5. What are the perceived benefits of the new programme in the preparation of teachers?
6. What are the problems confronting the internship programme?

### **Significance of the Study**

It is the conviction of the researcher that the realities, which the study would reveal, would benefit a wide spectrum of policy makers, educational planning and administrators, university supervisors, mentees and the general public. The study, it is hoped would unearth conditions that gave birth to the designing and implementation of the programme. It would help discover mentors and mentees perceptions about the duration, the number of periods allotted to



mentee for teaching and mentees involvement in co-curricular activities. This would guide the University authorities on how to re-orientate the perceptions of the mentees and mentors to develop positive attitudes towards the programme.

The results of the study would also help policy makers, lecturers, and teaching practice organizers to formulate plans and policies that would help to improve the programme. It would also help the schools in their in-service training programmes.

Furthermore, prospective mentees would become aware of some of the problems they would face during teaching practice. They would, therefore, be prepared psychologically and adequately for the exercise.

The data that the study would generate would help educational planners determine the effectiveness of the programme. This could lead to the continuation, modification, or discontinuation of the programme.

Finally, the study would complement the work of those who have already done similar studies in this area. It would also serve as a useful stepping stone for a smooth take-off for other researchers.

### **Delimitation of the Study**

A study of this nature should have taken the researcher to all the institutions where the mentee teachers of the University of Education, Winneba, do their internship. For the purpose of collecting information regarding the planning and implementation of the internship programme, the researcher restricted the selection of respondents to only those who have completed their internship in 2006/ 2007 mentees practicing in the Ashanti region, mentors in the Ashanti region and university supervisors in the Kumasi and Mampong campuses

of the University of Education. The Ashanti region was chosen probably due to its proximity to the researcher and the fact that a fairly large sample of mentees could be gotten there for the study. The researcher also delimited the study to only the teaching practice aspect of the programme. The study does not include co-curricular activities undertaken by the mentees. It does not also focus on post internship seminars organized for the students; hence, it will not look at things like students' assessment portfolio and personal philosophy of teaching.

### **Definition of Terms**

For clear understanding of this research, certain terms need to be defined precisely and concisely to help reduce ambiguities.

#### **Teaching Practice**

It is an activity whereby a trainee teacher is assigned to a class of students for supervised teaching over a period of time. This exercise is aimed at improving the trainee teachers' skills and also helping them to discover how students learn. It encompasses On- Campus Teaching Practice and Off- Campus Teaching Practice.

#### **On-Campus Teaching Practice**

It refers to teaching practice organized on campus during which a trainee teacher "teaches" his classmates in a simulated classroom situation under the supervision of the faculty supervisors.

#### **Off-Campus Teaching Practice**

It is teaching practice outside the campus where the trainee teacher is assigned to a public or a private school to practice how to teach under the supervision of experienced teachers and faculty supervisors.

#### **Mentee**

It refers to the student being trained as a teacher.

### **Faculty Supervisors**

They are mostly lecturers from the University who supervise the work of the mentees.

### **Mentors**

Mentors are those teachers who supervise mentees' work in the various schools where the mentees practice. Mentors are usually chosen or appointed by the headmaster/principal according to agreed criteria and given some training by the University of Education, Winneba.

### **Organization of the Study**

The study report consists of five chapters. Chapter one focuses on the introduction of the study. It gives background information on the study. It also states the statement of the problem, purpose, significance, research questions, and delimitations of the study as well as operational definitions of core terms related to the study.

Chapter two is on the review of related literature. It examines the views of authors and researchers on issues like meaning and purpose of programme evaluation, models of programme evaluation, and history of teacher education in Ghana, objectives of teacher education, teacher preparation, the concept of teaching practice, and its importance, the preparation of teachers for teaching practice, the concept of supervision and mentorship and theoretical framework.

Chapter three discusses the methodology adopted for the study. It comprises the research design, population, sample, and sampling procedure, research instruments, pre-testing of instruments data collection and analysis

procedure.

The fourth chapter constitutes the analysis and discussion of data obtained from the fieldwork. It examines the emerging trends from the data using both descriptive and inferential statistics.

The final chapter is chapter five. This chapter comprises the major finding of the study, conclusion, recommendations, and suggestions.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

Many writers and educationists unanimously agree that Teaching Practice is a vital component to theoretical courses in educating teachers. In this section, therefore, the writings of authorities as well as previous research on the topic are reviewed. The review is organized under the following headings:

- i. Meaning and Purposes of programme evaluation
- ii Models of programme evaluation
- iii History of teacher education in Ghana
- iv Objectives of teacher education
- v Teacher preparation
- vi The concept of teaching practice and its importance
- vii Preparation of students for teaching practice
- viii. Key concepts in the internship
- viii The concept of supervision and mentorship
- vii Theoretical framework

#### **Meaning and Purposes of Programme Evaluation**

Schools are purposeful organizations set up for the systematic education of learners. For this reason, now and again, educational authorities and the lay public alike get keenly interested in finding out the extent to which school programmes,

processes and products are yielding the desired results. This scenario has given rise to what has become known as educational or programme evaluation.

The meaning of the term evaluation becomes clearer when it is contrasted with “assessment,” a related idea. Assessment has been defined as “an activity designed to show what a person knows or can do” (Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983, p. 33).

Thus, it is concerned with the appraisal of individuals, and it is largely based on a teacher’s estimation of the extent to which a learner has attained mastery of what he is supposed to learn. Such an assessment can be made through the use of a test or by means of the teacher’s observation of the learners as he goes about his normal learning activities.

Evaluation, on the other hand, is a more inclusive or broad term. As a matter of fact many writers have defined evaluation differently. For example, Tyler (1949) defined evaluation as “the process of evaluation is essentially the process of determining to what extent the educational objectives are actually being realized by the programme of curriculum and instruction.” Here, emphasis is placed on the appraisal of a programme or project rather than an individual.

Cooper (1990) defines evaluation as “the collection and provision of evidence, on the basis of which decisions can be made about the feasibility, effectiveness, and educational value of curricula” (p. 45). Cronbach (1963) also defines evaluation as “the collection and use of information as a basis for decisions about an educational programme” (p. 23). Hamilton (1976), on his part, says evaluation is “the process or processes used to weigh the relative merits of those educational alternatives which, at any one time, are deemed to fall within

the domain of curriculum practice” (p. 145). The foregoing definitions point out the main purpose of programme evaluation as to provide information that would enable us determine the current status of the object of evaluation, to compare that status with a standard criteria, and to select an alternative from among two or more to make a decision. Programme evaluation then should provide information whereby people can decide which course of action with regard to the curriculum is best for them.

Mathews (1989) makes the following perceptive comment about the nature of programme evaluation: ‘Evaluation, then, is a necessary precursor to action: We evaluate, then make a judgment, then act. Worthen (1984) on his part says, “evaluation involves gathering information, forming judgment based on the available information and using the judgment in making decisions” (p. 84). Programme evaluation, is therefore the gathering and provision of evidence on the basis of which decisions can be made about the worth of a programme. It could also be viewed as the process whereby the various parts, processes or result of a programme are critically examined to see whether they are satisfactory with regards to stated objectives. On their part, Hopkins and Glass (1978) refers to programme evaluation as “the continuous inspection of all available information concerning the teacher, student, educational programme and the teaching learning process to determine the amount of change in students and form valid judgment about the effectiveness of the programme” (p.75).

If programmes are evaluated and found to be effective in achieving the desired results, then no adjustment may be necessary. However, if discrepancies are uncovered between intended outcomes and actual performance, then

corrective measures will be required to ensure that actual performance meets the level of expected outcomes. The underlying principle is that the programme needs to be responsive to the changing needs of the society. Thus evaluation is part and parcel of programme development.

Programme evaluation may serve either a formative purpose that is helping to improve the programme or summative purpose that is deciding whether a programme should be continued or not (Alkin, 1972).

Cronbach (1963), identifies three purposes of evaluation. These are:

1. Course improvement: This deal with deciding what instructional materials and methods are satisfactory and what change is needed.
2. Decisions about Individuals: This deals with identifying the needs of the learner in order to plan for instruction, judging the pupil's merit for the purposes of selection, grouping and making known to the learner his strengths and weaknesses.
3. Administrative regulations: Judging how good the school system is, how good individual teachers are.

### **Models of Programme Evaluation**

There are a number of models for program evaluation. These models represent a coherent set of ideas about what programme evaluation should accomplish and how it should be done.

#### **The Objectives/Goal Oriented Model**

This model was proposed by Tyler (1949) and involves identifying, clarifying, and stating the purposes of an educational activity and then assessing the extent to which the purposes have been achieved or are being achieved (Tyler,



1949). This model therefore makes use of programmes specific objectives as the yardstick in determining success. In this model, programme objectives are identified and selected and defined in behavioural terms and relevant behaviours are measured against this criterion using either standardized or evaluator constructed items. The resultant data are then compared with the behavioural objectives to verify the extent to which performance is consistent with expectations (Maucher, 1962).

Tyler (1949) was of the view that the process of evaluation is basically a process of determining the extent to which educational objectives are actually being achieved. To him, it is only when the objectives of the programme are made clearer and stated in behavioral terms, then, it can be evaluated. Therefore, the objectives of the programme constitute the yardstick against which success must be measured and judged. He visualized the programme evaluation process to consist essentially of the following steps: (i) establishing broad goals and objectives (ii) classifying the goals and objectives. (iii) defining objectives in behavioral terms (iv) finding situations in which achievement of objectives can be shown, (v) developing or selecting measurement techniques (vi) collecting performance data and (vii) comparing performance data with behaviorally stated objectives.

Discrepancies between performance and objectives then form the basis for making modifications to correct deficiencies or reformulating the objectives to make them more achievable.

Taba (1962) stated that pre-specification of objectives is essential since it is the first step to evaluation. She was of the view that things that are clearly

evaluated are most effectively taught and therefore, objectives provide the yardstick for measuring and judging instructional process. Hammond (1973) agrees with Taba when he states that the evaluation of teaching and learning experiences should be based on the objectives of the programme. Other writers (Mefessel and Michael, 1967; Provus, 1973) made some modifications to Tyler's (1949) basic framework within the goal-oriented tradition.

Perhaps, the greatest strength of the goal oriented model is its simplicity which makes it easy to understand, easy to follow, easy to implement, and produces information that educators generally agree is relevant to their mission (Worthen and Sanders, 1987). It has considerable face validity because holding a programme accountable for what its designers say it will accomplish is obviously a legitimate exercise. Also, it helps to clearly delineate logical relationships between objectives and activities thereby emphasizing elements that are important to the attainment of programme objectives (Lawton, 1973). Furthermore the goal-oriented model has led to a great deal of improvements in the techniques for measuring educational outcomes.

However, it has received quite a number of criticisms. For example, Glass (1969) has criticized it on grounds that it does not deal with the occurrence of unplanned or unintended events. Stake (1969) says it does not pay attention to process variables or to the examination of antecedent conditions; while Stenhouse 1976 points out potential problems associated with its philosophical assumption-the idea that education is a technology; a body of techniques leading to prespecified objectives that guide actions and determine the means for achieving them. It may also be added that the goal-oriented approach creates the

erroneous impression that programme evaluation is co-terminus with the evaluation of learning outcomes. Also, Eisner (1979), Hirst (1969) and others have pointed out that in some areas of a programme, stating objectives behaviorally does not seem to make much sense. McCormick and James (1990) have criticized the objectives model on the grounds that the use of objectives as criteria for judging the success or failure of the programme does not diagnose to find out the reasons for the success or failure of the programme. In this respect, it would be quite difficult to evaluate learning outcomes in such fields by means of a goal-oriented model.

### **The Decision Oriented Model**

This approach concerns itself with providing information to aid decision making in respect of programme planning, design and implementation. The assumption underlying this approach is the belief that evaluation is worthwhile only if its results affect future actions (Lewy, 1977). In this regard it is the opinion of proponents of this evaluation model that evaluation information should be gathered and presented in such a way that it will aid programme designers and implementers to make better decisions. Evaluation activities are, therefore, supposed to be planned to coincide with the various phases of programme planning and implementation where there are needs for information for improving decision-making.

This model is meant to serve decision- makers. Its rationale is that evaluative information is an essential part of good decision making and that the evaluator can best serve education by serving administrators, policymakers, school boards, teachers and others in education who need evaluative information

Some decision oriented evaluators like Stufflebeam (1973) and Alkin (1990) contend that the major reason to conduct an evaluation is to provide information for making decisions about either individuals or the programme itself. Alkin defines evaluation as the process of ascertaining the decision areas of concern, selecting appropriate information, and analyzing the information in order to report a summary data useful for decision makers in selecting among alternatives. To him, the evaluator does not only assist the decision makers in selecting alternatives, but also draws the attention of the decision maker to the existence of alternatives. Stufflebeam views evaluation as “the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives.” Posner (1992) reiterates that decisions about individuals are necessary for six good reasons – diagnosis, instructional feedback, placement, promotion, credentialing, and selection.

Stufflebeam (1973) came out with a basic outline of programme evaluation commonly called the Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) model. The model was basically to serve the informational needs of decision makers and administrators. The **context evaluation** has to do with the determination of the actual condition or problem and isolating ‘unmet needs’ as well as opportunities that could be used. Context evaluation has been related to defining and describing the environment in which a programme will be offered, identification of needs that have been used as a criteria and pinpointing any constraints that keep those needs from being achieved.

**Input evaluation** provides information about alternative strategies that may help deal with the needs identified as well as available resources.

Stufflebeam (1973) pointed out that the basic purpose of input evaluation is to determine how resources might best be utilized to achieve the objectives stated. It is at this stage that the evaluator may identify and point out the best alternative strategy for dealing with the needs identified. At this stage, questions such as “what programme materials might be most useful in a particular educational setting? What materials are most acceptable to students and teachers? How must instructions be best implemented? Input evaluation is therefore concerned with the identification and assessment of alternative materials for achieving specified goals.

**Process evaluation** provides information pertaining to procedural designs or implementation and making adjustments and refinement. At this level, evaluators try to find out how well the programme is being implemented, what problems or challenges are hindering the smooth implementation of the programme, what changes can be made for the successful implementation of the programme. Questions like, “How well are learners performing? What is the quality of instructional and support services? are raised at this level.

**Product evaluation** which is the final level of the CIPP model typically takes place on the field. The main aim of product evaluation is to relate outcome information to objectives and the context, input, and process data which may then lead to a series of decision (Borich 1991). At each stage, outcomes are compared to stated objectives and differences between expected and actual results are reported to decision makers. Product evaluation is concerned with the extent to which the goals of the programme have been realized and what could be done with the programme after it has run its full course.

The greatest advantage associated with the decision-focus model is, perhaps, the fact that it helps to focus an evaluation study by paying attention to the specific informational needs of the curriculum planning and implementation process. This helps to prevent blind gathering of information that is not directly relevant to the key issues or questions. The decision-focused approach helps to evaluate the programme at its formative stages so that needed adjustments are made at the various decision stages for improvement. Because it emphasizes information for decision-making, this model is also the most popular or most preferred approach for most school boards, school administrators and other programme implementers. Furthermore, the capacity for the decision-focused approaches to provide feedback to decision makers at various decisional stages in programme planning and implementation makes it instrumental in ensuring that the programme is not left to proceed unaffected by updated knowledge about needs, resources, new developments in education, the realities of day-to-day operations, or the consequences of providing education in a given way (Worthen and Sanders, 1984). It also provides feedback at the various levels (Worthen and Sanders, 1987).

One serious weakness of the decisions-focused approach, according to Stecher and Davis (1987), is that many important decisions are not made at a specific point in time, but occur through a gradual process of accretion. Again, many decisions are not based on data but rely on the subjective impressions, feelings and personnel needs of programme planners and implementers'. Also, according to House (1980) the decision focused model appears to take away the posture of the evaluator as a judge of programme design and implementation and

rather seems to place him at the service of programme managers for furthering their purposes thereby making evaluation potentially unfair and undemocratic. House (1980) takes this view because of the fact that under the decision-focused approach evaluators are not supposed to make the final decision about programmes but are only supposed to show decision makers various alternative approaches for dealing with an issue. Another shortcoming of decision-focused evaluation is that it can be very costly and complex where priorities are not carefully set and followed.

### **The Responsive Model**

Responsive evaluation operates on the basis that the most authentic evaluation is one that is based on the diverse perspectives of all people who have a stake in the programme being implemented. In this regard then, responsive evaluators do not base their conclusions on the impressions of one person or even a group of persons, but on the multiple perspectives of all the various people affected by the evaluation.

This model was advocated by Stake (1982) who stated that “an educational evaluation is responsive if it respond to audience need for information and if the value perspectives present are referred to in reporting the success or failure of the programme.” The major focus of this model is on the presentation of its report. According to Stake, different audiences require different informational needs. Based on this, evaluation should be structured in such a way that it meets the needs of the various audiences. As a technique, responsive evaluation does not place emphasis on quantitative research methods such as the use of tests or other structured instruments, statistical procedures and the like. On the contrary, more

emphasis is placed on qualitative methods of data gathering and analysis including the use of observation, unstructured interviews, and other naturalistic and participant-oriented approaches of data collection; and the building of models that reflect viewpoints of diverse groups. Responsive evaluation is, therefore, not only responsive to the needs and purposes of the various stakeholders but also places much premium on contextual factors and comprehensive explanation of the phenomenon under study from diverse perspectives.

Typically, responsive evaluation does not make use of quantitative research methods like test or use of structured instruments and statistical procedures. Stake points out that a responsive evaluator spends so much time with clients, observing programme activities as they unfold, trying to understand underlying purposes and concerns, and conceptualizing problems and issues from various points of view. This role requires the capacity, on the part of the evaluator, to empathies with others, instead of acting like a judge as to the worth, success or otherwise of a project, the responsive evaluator rather acts as a counselor and facilitator, helping participants clarify their own understandings and making the right decisions.

The major advantage of the model is the fact that it brings the human element into evaluation by directing the evaluator to the needs of the clients in a given situation. It is highly sensitive to the multiple points of view of various individuals and groups and has the capacity to accommodate ambiguous or poorly focused concerns. Indeed, responsive evaluators can operate where there are differences between the concerns of different groups because they can embody these conflicting points of view in a meaningful way. According to House (1980)



the major problem with responsive evaluation is that it is very difficult to take the multiple points of view of all stakeholders in an evaluation into consideration in practice. Also, because of its complexity, responsive evaluation is more appealing to intellectuals than to practitioners whose attitudes really matter as far as implementation of evaluation recommendations are concerned. Another serious defect of responsive evaluation, according to its critics is subjectivity. Because of the fact that findings of responsive evaluation are based on observation, participant-oriented approaches and naturalistic methods of data gathering and analysis; and also because of over reliance on individual perspectives on issues, advocates of responsive evaluation have been accused for making “loose and unsubstantiated” evaluations. Finally, it is more costly to use qualitative methods in evaluation studies than it is to use more quantitative methods. This is because such methods are much more labour intensive and time consuming and often make so much demand on the time and efforts of the evaluators (House 1980).

### **Formative and Summative Evaluation**

Scriven (1967) made a major contribution to programme evaluation with his distinction between formative and summative evaluation. Scriven emphasized that one may pose questions concerning the merits and demerits of a programme during the progress of its development which he refers to as formative evaluation or alternatively, the question may be posed after the programme has run its full course and has come to its end which he refers to as summative evaluation.

Glasser and Nitko (1971) refer to formative evaluation as the data provided during the developmental and design stages of the constructional procedures and materials. It takes place as the programme unfolds. It provides

information about progress made. It leads to the identification of strengths and weaknesses in the educational process. Summative evaluation refers to the type of evaluation which is conducted at the end of an instructional segment to determine if learning is adequate to warrant moving the learner to the next stage of instruction (Stake, 1991).

### **The Goal -Free Model**

One approach that is at variance with the objective model is the goal free model. This model has as its main purpose the determination of the merits of a programme without making reference to its objectives. The major principle underlying this model is its focus on results rather than stated objectives. The overdependence on programme objectives makes evaluation burdensome and narrows the range of potential outcomes that can be investigated (Scriven, 1972). Scriven (1967) who supports this model of evaluation contends that in an attempt to escape the restrictive nature of objective model, the evaluator should concentrate on what a programme actually does rather than what it ought to have done. In this respect the goal free evaluator judges the worth of a programme on the basis of his or her professional competencies.

In an attempt to justify the goal free evaluation model, Scriven (1967) offers a framework upon which it is possible to determine which observed effects could be attributed to the programme under investigation. Likening the goal free model to criminal investigation, he proposes that prior to evaluating the programme; the evaluator examines carefully all potential causes for observed effects and establishes strong linkages activities and competing influence.

Just like all evaluation models, goal free evaluation model does not go

without criticism. Stecher and Davies (1987) intimates that the most serious setback of this model is the substitution of the goal of the programme for that of the evaluator ,that is the evaluator establishes his or her own criteria for measuring the worthiness of the programme without taking into account those of the programme designer. The advocates of this model in their defence contrive that what matter in the implementation of a programme is the degree to which the programme meets the demonstrated needs of the users and not the degree to which it meets its goals. Therefore the critical task for the evaluator is to determine the needs of the affected population and these become the basis for judgment about programme effects. It is upon this that Scriven (1967) described this model as “needs- based” and “consumer based” evaluation. The clue is that the worthiness of a programme depends on the degree to which it is meeting the needs of the learners and the society as a whole.

### **Evaluation of Educational Programmes in Ghana**

Several attempts have been made to evaluate educational programmes in Ghana. The evaluation centred on determining the conditions under which certain programmes succeed or fail availability of support facilities and the capabilities of implementers.

One programme that has been evaluated is the teaching of curriculum studies in teacher training colleges in Ghana by Tamakloe (1997). He evaluated the attitude of the principals of the 38 teacher training colleges towards the teaching of curriculum studies in the colleges. He obtained his data through the use of questionnaire. The study reveals that curriculum studies were taught in all the training colleges under the broad subject area “Aims and Principles of

Education.” The study also revealed that the principals have favourable attitude toward the teaching of the course.

Another educational programme evaluated was carried out by Cobbold (1999) on the implementation of Social Studies in the teacher training colleges in Ghana. He obtained his data through interviews, questionnaires, and discussion with tutors and students as well as field observation. The study revealed that both teachers and students regard all the components of the social studies programme as important. It also came to light that principals, tutors, and students have favourable attitudes toward the teaching of social studies in the teacher training colleges.

Adu and Baku (1990) also evaluated the establishment of junior secondary schools in the country between 1976 – 1981. The aim of the study was to evaluate the nature, implementation, and impact of the JSS programme in Ghana from 1976 to 1981. The respondents for the study comprise pupils, teachers, parents, community leaders, and heads of educational institutions. The study revealed that the aims and objectives of the programme were good and made known to everybody through public education. It also came out that inputs, both human and material were not enough to the smooth implementation of the programme. Respondents were in favour of the programme but expressed some reservation about the implementation of the programme.

This study made use of the objective model of evaluation in evaluating the internship programme. The various objectives as outlined in the student internship handbook form the basis for the study. Each objective of the programme was taken and questions were formulated for mentees, mentors and

university supervisors to determine the extent to which the objective has been achieved.

### **History of Teacher Education in Ghana**

The development of teacher education in Ghana started as a result of the introduction of formal education in the country. The beginning of the development of teacher education in the country can be traced to the missionaries. McWilliams and Kwamena – Poh (1975) notes that no effort was made to train teachers until the arrival of the missionaries. The Basel mission realized that any thorough and meaningful education depended on the supply of trained teachers. They therefore established the first teacher training college in the country in 1848 at Akropong –Akwapim. They established another one at Abetifi in 1898. This was however merged with the one at Akropong in 1924.

The government opened its first teacher training college in 1909 based on the recommendations of the 1908 Education Committee which was instituted by Governor Rodgers. The Accra Teacher Training College which was a non denominational college started with the 2- year teacher training programme and continued until Guggisberg introduced the 3- year programme in 1925 and later in 1927, the 4- year programme was introduced for the training colleges. The training of female teachers however, continued to be 2- years (McWilliam and Kwamina-Poh, 1975; Antwi, 1992).

From the 1920s, a number of training colleges were established. For instance, Wesley College was moved from Aburi to Kumasi in 1924. St. Augustine College which was first opened in 1930 at Amissano near Elmina was moved to Cape Coast in 1936. These colleges also offered 4- year programmes.

According to Graham (1977), the 1937-1941 education committee recommended a 2 year course leading to a teachers certificate 'B'. This was to run alongside the existing 4-year course. The post 'B' course of 2 year duration that led to a teacher's certificate 'A' was also introduced. The post 'B' course was aimed at getting trained teachers to teach mostly in the middle schools and to meet the teacher needs of the post war expansion in education.

In the views of McWilliam and Kwamena Poh (1975) the implementation of the Accelerated Development Plan of Education (ADPE) in 1951 brought in its wake a large number of primary and middle schools that required teachers to teach in these schools. The supply of teachers was therefore necessary for its success. In order to meet the growing demand for teachers, a large number of pupil teachers were recruited to cater for the schools as a short term measure, It was however, deemed appropriate to give at least some guidance to those pupil teachers who would continue to man the schools until enough teachers could be trained. Accordingly, emergency training colleges started with the first one being established at Saltpond in 1953. The purpose of these emergency training centres was to give six weeks of intensive training to the pupil teachers to prepare and equip them academically and professionally. By the end of 1953, ten emergency training centres were being operated in the country. Also ten new certificate 'B' colleges were established. The intake of six existing new ones was doubled. All teachers in training were to be treated as if on study leave. Additionally, the salaries of teachers, trained and untrained, were to be reviewed (Graham, 1971; Pecku, 1988). In 1961 however, the certificate 'B' course was abolished and in its place came the continuous four years course leading to the award of certificate

‘A’. The two year post secondary certificate programme was retained for secondary school leavers.

An important event that occurred in the history of teacher education in Ghana was the introduction of specialist courses in the teacher training colleges. During the 1964 / 65 academic year, specialist courses for teachers were introduced in nine training colleges in the country. In 1973, the demand for specialist teachers to augment the number of graduate teachers trained from the University of Cape Coast and teaching in the training colleges and the secondary schools, led to the opening of specialist training courses in Mathematics, English, History, Geography, Art, Music Physical Education and Ghanaian Languages (Antwi, 1992).

Later, seven diploma awarding colleges were put in place to admit certificated teachers with at least three years post secondary qualification plus G.C.E. ‘O’ level. The diploma institutions trained teachers for the secondary schools and the training colleges. Presently, all the diploma awarding institutions provide degree courses under the umbrella of the University of Education, Winneba. The University of Cape Coast has also been offering degree, diploma and certificate courses since 1962. Initially, the university runs a four year undergraduate course leading to the award of Bachelor of Education certificate (Antwi, 1992)

### **Objectives of Teacher Education**

Every professional course is structured to meet clearly set goals. Teaching, as a profession, has a set of goals to achieve. For instance, Tamakloe (1997) claims that the objectives of teacher education can be put into three broad areas,

namely the area of cognitive development and acquisition of skills; the development of the ability to examine and identify educational and teaching problems and to solve them satisfactorily; and the production of mature teachers capable of contributing to the creation of significant and creative personal and inter-group relationship.

Lockheed and Vespoor (1991) were of the view that the goal of teacher education is not to indoctrinate teachers to behave in rigid, prescribed ways, but to encourage them to think about how they teach and why they teach. In the same vein, Pecku (1998) is of the view that: Teacher education must now move away from undue emphasis on theory to pedagogy which transmits adequate teaching skills to enable the trainee deal effectively with real classroom experiences.

This suggests that there is the need to strike a balance between theory and practice. Wragg (1993), writing on the objectives of teacher education, contended that:

If teaching is one of the most important responsibilities a society can ask some of its members to undertake, then the challenge to nurture and enhance the professional skills of each new generation of teachers for the vastly complex world of the twenty-first century, and sharpen the proficiency of teachers already in post, must be an equally valuable assignment (p. 102).

This means that initial teacher training as well as in-service training is very important to make teachers move abreast with time. Also, in Ghana, the



guidelines for the implementation of Teacher Education Policy say that a competent teacher should possess among others:

certain professional knowledge, understanding and skills, which are directly related to the day-to-day work of teaching ... ability in planning, organizing and providing instruction as well as making scientific analysis of situations as they arise. Ability to communicate facts and information to pupils in such a form and to such an extent that the pupils are able to understand what should be learned (G.E.S, 2000, p.8).

It therefore, follows that teacher competency is an indispensable factor in the successful teaching and learning process that should go on in schools. For the objectives of teacher education to be attained, more emphasis should be put on the practical preparation of teachers.

Djangmah (1986) enumerated the objectives of teacher education as stated in the New Structure and Content of Education (1974) based on Dzobo Committee report as

1. to give teachers a sound basis in the content of the courses at the levels they will be teaching,
2. to give teachers sound professional skills that will enable them to guide pupils to learn, and
3. to equip teachers with manual skills in other to help the pupils in the acquisition of basic vocational skills.

Tozer, Violas, and Senese (1995) also enumerated the goals of teacher education as:

1. to make the education of teachers intellectually more solid,
2. to convert teacher education institutions to schools for teacher preparation and development, and
3. to recognize differences in teacher's knowledge, skills and commitment in their education, certification and work.

Thus teacher education entails having the opportunity to develop the personal qualities, commitment, and self understanding, essential to becoming a sensitive and flexible teacher.

### **The Concept of Teaching Practice and its Importance**

There are as many definitions of teaching and teaching practice as there are several researchers in this area of study. Tamakloe (1997) writes: teaching can be explained as an activity of impacting knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values to learners. It involves creating situations to facilitate learning and motivating learners to have interest in what is being transmitted to them.

The underlying philosophy of teaching practice is the principle of learning by doing. In the school situation the student learns the practical application of this art by his own meaningful activity in a real classroom. Thus the most important purpose of teaching practice is to help the student learn his job (Zeichner, 1980).

According to Stones (1984) practice teaching was 'one of variety of terms applied to that part of a student's professional training that involves the student trying to teach pupils. Other terms used less synonymously in the literature are teaching practice, school experience, field experience, and practicum. Stones further stated that in practice teaching in most teacher training institutions,

trainees engaged in practice teaching, spend several weeks in schools practicing to teach pupils'. They are guided by tutors in the training institutions and by cooperating teachers.

Commenting on the importance of teaching practice, Machario and Wario (1989) wrote that teaching practice is an essential element of any teacher training course. It is perhaps the most important component. It is the responsibility of every teacher education to organize effective teaching practice programme for its trainees.

One does not learn to teach children from text books alone. Teaching practice gives the student the opportunity to gain first hand knowledge of the children he is going to teach after the course. Theory learnt in the lecture room cannot provide the answer to every contingency. Teaching demands versatility and the ability to respond to the unpredictable quickly and effectively. In this sense, the general methods students learn in the lecture room need interpretation in terms of human relations in the classroom.

Stradley (1968) was of the opinion that the primary purpose of teaching practice is to give a person supervised classroom experience and also to provide a relatively valid way of predicting teacher success. The area of student teaching is one phase in a potential teacher's professional training where the theoretical and the practical really come together. Thus, teaching practice provides the student an opportunity to apply theory in the practical situation. The primary purpose of practice teaching is to give a person supervised classroom experience and also to provide a relatively valid way of predicting teacher success.

Olaitan and Agusiobo (1992) maintain that adequate preparation of the

student teacher for his task is very important. They were of the view that teaching practice is the first opportunity for the student to participate in activities involved in teaching in actual situations. Teaching practice to them is also recognized as the experiences of guided teaching in which the student teacher assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group of students over a specific period of time.

They explain further that teaching practice is a means of providing opportunities under typical school situations in selected cooperating schools for the student teacher to secure experiences in observing and participating actively in all diverse educational activities of teachers in the school. They conclude that teaching practice is designed to provide opportunities for guidance in a school setting for a student teacher to develop his professional competencies and the personal characteristics of a teacher.

Tamakloe (1999) sees the period of teaching practice as one during which the student teacher has to bring to bear all the knowledge, skills and values that he has acquired both in his academic and professional studies to fulfill the task involved in the teaching- learning process. According to Tamakloe, if the student has not been taking his academic studies seriously, he is likely to give inaccurate information to the students thereby exposing him to ridicule. Likewise, if he did not take his professional studies seriously, he would be handicapped in the application of the 'tricks' which are used to affect successful teaching.

### **Preparation of Student Teachers for Teaching Practice**

The reform of any education depends first and foremost on restructuring its base-the teaching profession. The restructuring must be directed towards

increasing teacher's knowledge to meet the demands they would encounter in their work. Teaching is a complex task which requires training different from that given for the acquisition of simple skills (Rosenshine, 1971). He states that a programme of training teachers must be accountable to the system.

Different views have been expressed by authors with regard to the preparation of students for teaching practice. Adams and Dickey (1956) believe that student teaching becomes functional only when the work of the student is planned, organized, and directed as a learning exercise in a teaching learning situation. Rosenshine (1971) in his review of teacher preparation concluded that, “the major question raised by these few studies is not whether teacher preparation is worthwhile but whether the teacher preparation is related to classroom practice” (p. 208).

He therefore, suggests that in preparing students for teaching practice, they should be taught the methods, skills, and techniques that they would need in the classroom. For instance, they should be introduced to making teaching aids from locally available materials. In addition, they should be exposed to the use of ready-made teaching or audio-visual aids and they must be given the opportunity to try their hands on the materials since many students will be getting their first experience in teaching during the practice teaching. This suggests that the organization of teaching practice must not leave any room for lapses; since any lapses will render the whole programme ineffective and fail to give student teachers the needed opportunities to prepare positively for their career. Nothing should be left to chance.

Cohen and Manion (1986) claim that one of the most crucial factors in the

teaching practice situation for the student teacher is preparation. That is, finding out as much as possible about the school before hand, formulating aims and objectives purposely, selecting appropriate content, deciding on the best methods of presentation and writing the actual lesson notes. They claim that there should be a preliminary visit to the school which may take the form of an observation week or a system of school attachments, in the period leading up to the teaching practice. This will enable the student teacher to meet the head teacher and the rest of the staff, to become acquainted with his class or subject teacher, to see the children he will be teaching to get to know the nature, layout, and resources of the school and gather information relevant to the work he will undertake during the practice.

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that teaching practice is important and, therefore, its organizations should be accorded the necessary support, else many students will pass through teaching practice and teaching practice will not pass through them. That is to say many teachers may be left completely unprepared to go out as professional teachers. It is therefore important to expose trainee teachers to the preparation of lesson notes, preparation of teaching learning resources, methods of teaching specific subjects, the establishment of good human relationship with students and supervisors, class management and control and many more.

### **Teaching Practice Supervision and Mentorship**

Jarvis (1990) defined supervision as the process of advising and guiding a student in learning situation. He indicated that the supervisor is a tutor who oversees the professional placement of a student in professional education. It

follows that supervision implies a 'super-ordinate sub-ordinate relationship.

Ekuban (1972) sees supervision as a cooperative educational enterprise in which all persons concerned with child growth and development work together to improve the total setting for learning. Brew- Riverson (1972) is of the opinion that supervision should be viewed as the bridging gap between theory and practice. Supervision should therefore recall theory and show its relevance in the classroom.

Writing on the importance of supervision, Adesina (1990) stated that supervision plays a major role not only in creating a professional relationship between the leader and his subordinates but also provides ample evidence on which assessment can be based. In the school system, he was of the view that supervision helps the new teacher to understand the purposes, responsibility, and relationships of his positions and the directions of his efforts. He concluded that supervision does not mean "policing" which he argued is the type found in most schools. On the issue of who qualifies to be a supervisor, Stones (1985) said the basic qualification one needs is "super-vision." He was of the view that a person with super- vision would need to have acute eyesight to see what was happening in the classroom. He needs insight in order to come to terms with happenings in the classroom. Hama (1998) argued that teacher educators themselves need to be properly trained for their jobs. Various supervisory approaches have been reported which seeks to foster capabilities of self analysis. These include partnership supervision, reflective supervision, horizontal supervision, and other variations in the general approach of clinical supervision which focus on helping teachers to elaborate and refine their practical theories about teaching.

Mensah (1991) noted that in Ghana, from time to time, supervisors visit schools where they have their students to supervise them. He noted that supervisors drop in when the class has already begun. The supervisor then finds a comfortable place to sit at the back and starts writing his comments. By the end of the lesson the student has been rated. The supervisor then hurriedly organizes post-observation conference with the student during which the student is given some feedback. Mensah observed that pre-observation is hardly ever held and the supervisor proceeds to observe the student without any ideas about teaching problems the student is facing, the characteristics of the pupils and problems of the school in general.

One way to prepare teachers for the schools is to mentor the teacher trainees and beginning teachers. Linda, Phillips, and Jones (1982) described mentors as “influential people who significantly help one to reach his or her life major goals. They have the power through what they know to promote the welfare, training, or career of the mentees” (p. 76).

Writing on the role of the mentor, Anderson and Shannon (1988) posited that the mentor’s major responsibility is to nurture, serve as role models, be a caregiver and teach, support, encourage, counsel and befriend the mentee. According to Anderson and Shannon the mentoring process has five essential characteristics: [a] the process of nurturing, [b] the act of serving as a role model. [c] mentoring functions (teaching, supervision) [d] professional and or personal development and [e] caring relationship. Thus in teacher education, the mentor is a professional teacher with a difference in terms of exhibiting excellent skills and attributes worth emulating. It follows then that not all experienced teachers can



be asked to be mentors. The selection should be carefully done. Apart from that, those selected need to be given induction into what their roles are. When this is judiciously done, supervisors and mentors can make meaningful impact on trainees.

Maynard (1992) was of the view that the role of the mentor is coordinating the classroom related learning experience of each mentee throughout the year as well as being responsible for the detailed planning of student progress. Looney (1996) also saw the mentor as the primary facilitator of the training process.

### **Timing and Duration of Teaching Practice**

Diverse opinions have been expressed with regard to timing and duration of teaching practice by many writers. They all point to the fact that the duration of teaching practice should be long enough. For instance the report on the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland (1957) as cited by Stones and Morris (1972) states that; practice teaching should as far as possible be continued throughout the whole course of preparation. The student teacher should have an adequate period of continuous teaching with virtually independent charge of a whole class. It is only in this way is he (the trainee) able to enter fully into the day to day life and work of the school as a teacher. Also Cooper (1993) suggests that there should be a lengthy period of time for teaching practice in order to conduct it at a reasonably leisurely pace.

Similarly, Farrant (1992) suggests that experimental teachers require a more prolonged stay in a practicing school so that they could put into practice the methods on which they have been tested and evaluated. Haines (1960) believes

that teaching practice should be done throughout the term. He claims that a longer period of teaching practice will enable student teachers acquire more professional skills and experience. Bentley (1972) reports that in the Keele Institute of Education, there is a minimum of 12 weeks teaching practice for 3 year training students. He further states that many colleges do more than the 12 weeks but they are not allowed to do less.

### **Problems of Teaching Practice**

Teaching practice like any other human endeavour is associated with problems. Essilfie (1982) attributes one of the problems to inadequate theoretical and practical preparation. In her introduction to teaching practice 'tips' she states that students regularly complain that they had not been taught how to comport themselves in their school before being sent on teaching practice. Most student teachers according to her are totally unprepared for real life teaching situations, as a result, student teachers are often confused because they do not know what it is they are supposed to be doing rightly or wrongly.

Avalos (1991) who worked on the education of community school teachers in Papua New Guinea states that among the noticeable problems was that student teachers put all their efforts into showing evidence of their teaching plans to the detriment of actually teaching or explaining curriculum content to the students. In addition 50% mentioned problems connected with the subject matter of their teaching and its presentation to the pupils.

Fianu (1996) identifies two important weaknesses associated with teaching practice assessment in the initial teacher training colleges in Ghana. In the first

place, he points out that teaching practice in the Ghanaian context does not ensure that students' teachers reflect on their teaching experiences in order to build upon their strong points and to remedy any shortcomings. He indicates that reflection in teaching should involve the need for student teachers to be encouraged to think about their practice by way of analysis, discussion, evaluation, and change.

The other major problem with teaching practice identified by Fianu (1996) is the fact that assessment by supervisors tend to be highly directive and prescriptive in nature. Supervisors assume the role of authority figures during the post-observation conference and apply "blue prints" about how lessons ought to be taught. Mensah (1991) referring to this same problem says, "supervisory practices in Ghana assume wrongly that there is a finite set of good teaching behaviour and that college supervisors are the repositories of good teaching behaviour.

Mensah (1991) has made a number of significance observations about the problems of teaching practice in teacher training institutions in Ghana. He says that student teachers are not usually exposed to wide spectrum of administrative work and co-curricular activities that they will be required to perform when they pass out as qualified teachers. Also, he points out that not all supervisors who passed through teacher training are properly qualified to operate as supervisors without special training. Again, Mensah notes that sometimes some school authorities are unwilling to allow student teachers to practice in their schools because they have their own programmes, which they believe teaching practice will disrupt.

Mensah (1991) writing on the organization and supervision of student

teaching in University of Cape Coast, writes that there is hardly ever a pre-observation conference. The supervisor proceeds to observe the student teaching with little or no idea about the teaching problems of the student teacher, the characteristics of his pupils or the special problems of the school. He claims that the student teacher is not given the time to explain why he used a certain method in the course of teaching. The student teacher is awarded a grade at the end of the teaching even before the post observation conference. The post observation conference is a one way communication from the supervisor to the student teacher. The student is hardly ever given the chance to give reasons why he acted in a certain way or used a technique which to the supervisor is wrong’.

Avalos (1991), in his survey of the assessment of teaching practice in over 120 institutions in the United Kingdom, found little agreement on the important criteria of teaching. Dress and physical appearance were among the most important frequently cited criteria and pupil learning was the least frequently mentioned variable. He also found that teaching practice supervisors do not always agree on what constitutes good teaching. Some male supervisors favour female trainee teachers. He related ranked orders of physical attractiveness of female students and their teaching practice marks. The supervisors were men and the correlation was significant. One cannot therefore expect that a group of supervisors who may have different teaching experiences would automatically agree on what constitutes good teaching.

## **The Student Internship Programme at University of Education, Winneba (UEW)**

The student internship programme (field experience) is an intensive one academic year school-based student teaching experience that provides a structured, supervised, clinical experience. The programme does not only involved teaching but also experiencing good practices with students in a variety of ways through the thoughtful guidance of a mentor in basic, senior secondary schools and teacher training colleges. (Student Internship Handbook, SIP 2005).

The internship programme of the University is based on the Collaborative School Model (CSM). The guiding principles of this model include;

1. Having interns interact with a cohort of peers.
2. Encouraging professional development opportunities for mentors, and
3. Encouraging interns to participate in a whole school experience.

The rationale for the student internship programme is to prepare teachers who will demonstrate excellence in the classroom and who will serve as leaders in the field of education. The university recognizes that to become a teacher, requires strong preparation not only in subject matter knowledge, but in the development of pedagogical skills, right dispositions and the ability to make informed decisions and judgments in practice as well as attending thoughtfully to the particular qualities of life in classrooms, schools and communities(SIP – 2005).

The University's internship programme as outlined in the Student Internship Programme Handbook (SIP) consists of the following experiences:

1. **School activities:** the Intern (student teacher) is required to take part in all phases of the professional life of a teacher which includes classroom teaching in different contexts, observation of the teaching and other activities of the regular teachers and other interns, participation in co-curricular activities, staff meetings and other school routine assignments.
2. **Teaching Portfolio:** each intern is expected to prepare a teaching portfolio to showcase their teaching skills, ideas, interests and other professional development over the period of the internship.
3. **Statement of Teaching Philosophy:** A teaching philosophy is a statement of what the intern believes about teaching and learning, why those beliefs and how the intern implemented those beliefs and values in the classroom. During the period of the internship, each intern is expected to write his/her philosophy of teaching which reflects his personal teaching values and vision.
4. **Reflective Practice:** As part of the internship, interns are expected to write their reflections on their teaching. Reflective practice emphasis continual revision of effective approaches to teaching and learning.
5. **Action Research (Inquiry Project):** The University requires interns to design and complete a major inquiry or classroom action research project in the schools where they are practicing. The project aims at helping them experience the importance of research as an integral part of being a teacher.

The Student Internship Handbook (2005) lists the following as programme participants.

1. **The Intern:** The intern (student teacher) is a student enrolled in a Bachelor of Education programme at University of Education, Winneba and participating in a school based clinical experience. The intern is expected to assume an increasing degree of responsibility in a real classroom, under the tutelage of a qualified classroom teacher, link coordinators, and University supervisors.

The interns are expected to become temporary staff of the partnership school under the direction of the head of the school. Through an induction programme provided by the school, all interns are expected to be familiarized with the school policies and administrative procedures of the school as well as the community.

2. **The Mentor:** According to the (SIP-2005), the mentor is an experienced, competent, and empathetic graduate professional teacher not below the rank of Principal Superintendent in the Ghana Education Service. At the second cycle level, mentors must be experts in the relevant subject areas and must have not less than 5 years teaching experience. The mentor serves as the supervisor of the intern in the partnership institution.

The responsibilities of the mentor as outlined in the (SIP-2005) include:

1. being conversant with the purpose of the internship experience
2. orienting the intern to the school and the community.
3. arranging for interns to observe him (mentor) teach during the first three weeks.
4. giving corrective feedback in private
5. encouraging interns to experience with new teaching ideas and styles

6. guiding interns to develop their portfolios and action research projects.
7. assessing interns performance based on the University performance standards
8. supervising each intern a minimum of six times during internship
9. organizing periodic conferences and counseling sessions with interns
10. plan and conduct parallel supervision with the University supervisor
11. Write termly reports on interns.

**3. Heads of Partnership Schools:** The heads of partnership institutions are members of the team of educational professionals whose duty is to guide and assess the intern's progress throughout the internship period. The head is a professional administrator in the school where the intern is assigned. The heads responsibilities include:

1. Nominate appropriate mentors for interns in their schools.
2. Organize induction courses for interns to familiarize them with the environment and daily operation of the school.
3. Ensure that interns do not take over completely the classes taught by their mentors.
4. Involve interns in various schools activities
5. Pay occasional visits to the intern's class
6. Collect reports from all mentors in the school and provide annual reports on the programme to the University.

**4. The University Supervisor:** The University supervisor is a University lecturer with background in teaching methodology and who has



knowledge of the student internship programme and must have training in internship supervising skills.

The University Supervisor's duties are to:

1. Make at least one observational/supervision visitation to a partnership institution.
  2. meet intern and mentor during each visit
  3. Assist the mentor in dealing with any problems the intern might be facing including those related to portfolio development, reflective practice, and action research.
  4. Plan and conduct parallel supervision with the mentor.
- 5. The University Link Coordinator:** A University link Coordinator is a lecturer who works closely with a group of partnership institutions to offer supportive guidance to interns and mentors. They are faculty members who facilitate communication between the University and partnership schools.

The responsibilities of the link coordinators include:

1. Provide a first point of information in terms of monitoring how things are progressing with the programme in partnership institutions.
2. Report to the Centre for Teacher Development and Action Research (CETDAR) any difficulties, questions, concerns and issues for prompt attention.
3. Schedule meetings with the mentors to assess the progress of the interns.
4. Help in resolving any conflicts between mentors and interns.
5. Serve as resource persons for the mentors, the partnership schools, and the interns.

## **Theoretical Framework**

Many educationists have worked on theories of education. For instance, Duke (1990) writes that a theory of education is a coherent set of beliefs and expectations about how teaching and learning should occur. It provides a set of guidelines for the fulfillment of your obligations as a member of a helping profession. He claims that, without a theory of education, one may lose sight of the ultimate goals of teaching. He states further that teachers will be more likely to deal with the challenges of teaching in an effective manner if they are clear about why they are teaching.

Various theories, models, and principles have been put forward by educationists. The Progressive Theory of education states that children should be free to develop naturally and that a child's interests, as manifested in direct experience, are the best stimuli for learning. The teachers' role is therefore to provide learning activities that will fully engage students and guide them as they deal with the consequences of their engagement.

The essentialist Theory of education also stresses the importance of having every student become proficient in the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. The theory relies on the liberal arts and sciences as the foundation for secondary curriculum. They emphasize the authority of the teacher and the value of hard work and discipline. The fact that teachers play a vital role in shaping the behaviour of the learner cannot be over-emphasized.

Another model is the Model of Instructional Process. It states that an effective teaching process requires two basic groupings of skills and competencies. The first is the process of teaching which consists of a group of

skills for organizing content of a lesson and for attaining instructional objectives. It also states that effective teaching consists of a group of personal and social skills for successful functioning in the school, for relating with parents and administrators. It contends that teaching has three stages namely (i) pre-teaching stage (ii) the teaching stage and (iii) the post-teaching stage.

### **Summary of major findings related to Teaching Practice**

The literature reviewed so far on the concept of teaching practice, aims and objectives of teaching practice, preparation of students for teaching practice, theoretical frame work among others relate to the situation at the University of Education, Winneba. This is because the prevailing factors which influence the organization and supervision of teaching practice are universal and seem to apply to University of Education as well even though the organization of teaching practice may vary in different academic settings.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Overview**

This chapter discusses the area of study, design of the study, the population of the study, the sample, as well as sampling procedure adopted for the study. The research instruments including pre-testing, data collection and analysis procedures are all discussed.

#### **Area of Study**

The research was conducted in the Ashanti region of Ghana. This region was chosen because it has relatively large and fairly populated number of schools. Specifically, there are eighty one (81) secondary schools, six (6) teacher training colleges and over two hundred junior high schools in the region. Also, statistics from the teacher development unit of the university indicates that the Ashanti region has the highest number of mentees doing their internship. The region also has the highest number of mentors. The region was therefore, chosen with the hope that with the large number of mentees and mentors in the region it would give a representative and reflective idea regarding the perception of both mentors and mentees about the internship. The region was also chosen since the researcher is a senior principal research assistant at the Kumasi campus of the

University of Education – Winneba, and therefore found it more convenient to under-take the research in the region.

### **Research Design**

Aina (2004) describes a research design as a plan of study providing the overall framework for collecting data. Research scientists' like Best and Khan (1996), Yin (1994) and McMillan (1996) believes that there is no one single scientific method for scientists to carry out their investigations. However, accuracy of observation and the qualities of creativity and objectivity are some of the ingredients in all scientific methods. Yin (1994) again notes that the choice of a particular research strategy is determined, all things being equal by the type of problem being investigated, temporal dimensions of the problem and the research competence of the investigator.

Perception, just like attitude, is a hypothetical construct which cannot be measured directly. One can only measure perception through its expression in what a person does or says (Oppenheim, 1992). Thus inference is the main tool of tapping attitude and perception. Against this background, the underlying theoretical paradigm of descriptive survey was employed for the study. This type of research is non-experimental because it studies relationships between non-manipulated variables in a natural setting rather than in an artificial setting. As Gay, (1992) puts it, the descriptive sample survey “involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions concerning current status of the subjects under study” (p. 69). The descriptive sample survey has been recommended by Babbie (1990) for purposes of generalizing from a sample to a

population so that inferences can be made about some characteristics, attitudes, or behaviours of the population.

The descriptive research design has some advantages including producing good amount of responses from a wide range of people. Also, it gives clear meaning of events and seeks to explain people's perception and behaviour on the basis of data gathered at a particular point in time. In addition, it can be used with greater confidence with regard to particular questions of specific interest to the researcher. Also items that are unclear can be explained and follow-up questions asked in using the descriptive research design (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2003).

Notwithstanding, there is the difficulty of ensuring that the statement to be responded to, are clear and not misleading. This is because ambiguous statements distort facts and opinion. As a result surveys can vary significantly depending on the exact wording of questions or statements. Also, survey reports may produce unreliable results because some of the questions often asked, delve into private matters that people may not be completely truthful about (Creswell, 1994). In spite of these disadvantages, the descriptive research design was considered the most appropriate for carrying out the study since it was the purpose of the researcher to survey the views of sampled mentors, mentees and university supervisors on the one year internship and to make generalizations to the entire mentors, mentees and university supervisors about the programme. Thus the descriptive survey was used for this study.

### **Population**

The population for the study included all the 1,974 mentees of the 2007/2008 academic year of the University of Education, Winneba, all mentors who

have been given official training by the university and all lectures of the University of Education who are involved in the internship supervision. The essence of this structure is to collect detailed and objective information as far as possible from different groups of people involved in the internship programme.

The selection of the 2007\2008 academic year mentees was because they were undertaking the programme at the time the research was carried out. The mentors were included in the study since they are ultimately responsible for guiding the mentees and ensuring they develop the necessary teaching and professional skills envisaged by the university. The selection of the university supervisors was based on the fact that they are the implementers of the programme. Also, since they supervised the mentees, they are in a position to indicate if what students have been taught during the three years face to face teaching and learning were put into practice by the mentees.

The target population for the study was 3,078. This was made up of 1,974 mentees of the 2007\2008 academic year, 780 mentors and 324 university supervisors (Basic Statistics, 2007). The accessible population comprised all mentees, and mentors in the Ashanti region, University Supervisors of the University of Education at Kumasi and Mampong campuses. Statistics from the teacher development and support unit of the university indicates that there are 587 mentees and 215 mentors in the Ashanti region. Also, there are 85 internship supervisors at the Kumasi and Mampong campuses of the university (CETDAR, 2007).

### **Sample and Sampling Procedure**

The systematic random sampling procedure was used to select a

representative sample of mentees and university supervisors for the study. The method was used to select one hundred and seventy seven mentees (30% of mentees in the Ashanti region) and 65 of the university supervisors. The list of all the 2007\2008 mentees was obtained from the Center for Teacher Development and Action Research (CETDAR) unit of the University of Education, Winneba. The names were then written on pieces of papers and the selection was done with replacement. The same procedure was used in the selection of the university supervisors.

The researcher made use of all the mentors whose mentees were selected for the study. That is, any mentee who was selected automatically have his or her mentor being selected. This procedure was used because the researcher wants to avoid a situation whereby a mentor would be selected but the mentee(s) would not be selected and vice versa. This procedure yielded a mentor sample size of ninety one. Therefore the total number of subjects selected for the study was 333. This was made up of 177 mentees, 91 mentors, and 65 university supervisors.

### **Research Instrument**

The main instrument for the research was the questionnaire. Three categories of questionnaires were designed and distributed to university supervisors, mentors and the mentees. The different types of the questionnaire were similar in structure and content.

Best and Khan (1996) explain that the questionnaire may serve as the most appropriate and useful data – gathering device in a research project if properly constructed and administered because it has a wider coverage since questionnaire can reach respondents more easily than other methods. However, the



questionnaire as a tool for data collection cannot be used for illiterates and people who are too young to read.

After reviewing the literature on teacher preparation and teacher education and techniques of instrument development, the major issues in teacher preparation and education were identified. Since no instrument was found by the researcher that specifically measures teachers and teacher – trainees views about various modes of teacher preparation, a questionnaire was designed by the researcher following procedures outlined by Sproull (1988), Babbie (1990), Borg and Gall (1993) and Best and Khan (1996). The initial items were constructed by identifying modes of teacher education issues and ideas frequently found in the literature. Some of the items were arrived at after informal interaction with some mentees, mentors, and university supervisors. Some of the items were also based on the roles and responsibilities of mentors, mentees and university supervisors as well as the general objectives of the internship as outlined in the Student Internship Handbook (2005).

The result of this deep search for issues was a pool of statements and questions which were carefully vetted and edited by colleagues and codified into 48 items for mentors, 44 items for mentees and 31 items for university supervisors. The questionnaires for the mentors and mentees have seven sections. Section A of the instrument contains items dealing with demographic data of the mentees and mentors. Section B contains items on the preparation of mentors and mentees. Items in Section C focused on the duration of the internship. The roles of the mentors were captured in Section D, while Section E dealt with the views of mentors and mentees about the university supervisors. Section F was on the

benefit of the internship. Section G focuses on the problems of the internship. The questionnaire for the university supervisors contains five sections along the same line as that of the mentors and the mentees, except that, it does not contain items on the role of the mentors and the mentees and also there were no items on supervisors' views on the mentors and the mentees (see Appendix A)

All the items were close – ended likert scale items. The likert – type questionnaire has been found to be the most suitable instrument for measurement of attitudes and perceptions of individuals. This is because it enables respondents to indicate the degree of their belief in a given statement (Best and Khan, 1996). The four point likert type scale was preferred to the more conventional five point scale because of the recommendations of Casley and Kumar (1988). These writers argue that if an odd number of response scale is used, there is the tendency for individuals to select responses in the centre of the scale. The items were largely made up of positive statements indicating a favourable response on the part of the respondents, though a few items were deliberately worded in the negative to check 'response set', that is the tendency for respondents to agree or disagree with items or give extreme responses regardless of item content.

The preliminary questionnaires were submitted to the researcher's supervisor and some colleagues in the M.Phil (measurement and evaluation) programme for their suggestions and for revision. Some refinements were made based on their comments, criticisms, and suggestions. A pre – test was conducted to test the instrument for reliability. The instruments in their primitive form were given to 25 mentees, 20 mentors and 10 university supervisors all at Winneba. The respondents in the pre test were asked to fill out the instrument and provide

their comments or suggestions for the revision of unclear or ambiguous items. All the comments, suggestions, and corrections made were taken into consideration in the final write up of the instruments. The reliability of the instrument was determined through the use of the Cronbach alpha, a measure of internal consistency. The items yielded reliability co-efficient of 0.87 for mentees, 0.89 for university supervisors and 0.91 for mentors.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

The researcher conducted the survey in person. It was believed that the administration of the instrument by the researcher in person would result in more co-operation than if others were asked to administer and collect the data.

In order to facilitate the administration of the instruments, a letter written by the Head of Department of Educational Foundations, UCC was delivered to the school authorities. In this letter the purpose of the study was stated and the cooperation of the school authorities was sought. In the case of mentors and mentees, they were given one week to submit the filled questionnaires to the assistant headmaster in charge of academic affairs. In most cases this arrangement was not honoured and the researcher went round personally to retrieve the questionnaires after repeated visits. However, all the questionnaires given out were retrieved. In the case of the university supervisors, they were given two weeks to fill the questionnaire. The researcher personally went round and retrieved all the 65 questionnaires given to them.

### **Coding and Data Analysis**

In order to facilitate scoring and analysis of the data, the various categories on the questionnaires were coded according to the following rules: Strongly Agree – 4; Agree – 3; Disagree – 2; Strongly Disagree – 1. This scoring scale was reversed for negatively worded statements as follows: Strongly Agree – 1; Agree – 2; disagree -3; Strongly Disagree – 4

All the responses were inputted into the computer for computer analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Being a descriptive sample survey, the researcher employed descriptive statistical tools in the analysis of the data. All the research questions were analyzed using frequency counts and simple percentages. This was because the items on the questionnaire were measured on a nominal scale.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter is devoted to the result of the analysis of the responses made by the respondent under study. The data was collected from 333 subjects made up of one hundred and seventy seven (177) mentees, ninety one (91) mentors and sixty-five (65) university supervisors. In the analysis of the data, frequency and percentage tables based on the likert type scale was constructed to illustrate and support the findings. Also the Chi-square test of goodness-of-fit was used to analyse all the research questions. The chapter has been put into two major parts. The first part presents the detailed results of the study. This includes the demographic information of the subjects' and the results for the research questions. The second part presents the discussion of the findings. The analysis was done based on the research questions.

#### **Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

A total of 333 respondents participated in the study. This is made up of 177 mentees, 91 mentors, and 65 university supervisors. Out of the 177 mentees, 113 (63.8%) were males while 64 (36.2%) were females. Fifty-eight (63.7%) of the mentors were males while 33 (36.3%) were females. With regards to the university supervisors, 46 (70.8%) were males and 19 (29.2%) were females.

On the issue of professional status, 137 (77.4%) of the mentees indicated that they are professionally trained teachers while 40 (22.6%) said they are not professionally trained teachers. All the 91 (100.0%) mentors were professionally trained teachers. Fifty-nine (90.8%) of the university supervisors were professionally trained teachers while 6 (9.2%) were not professionally trained teachers.

Table 1

**Number of years mentees have taught**

Number of years	Frequency	Percent
1 – 3	10	7.3
4 – 6	70	51.1
7 – 9	30	21.9
10 and above	27	19.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 2

**Numbers of year’s mentors have been teaching**

Number of years	Frequency	Percent
1-5	14	15.4
6-10	37	40.6
11-15	32	35.2
16 and above	8	8.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100.0</b>

From Table 1, it could be seen that 7.3% of mentees have taught between a period of 1 to 3 years. Majority of the mentees, 51.1% have taught for a period of 4 – 6 years, 21.9% have taught for a period of 7 – 9 years while 19.7% have taught for more than 10 years.

Table 2 indicates that with regards to the number of years of teaching, 15.4% of the mentors have taught for a period of between 1 – 5 years, 40.6% have taught between 6 -10 years, 35.2% have taught between 11 – 15 years and 8.8% have taught for a period of 16 years and above. This finding contravenes the university regulation which states that mentors must have more than five years teaching experience (SIH, 2005).

Table 3

**Professional Rank of Mentees**

Rank	Frequency	Percent
Certificate 'A'	7	5.1
Assistant Superintendent	47	34.3
Senior Superintendent	71	51.8
Principal Superintendent	8	5.8
Assistant Director	4	3.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 3 indicates that 5.1% of the mentees were certificate ‘A’ teachers, 34.3% were at the rank of assistant superintendent, 51.8% were senior superintendent, 5.8% were principal superintendent and 3.0% were assistant

directors. With regards to the professional qualification of mentors all the 91 (100.0) indicated that they were professional graduates. This finding is consistent with the university's requirement that all mentors must be graduate professional teachers (Student Internship Handbook (SIH), 2005, p12).

Table 4

**Number of years as a mentor**

Number of years	Frequency	Percent
1 year	6	6.6
2 years	36	39.6
3 years	42	46.1
4 years and above	7	7.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 4 shows that 6.6% of the mentors have been mentoring for 1 year, 39.6% have been mentors for 2 years, 46.1% have been mentors for 3 years and 7.7% have been mentors for 4 years and above. On the issue of the type of teaching practice that mentors went through during their professional training, 45 (49.5%) said they had the 4 weeks off campus teaching practice while 46 (50.5%) said they went through the one year internship system. Also all the 91 (100.0%) mentors indicated that they have been given official training by the university. All the 65 (100.0%) university supervisors also indicated that they have been given official training by the university. This finding is also consistent with the university's requirements that all mentors and university supervisors must receive official training from the university (Student Internship Handbook, 20



## **Analysis of the Results of the Study**

### **Research Question 1**

How adequately are Mentees, Mentors and University supervisors prepared for the internship?

This research question sought to find out from the mentees, mentors and the university supervisors the adequacy of preparation given them for the internship programme. Items 5- 12 of mentees, 7- 12 of mentors and 4- 9 of the university supervisors' questionnaires were used to answer the research question. The results are shown in Tables 5 (mentees response), 6 (mentors response) and 7 (supervisors response). In this table and subsequent tables, SA stands for Strongly Agree, A stands for Agree, D stands for Disagree and SD stands for Strongly Disagree.

Table 5

**Preparation of Mentees (Mentees response)**

STATEMENT	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. During the pre-internship, mentees were taught how to prepare lesson plans and teaching materials.	22	12.4	81	45.8	65	36.7	9	5.1	177	100
2. The pre-internship equipped me with practical skills for teaching.	29	16.4	107	60.5	36	20.3	5	2.8	177	100
3. I have been prepared adequately in the content area I am to teach before embarking on the internship.	2	1.1	44	24.9	98	55.4	33	18.6	177	100
4. I acquired the skills of reflective practice during the pre- internship.	19	10.7	60	33.9	76	42.9	22	12.5	177	100
5. The pre-internship equipped me with the skills of writing action research.	9	5.1	38	21.5	88	49.7	42	23.7	177	100

**Table 5 continued**

STATEMENT	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
6. The pre-internship equipped me with the skills of writing teaching philosophy	6	3.4	46	26.0	77	43.5	48	27.1	177	100
7. The period for the pre-internship was adequate for the Mentees.	12	6.8	31	17.5	79	44.6	55	31.1	177	100
8. Each mentee was actively involved in the pre-internship.	12	6.8	29	16.4	83	46.9	53	29.9	177	100

From Table 5, it could be seen that with regard to the item ‘during the pre-internship, mentees are taught how to prepare lesson plans and teaching materials,’ majority (58.2%) of the mentees were of the view that they were effectively taught how to prepare lesson notes and teaching learning materials, while 41.8% disagreed with the statement.

The second item on research question 1 which reads, ‘the pre-internship equipped me with practical skills for teaching’ had 76.9% of the mentees agreeing with the statement that the pre-internship programme equipped them with practical skills for teaching while 23.1% disagreed with the statement.

Item 3 on the research question sought to find out if mentees have been prepared adequately in the content area they are to teach before embarking on the internship. The result as shown in Table 5 indicates that 76.1% majority of the mentees sampled indicated that they were not adequately prepared in the content area they were to teach before embarking on the internship while 23.9% were of the view that they were adequately prepared during the pre-internship in the content area they were to teach.

Item 4 on the research question 1 reads ‘I acquired the skills of reflective practice during the pre-internship.’<sup>1</sup> From the responses on Table 5, it could be seen that majority (75.4%) of the respondents were of the view that the pre-internship programme did not equip them with the skills of reflective practice which happens to be one of the major segments of the internship programme, however, 24.6% indicated that they had enough preparation on reflective practice during the pre-internship.

‘The pre-internship equipped me with the skills of writing action research’ was item 5 on research question 1. The responses given by the various respondents indicate that a majority (73.4%) were of the view that they were not adequately prepared in the writing of action research. Only 26.6% indicated that they were adequately prepared on how to conduct action research.

Item 6 of research question 1 required respondent to indicate whether the pre-internship equipped them with the skills of writing teaching philosophy. From the analysis of the item as shown on table 5, 70.6% of the mentees disagreed with the statement that they were adequately given training in philosophy of teaching. However 29.4% of the mentees agreed with the statement.

The seventh item on research question 1 for the mentees sought to find out if the period for the pre- internship was adequate. The response shows that 75.7% of the respondents were of the view that the duration of the pre-internship programme was not adequate while 24.3% were satisfied with the duration of the internship.

The last item on research question one for mentees reads “each mentee was actively involved in the pre internship. It could be inferred from table 5 that majority (76.8%) of the respondents were of the view that mentees involvement in the pre-internship was not very adequate while 23.2% agreed with the statement that the mentees were actively involved in the pre-internship.

In sum, analysis of research question one for the mentees indicates that mentees were not adequately prepared for the internship especially in the areas of action research, teaching philosophy and content areas the mentees were supposed to teach. However, mentees were of the view that they had adequate preparation in the preparation of lesson plans, and teaching learning/materials. They also agreed that the pre-internship equipped them with practical skills for teaching.

Table 6

**Preparation of Mentors**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. I acquired the skills of reflective practice during the workshop	-	-	22	24.2	55	60.4	14	15.4	91	100
2. The workshop equipped me with knowledge on writing action research.	8	8.8	33	36.2	43	47.3	7	7.7	91	100
3. The workshop equipped me with the skills of writing teaching philosophy	1	1.1	21	23.1	58	63.7	11	12.1	91	100
4. I was equipped with the skills of evaluating interns lesson during the workshop	23	25.3	50	54.9	16	17.6	2	2.2	91	100
5. I acquired the skills of organizing pre and post observation conferences during the workshop	1	1.1	28	30.8	52	57.1	10	10.9	91	100
6. I acquire the skills of assessing mentees based on the university performance standard.	10.	11.0	58	63.7	23	25.3	-	-	91	100

The first item on Table 6 reads ‘I acquired the skills of reflective practice during the workshop.’ From the responses, it could be seen that majority (75.8%) of the mentors were of the view that the workshop did not equip them with the skills of reflective practice which is one of the segments of the internship programme. However, 24.2% of the mentors indicated that the workshop equipped them with the skills of reflective practice.

‘With regards item 2 on Table 6, 55.0 % of the mentors were of the view that they were not adequately prepared in the writing and the supervision of action research while 45.0% indicated that they were adequately prepared in the writing and supervision of action research.

Item 3 of research question 1 required respondent to indicate whether the workshop equipped them with the skills of writing philosophy of teaching. From the analysis of the item 75.8% of the mentors were of the view that they were not adequately trained in philosophy of teaching while 24.2% indicated that they were given adequate training in philosophy of teaching

‘I was equipped with the skills of evaluating interns lessons’ was item four on research question 1. The response indicates that the respondents were adequately taken through the evaluation and supervision of interns lessons as indicated by 80.2 % of the mentors’ who agree with the statement while 19.8% disagreed with the statement.

The fifth item on the research question was ‘I acquired the skills of organizing pre and post observation conferences during the workshop’. As could be seen from Table 6, 68.0% of the mentors were of the view that the workshop



did not 'adequately' equip them with the skills of organizing both pre and post observation conferences while 32% indicated otherwise.

The last item on table 6 required the respondents to indicate the extent to which the workshop equipped them with the skills of assessing mentees based on the university performance standard. From the responses, it could be seen that majority (74.7%) of the respondents were of the view that they 'adequately' acquire the skills of assessing mentees based on the university performance standard while 25.3% disagreed with the statement.

The analysis of research question one for the mentors indicates that mentors were adequately prepared for the internship in the areas of evaluation and supervision of mentees lessons, and assessing mentees based on the university performance standard. However, the mentors indicated that they were not fully prepared in the areas of reflective practice, organizing pre and post observation conferences as well as writing of action research.

Table 7

**Preparation of Supervisors**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. I acquired the skills of organizing pre and post observation conferences.	7	10.7	12	18.5	30	46.2	16	24.6	65	100
2. The workshop equipped me with the skills of evaluating students' lessons.	11	16.9	20	30.8	27	41.5	7	10.8	65	100
3. I acquired the skills of reflective practice during the workshop.	13	20.0	30	46.1	12	18.5	10	15.4	65	100
4. The workshop equipped me with the skills of writing action research.	10	15.4	36	55.4	13	20.0	6	9.2	65	100
5. The workshop equipped me with the skills of supervising students work in the writing of teaching philosophy.	17	26.2	22	33.8	17	26.2	9	13.8	65	100
6. I acquired the skills of supervising mentees based on the university performance standard	5	7.7	27	41.5	21	32.3	12	18.5	65	100

From Table 7, it could be seen that with regard to the item ‘I acquired the skills of organizing pre and post observation conferences during the workshop. It could be inferred from the responses that majority (70.8%) of the supervisors were of the view that the workshop did not equipped them with the skills of organizing both pre and post observation conferences while 29.2% of the supervisors were of the view that the workshop did equip them with the skills of organizing pre and post observation conferences.

The second item on Table 7, “The workshop equipped me with the skills of evaluating interns’ lesson”. The analysis show that 52.3% of the supervisors indicated that the workshop did not equip them with the skills of evaluating mentees lessons while 47.7% indicated that the workshop equipped them with skills of evaluating interns’ lesson.

Item 3 on Table 7 reads ‘I acquired the skills of reflective practice during the workshop’. From the responses, it could be seen that majority (66.1%) of the supervisors were of the view that the workshop equipped them with the skills of reflective practice while 33.9% disagreed with the statement.

Item 4 on Table 7 asked the supervisors to indicate the extent to which the workshop equipped them with the skill of supervising students work in action research. It could be inferred from the analysis that majority (71.8%) of the supervisors sampled indicated that the workshop equipped them with knowledge on action research and therefore have the skills to supervise mentees work in action research while 18.1% indicated that the workshop did not equip them with the skills of supervising mentees action research work.

Item 5 on Table 7 required respondents to indicate whether the workshop equipped them with the skills of supervising students' philosophy of teaching. From the analysis of this item, there is an indication that the supervisors were adequately given training in philosophy of teaching as indicated by 60.0% of the respondents who agree with the statement while 40.0% disagreed with the statement.

The last item on Table 7 which reads "I acquired the skills of supervising mentees based on the university performance standard. The responses show that 50.8% of the supervisors were of the view that the workshop did not equip them with the skills of supervising mentees based on the university performance standard while 49.2% agreed that the workshop equipped them with the skills of supervising the mentees based on the university performance standard.

The analysis of research question 1 for the supervisors show that the supervisors were not given adequate preparation in organizing pre and post observation conferences and in supervising mentees based on the university performance standard. However, supervisors were given adequate preparation in writing action research, reflective practice, and writing of philosophy of teaching.

## **Research Question 2**

What are the views of mentees', mentors and university supervisors about the duration of the internship?

This research question sought to find out the views of the respondents about the duration of the internship. Items 13-17 of mentees, items 13-17 of

mentors and items 10-14 of the university supervisors questionnaires were used to answer this research question. The result is shown in Tables 8, 9 and 10.

Table 8

**Duration of the internship (Mentees responses)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. The duration of the internship is too long	22	12.4	81	45.8	65	36.7	9	5.1	177	100
2. The duration of the internship is quite enough to help mentees acquire the needed teaching skills	29	16.4	107	60.5	36	20.3	5	2.8	177	100
3. The university should revert back to the four weeks off campus teaching practice	2	1.1	44	24.9	98	55.4	33	18.6	177	100
4. The internship is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher training	19	10.7	60	33.9	76	42.9	22	12.4	177	100
5. The internship should be for one term and not one full academic year.	48	27.1	77	43.5	46	26.0	6	3.4	177	100

From Table 8, it could be seen that the first item which reads ‘the duration of the internship is too long’, 58.2% of the respondents were of the view that the duration of the internship is too long while 41.8% of the mentees held the view that the internship duration is not too long.

The second item on Table 8 which reads ‘the duration of the internship is quite enough to enable mentees acquire the needed teaching skills’. The analysis of the responses indicates that a majority (76.9 %) of the respondents indicated that the duration of the internship is quite enough to enable mentees acquire the needed teaching skills.

On the statement, the University should revert back to the four weeks off-campus teaching practice, 74.0% of the mentees were of the view that the university should not revert back to the four weeks off-campus teaching practice while 26.0% indicated that the university should revert back to the four weeks off-campus teaching practice.

The fourth item on Table 8 which reads, the one year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher training, had 55.3% of the mentees disagreeing with the statement while 44.7% agreed with the statement.

Item five on Table 8 reads, the internship should be for one term and not one full academic. The analysis of the item shows that 70.6% of the respondents were of the opinion that the duration of the internship should be one term and not one full academic year while 39.4% disagreed with the statement.

The analysis of research question 2 for mentees indicated that the one full academic year duration of the internship is too, mentees objected to the university

reverting back to the 4-weeks off- campus teaching practice. The mentees also disagreed with the statement that the one year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher education. The mentees agreed with the statement that the duration of the internship should be one term.



Table 9

**Duration of the internship (Mentors)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. The duration of the internship is too long	17	18.7	47	51.6	20	22.0	7	7.7	91	100
2. The duration of the internship is quite enough to help mentees acquire the needed teaching skills	7	7.6	44	48.4	38	41.8	2	2.2	91	100
3. The university should revert back to the four weeks off campus teaching practice	10	11.0	35	38.5	36	39.5	10	11.0	91	100
4. The one year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher training	6	6.6	22	24.2	34	37.4	29	31.8	91	100
5. The internship should be for one term and not one full academic year.	27	29.7	51	56.0	12	13.2	1	1.1	91	100

The first item on Table 9 reveals that majority (70.3%) of the mentors agreed that the duration of the internship is too long while 29.7% disagreed with the statement.

Item 2 on Table 9 had 56.0% of the respondents agree that the duration of the internship is quite enough to help the mentees acquire the necessary teaching skills while 44% disagreed with the statement.

On the question of the university reverting back to the four weeks off campus teaching practice, 50.5% of the mentors kicked against it while 49.5% favoured returning to the four weeks off campus teaching practice.

Also the statement, the 'one year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher education' 79.2% disagreed with the statement while 20.8% favoured it.

The statement 'the internship should be for one term and not one full academic year had 85.7% of the mentors agreeing while 14.3% were of the view that the one academic year should be maintained.

The analysis of research question 2 for mentors show that the mentors agreed that the one year duration of the internship is too long. They were also of the view that the duration should be for one term. They also disagreed that the university should revert back to the 4-weeks off-campus teaching practice.

Table 10

**Duration of the internship (Supervisors)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. The duration of the internship is too long	12	18.5	2	32.3	27	41.5	5	7.7	65	100
2. The duration of the internship is quite enough to help mentees acquire the needed teaching skills.	22	33.8	28	43.1	15	23.1	-	-	65	100
3. The university should revert back to the four weeks off campus teaching practice.	8	12.3	19	29.2	21	32.3	17	26.2	65	100
4. The one year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher training.	4	6.2	23	35.4	20	30.8	18	27.7	65	100
5. The internship should be for one term and not one full academic year.	10	15.4	30	46.2	23	35.4	2	3.1	65	100

Analysis of the first item on Table 10 indicates that majority (50.8%) of the supervisors were of the view that the duration of the internship is too long. However, 49.2% were of the view that the duration of the internship is not long

With regards to the statement ‘the duration of the internship is quite enough to help mentees acquire the needed teaching skills, 76.9% of the supervisors agreed with the statement that the internship is quite enough to help mentees acquire the needed teaching skills while 23.1% dissented.

On the issue of the university reverting back to the four weeks off campus teaching practice, 58.5% of the supervisors kicked against the university reverting back to the four weeks off campus teaching practice while 41.5% supported the idea.

The statement “the one year internship should be for mentees who have not had any initial teacher education” had majority (58.5%) of the supervisors opposing the idea while 41.5% supported the idea.

The last item on Table 10 which reads “The internship should be for one term and not one academic year” had 61.6% of the supervisors agreed with the statement while 38.4% disagreed with the statement that the duration of the internship should be for one term.

The analysis shows that the supervisors agreed that the duration of the internship is too long. They however, disagreed with the statement that the university should revert back to the 4-weeks off-campus teaching practice. They also disagreed with the statement that the one year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher education.

### **Research question 3**

How adequately are mentors performing their roles as required by the university?

Responses to this research question were provided by the mentees and the mentors only. Items 18-23 of the mentees questionnaire and items 18-22 of mentors' questionnaire were used to analyze this research question. The responses to the various items are shown in Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11

**Responsibilities of Mentors (Mentees Response)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. My mentor oriented me to the school and the community.	13	7.3	57	32.2	93	52.5	14	7.9	177	100
2. My mentor arranged for me to observe him teach during the first three weeks.	12	6.8	49	27.7	67	37.9	49	27.7	177	100
3. My mentor guided me to develop my action research and portfolios.	7	4.0	31	17.5	103	58.2	36	20.3	177	100
4. My mentor organizes periodic conferences and counselling sessions for me.	29	16.4	110	62.1	38	21.5	-	-	177	100
5. My mentor conducts parallel supervision with the university supervisor.	4	2.3	41	23.2	109	61.6	23	13.0	177	100
6. My mentor encourages me to experiment with new ideas and styles of teaching.	28	15.8	107	60.5	36	20.3	6	3.4	177	100

With regards to the first item on the research question which reads ‘my mentor oriented me to the school and the community, it could be noted that majority (60.4%) of the respondents indicated that they were not given any orientation about the school and the community while 39.6% indicated that they were given orientation about the school and the community.

Item two on the research question required respondent to indicate whether arrangements were made for the mentees to observe the mentor teach during the first three weeks of the internship. The analysis shows that the respondents were not made to observe the mentors teach during the first three weeks of the internship. This is indicated by the majority (65.6%) of the mentees who responded negatively to the item while 34.4% indicated that they were given the opportunity to observe the mentors teach.

Item three on this research question requested respondents to indicate if mentees were helped by the mentors in carrying out their action research and building of portfolio. The analysis shows that majority (78.5%) of the mentees were not given any help by the mentors in writing their action research and the building of teaching philosophy and portfolios while only 21.5% were given help in carrying out the action research.

With reference to the fourth item on Table 11, which reads ‘my mentor organizes periodic conferences and counselling sessions for me.’ It could be inferred from the analysis that 78.5% majority of the respondents were of the view that mentors do organize periodic conferences and counselling sessions for them. On the other hand 21.5% disagreed with the statement

The fifth item on this research question reads 'My mentor conducts parallel supervision with the university supervisor. While 74.6% of the mentees agreed with the statement, 25.4% disagreed with the statement.

The sixth item on the research question reads 'My mentor encourages me to experiment with new teaching methods and techniques'. The analysis indicates that 76.3% of the mentees were of the view that they were encouraged by the mentors to experiment with new teaching methods and techniques while 23.7% disagreed with the statement.

The analysis of research question 3 for mentees indicated that mentors did not perform their responsibilities as required of them by the university. The analysis shows that mentees were not oriented to the school and the community, mentors did not arrange to teach for mentees to observe them (mentors) teach, mentors did not help mentees in writing their action research, and mentors did not conduct any parallel supervision with the university supervisors. However, mentees indicated that mentors do organize counselling sessions for them and also mentors do encourage them to experiment with new teaching methods and techniques.



Table 12

**Responsibilities of mentor (Mentors response)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. I oriented the mentee to the school and the community	7	7.7	21	23.8	63	69.2	-	-	91	100
2. I arranged for the mentee to observe me teach during the first three weeks.	19	20.9	57	62.6	15	16.5	-	-	91	100
3. I guided the mentees to develop their action research and portfolio.	7	7.7	32	35.2	49	53.8	3	3.3	91	100
4. I organize periodic conferences and counseling sections for mentees.	35	38.5	51	56.0	5	5.5	-	-	91	100
5. I conduct parallel supervisor with the university supervisor.	7	7.7	16	17.6	50	54.9	18	19.8	91	100

Item 1 on Table 12 reads ‘I oriented the mentee to the school and the community’. From the table it could be inferred that a majority (69.2%) of the mentors indicated that they did not orient the mentees to the school and the community while 30.8% agreed with the statement.

Item two on the research question required the mentors to indicate whether arrangements were made for the mentees to observe the mentor teach during the first three weeks of the internship. The analysis shows that the mentees were made to observe the mentors teach during the first three weeks of the internship. This is indicated by the majority (83.5%) of mentors who responded positively to the item.

Item three on the research question requested mentors to indicate if they helped mentees to carry out their action research and building of portfolio. The analysis shows that majority (57.1%) of the respondents did not give any help to the mentees in writing their action research and the building of teaching philosophy while 42.9% said they did.

Majority (94.5%) of the mentors do agree with the statement that they organize counselling and conference sessions for mentees. Only 5.5% of the mentors disagreed with the statement

The fifth item on the research question reads ‘I conduct parallel supervision with the university supervisor. The analysis shows that majority (74.7%) of the mentors do not carry out parallel supervision with the university supervisors.

The analysis shows that mentors did not perform their responsibilities as expected of them. The analysis indicates that mentors did not help mentees in writing their action research, did not orient the mentees to the school and the community, and did not arrange for mentees to observe them teach. However, mentors organized counselling sessions for the mentees.

#### **Research question 4**

What are the views of mentees' and mentors' about the university supervisor's duties?

This research question was responded to by the mentees and the mentors. Items 24–31 of the mentees questionnaire and items 23-30 of the mentors' questionnaire were used to analyze this research question. The results are presented on Tables 13 and 14.

Table 13

**Mentees View about the University Supervisor**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. The sudden and unannounced appearance of supervisors is unsettling to me.	42	23.7	84	47.5	51	28.8	-	-	177	100
2. The university supervisor does not find out from the mentor problems the mentee faces.	56	31.6	92	52.0	29	16.4	-	-	177	100
3. The university supervisors' are too authoritative in their dealings with mentees.	14	7.9	104	58.8	53	29.9	6	3.4	177	100
4. Supervisors do not organize pre observation conferences before supervising the mentee.	54	30.5	77	43.5	42	23.7	4	2.3	177	100
5. Post observation conferences by the supervisors are always one- way communication from the supervisors to the mentee.	33	18.6	111	62.7	27	15.3	6	3.4	177	100

**Table 13 continued**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
6. The mentee is hardly given the chance to explain why he acted in a way or used a technique which seemed wrong to the supervisor.	46	26.0	93	52.5	26	14.7	12	6.8	177	100
7. Supervisors award grades at the end of mentees teaching before holding post-observation conferences.	29	16.4	103	58.2	45	25.4	-	-	177	100
8. University supervisors' should not be made to supervise the mentees during the internship.	5	2.8	59	33.3	75	42.4	38	21.5	177	100

The first item on Table 13 “the sudden and unannounced appearance of supervisors” is unsettling to me” had 71.2% agreeing with the statement while 28.9% dissented.

Item 2 on Table 13 which reads the university supervisor does not find out from the mentor and the mentee the problem(s) the mentee is facing had 83.6% of the mentees indicated that the university supervisors do not consult the mentors and the mentees to find out problem(s) they the mentee faces in the school. However, 16.4% of the mentees did not agree with the statement.

The third item on Table 13 ‘the university supervisors are too authoritative in their dealings with the mentees’ had 66.7% of the mentees agreeing with the statement that the supervisors are too authoritative in dealing with the mentees. 33.3% disagreed with the statement.

With regards to the item ‘supervisors do not organize pre-observation conferences before supervising the mentee’, 74.0% of the mentees agree with the statement while 26.0% disagreed.

The fifth item on Table 13, ‘Post observation conferences by the supervisors are always one-way communication from the supervisors to the mentee’ had 81.3% of the mentees agreed with the statement while 18.7% disagreed.

Item 6 on Table 13 ‘which reads ‘the mentee is hardly given the chance to explain why he acted in a way or used a technique which seemed wrong to the supervisor,’ had majority (78.5%) of the mentees agreed with the statement that mentees are hardly given the chance to explain why they acted or used a method which seems wrong to the supervisor. Only 21.5% of the mentees dissented.

With regards to the item, ‘supervisors award grades at the end of my teaching before holding post-observation conferences’, 74.6% of the mentees agreed that supervisors award grades at the end of a lesson before holding any post observation conference. However, 25.4% disagreed with the statement.

The last item on Table 13, reads “university supervisors should not be made to supervise mentees during the internship” had 63.9% of the respondents were of the view that the university supervisors should continue to supervise the mentees while 36.1% of the mentees dissented.

The analysis of research question 4 for mentees indicated that mentees were not satisfied with the way university supervisors perform their duties. With the exception of one item, the university supervisors should not be made to supervise mentees during the internship, to which the mentees disagreed, they agreed with all the other items under the research question.

Table 14

**Views of Mentors about the University Supervisor**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. The sudden and unannounced appearance of supervisors is unsettling to me.	23	25.3	42	46.2	20	22.0	6	6.6	91	100
2. The university supervisor does not find out from the mentor problems the mentee faces.	29	31.9	51	56.1	11	12.1	-	-	91	100
3. The university supervisors' are too authoritative in their dealings with mentees.	8	8.8	44	48.4	30	33.0	9	9.9	91	100
4. Supervisors do not organize pre observation conferences before supervising the mentee.	34	37.4	49	53.8	8	8.8	-	-	91	100
5. Post observation conferences by the supervisors are always one- way communication from the supervisors to the mentee.	25	27.5	57	62.6	9	9.9	-	-	91	100



**Table 14 continued**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
6. The mentee is hardly given the chance to explain why he acted in a way or used a technique which seemed wrong to the supervisor.	18	19.8	58	63.7	15	16.5	-	-	91	100
7. Supervisors award grades at the end of mentees teaching before holding post-observation conferences.	8	8.8	74	81.4	9	9.9	-	-	91	100
8. University supervisors' should not be made to supervise the mentees during the internship.	18	19.8	15	16.5	58	63.7	-	-	91	100

The first item on Table 14 “the sudden and unannounced appearance of supervisors” is unsettling to me” had majority (71.5%) of the mentors agreed with the statement while 28.5% disagreed with the statement.

Item 2 on Table 14 which reads ‘the university supervisor does not find out from the mentor and the mentee the problem(s) the mentee is facing’ had 88.0% of the mentors agreed with the statement that the university supervisors do not consult them to find out problem(s) the mentee faces in the school while 12.0% of the mentors disagreed with the statement.

The third item on Table 14 ‘the university supervisors are too authoritative in their dealings with the mentees’ had 57.2% of the mentors agreed that the supervisors are too authoritative in dealing with the mentees. However, 42.8% of the mentors disagreed.

With regards to the item ‘supervisors do not organize pre-observation conferences before supervising the mentee,’ 90.2% of the respondents hold the view that supervisors do not organize pre-observation conference before supervising the mentee. Only 9.8% of the mentors dissented.

The fifth item on Table 14 ‘Post observation conferences by the supervisors are always one- way communication from the supervisors to the mentee’ had 90.1% of the mentors agreed with the statement while 9.9% of the mentors disagreed with the statement.

Item 6 on Table 14 ‘The mentee is hardly given the chance to explain why he acted in a way or used a technique which seemed wrong to the supervisor,’ had 83.5% of the mentors indicated that mentees are hardly given the

chance to explain why they acted or used a method which seems wrong to the supervisor.

With regards to the item, “supervisors award grades at the end of my teaching before holding post-observation conferences”, 90.1% of the respondents hold the view that supervisors award grades at the end of a lesson before holding any post observation conference while 9.9% of the mentors dissented.

The last item on Table 14, “university supervisors should not be made to supervise mentees during the internship” had 63.7% of the mentors indicated that the university supervisors should continue to supervise the mentees while 36.3% disagreed.

The analysis shows that mentors held negative views about the university supervisors with regards to how they performed their duties.

### **Research Question 5**

What are the perceived benefits of the internship programme?

This research question was responded to by all the three categories of respondents. Items 32-39 of the mentees’ questionnaire, items 31-37 of the mentors’ and items 15-22 of the supervisors’ questionnaire were used to analyze this research question. The results are shown on Tables 15, 16, and 17.

Table 15

**Benefits of the internship (Mentees responses)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. The internship programme offers the mentees more opportunity to experience the job while under training.	49	27.7	103	58.2	25	14.1	-	-	177	100
2. The internship programme helps to practicalise all the skills, knowledge and professional skills acquired theoretically.	32	18.1	86	48.6	52	29.4	7	4.0	177	100
3. The programme helps prepare practicing teachers to meet the types of demand they would face as beginners.	45	25.4	103	58.2	25	14.1	4	2.3	177	100
4. The internship enables mentees to interact with experience teachers and supervisors from whom they learn a lot.	46	26.0	104	58.8	27	15.3	-	-	177	100

**Table 15 continued**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
5. The programme has brought cordial relationship between partnership schools and the university.	34	19.2	104	58.8	39	22.0	-	-	177	100
6. The programme helps introduce mentees to a wide range of administrative and co-curricular duties.	39	22.0	86	48.6	51	28.8	1	0.6	177	100
7. The programme has contributed in transforming the teaching skills of mentees.	42	23.7	71	40.1	59	33.3	5	2.8	177	100
8. The programme has a better potential of producing competent teachers than the 4 weeks off campus teaching practice.	95	53.7	76	42.9	6	3.4	-	-	177	100

From Table 15, the first item had 85.9% of the respondents indicated that the internship offers the mentees opportunity to experience the job while under training. The second item on Table 15 had 66.7% majority of the respondents agreed that the internship helps them practicalise the skills they have learnt theoretically. However 33.3% of the mentors disagreed with the statement.

Item 3 on Table 15 shows that 83.6% of the mentees were of the view that the internship programme helps the mentees know the types of demand they will meet as beginning teachers. The fourth item indicates that 84.8% agreed with the statement that the internship help them interact with experience teachers from whom they learn a lot while 15.2% disagreed.

Item five on Table 15 shows that 78.0% of the mentees were of the view that the internship has brought cordial relationship between the university and the partnership schools. With regards to item 6 on Table 70.6% of the mentees were of the view that the internship helps introduce them to a wide range of administrative and co-curricular activities. However, 29.4% disagreed with the statement.

Item seven on Table 15 shows that 63.8% of the mentees were of the view that the internship has contributed positively in transforming their teaching skills. 36.2% of the respondents disagreed with the statement.

The eighth item on Table 15 shows that 96.6% of the mentees were of the view that the internship has a better potential of producing competent teachers than the four weeks off-campus teaching practice. Only 3.4% of the mentees disagreed with the statement

Table 16

**Benefits of the internship (Mentors responses)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. The internship programme offers the mentees more opportunity to experience the job while under training.	13	14.3	50	54.9	28	30.8	-	-	91	100
2. The internship programme helps to practicalise all the skills, knowledge and professional skills acquired theoretically.	15	16.5	50	54.9	26	28.5	-	-	91	100
3. The programme helps prepare practicing teachers to meet the types of demand they would face as beginners.	20	22	62	68.1	9	9.9	-	-	99	100
4. The internship enables mentees to interact with experience teachers and supervisors from whom they learn a lot.	23	25.3	52	57.1	16	17.6	-	-	91	100

**Table 16 continued**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
5. The programme has brought cordial relationship between partnership schools and the university.	13	14.3	56	61.5	22	24.2	-	-	91	100
6. The programme helps introduce mentees to a wide range of administrative and co-curricular duties.	13	14.3	56	61.5	22	24.2	-	-	91	100
7. The programme has contributed in transforming the teaching skills of mentees.	7	7.7	39	42.9	41	45.1	4	4.4	91	100
8. The programme has a better potential of producing competent teachers than the 4 weeks off campus teaching practice.	25	27.5	42	46.2	16	17.6	8	8.8	91	100



From Table 16, the responses to the first item shows that majority (69.2%) of the mentors affirmed that the internship offers the mentees more opportunity to experience the job while under training. However, 30.8% of the mentors disagreed with the statement.

With regards to the second item on Table 16, 71.4% of the mentors were of the view that the internship helps the mentees to put all what they have learnt theoretically into practice while 28.6% hold a contrary view.

Item 3 on Table 16 shows majority of the mentors (90.1%) were of the view that the internship helps mentees to meet the types of demand they would face as beginners while 9.9% disagreed with the statement. The fourth item on Table 16 indicates that majority (82.4%) of the mentors agreed that the internship enables mentees to interact with experience teachers from whom they learn a lot.

Item five on Table 16 shows that 75.8% of the mentors hold the view that the programme has brought cordial relationship between the university and partnership schools. With regards to item 6 on Table 16, 75.8% of the mentors agreed that the internship helps introduce mentees to a wide range of administrative and co-curricular activities.

Item seven on Table 16 shows that the mentors agree that the programme helps in transforming the teaching skills of mentees. This is indicated by 50.6% of the mentors who agreed with the statement. However, 49.4% of the mentors disagreed with the statement.

The eighth item on Table 16 clearly indicates that majority (73.7%) of the mentors agreed with the statement that the one year internship has the potential of producing competent teachers than the four weeks off-campus teaching practice.

Table 17

**Benefits of the internship (Supervisors' responses)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. The internship programme offers the mentees more opportunity to experience the job while under training.	20	30.8	37	56.9	8	12.3	-	-	65	100
2. The internship programme helps to practicalise all the skills, knowledge and professional skills acquired theoretically.	20	30.8	37	56.9	8	12.3	-	-	65	100
3. The programme helps prepare practicing teachers to meet the types of demand they would face as beginners.	20	30.8	37	56.9	8	12.3	-	-	65	100
4. The internship enables mentees to interact with experience teachers and supervisors from whom they learn a lot.	6	9.2	27	41.5	17	26.2	15	23	65	100

**Table 17 continued**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
5. The programme has brought cordial relationship between partnership schools and the university.	10	15.4	45	69.2	8	12.3	2	3.1	65	100
6. The programme helps introduce mentees to a wide range of administrative and co-curricular duties.	17	26.2	40	61.1	8	12.3	-	-	65	100
7. The programme has contributed in transforming the teaching skills of mentees.	15	23.1	27	41.5	17	26.2	6	9.2	65	100
8. The programme has a better potential of producing competent teachers than the 4 weeks off campus teaching practice.	17	26.2	37	56.9	11	16.9	-	-	65	100

From Table 17, the first item which reads “the internship programme offers the mentees opportunity to experience the job while under training”, 87.7% of the supervisors agreed that the internship offers the mentees the opportunity to experience the job while they are under training.

With regards to the second item on Table 17, 87.7% of the supervisors affirmed the statement that the internship enables the mentees to put into practice all what they have learnt theoretically while under training. Item 3 on Table 17 shows that majority of the supervisors’ (87.7%) were of the view that the internship helps mentees to meet the types of demand they would face as beginners.

The forth item on Table 17 indicates that 50.7% of the supervisors were of the view that the mentees do meet and interact with experience teachers from whom they learn a lot. However, 49.3% of the supervisors dissented. Item five on Table 17 shows that majority (84.6%) of the supervisors hold the view that the internship has brought cordial relationship between the university and partnership schools.

With regards to item 6 on Table 17 shows that majority (87.8%) of the supervisors agreed that the internship helps introduce mentees to a wide range of administrative and co- curricular activities. Item seven shows that majority 64.6% of the supervisors agreed that the internship has contributed to transforming the teaching skills of mentees

The eighth item on Table 17 shows that 83.1% of the supervisors agreed that the internship has the potential of producing competent teachers than the 4 weeks off-campus teaching practice.

The analysis of research question 5 for all the respondents indicate that the internship has transform the teaching skills of mentees, it has helped introduce mentees to a wide range of administrative and co- curricular activities, it has offered the mentees opportunity to experience the job while under training and has also offered opportunity to mentees to meet and interact with experience teachers and supervisors from whom they learn a lot. The programme has also brought cordial relationship between the university and partnership schools.

### **Research Question 6**

What are the problems confronting the internship programme?

This research problem was analyzed using the responses provided to items 40-48 on the mentee s' questionnaire, items 38-45 on the mentors' questionnaire and items 23-31 on the university supervisors' questionnaire. The results are shown in Tables 18, 19, and 20.

Table 18

**Problems of the internship (Mentees responses)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. I am overburdened with the internship responsibilities.	41	23.2	64	36.2	54	30.5	18	10.1	177	100
2. The yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough.	41	23.2	64	36.2	66	37.3	6	3.4	177	100
3. Not all the mentees are observed by the university supervisors.	42	23.7	93	52.5	35	19.8	7	4.0	177	100
4. Mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around.	17	9.6	91	51.4	63	35.6	6	3.4	177	100
5. Mentees are not fully prepared for the internship	103	58.2	62	35.0	12	6.8	-	-	177	100
6. It is difficult to write the action research while outside the university campus.	105	59.3	66	37.3	6	3.4	-	-	177	100

**Table 18 continued**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
7. Partnership schools are not cooperating with mentees.	12	6.8	39	22.0	102	57.6	24	13.6	177	100
8. It is difficult to get schools to undertake the internship.	32	18.1	92	52.0	43	24.3	10	5.6	177	100
9. Absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on problems of students and mentors.	68	38.4	83	46.9	11	6.2	15	8.5	177	100

From Table 18 the following results could be inferred. 59.4% of the mentees hold the opinion that they are overburdened with the internship. However 40.6% dissented. The second item on Table 18 reads, 'the yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough' had 59.4% of the mentees indicated that the allowance paid to mentors is not enough; however, 40.6% of the mentees disagreed with the statement. .

Item three on Table 18, 'Not all the mentees are observed by the university supervisors' had 76.2% of the respondents were of the opinion that not all the mentees are supervised by the university supervisors. Item four, 'mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around' had 61.0% of the respondents agree that the mentees leave their work when supervisors are not around while 39.0% disagreed.

Item five on Table 18 which reads 'mentees are not fully prepared for the internship' indicates that majority 93.2% of the respondents are of the view that mentees are not fully prepared for the internship. Item six on the research question 6 reads 'it is difficult to write the action research while outside the university campus. The analysis indicates that a majority (96.6%) of the respondents indicates that it is really difficult to write the action research while outside the campus.

The seventh item on Table 18, 'partnership schools are not cooperating with mentees' shows that 71.2% of the respondents were of the view that partnership schools cooperate with them. For item eight which reads 'it is difficult



to get schools to undertake the internship,' 70.1% of the respondents were of the view that it is difficult to get schools to undertake the internship.

The last item on Table 18 which reads 'absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on the programme' had 85.3% of the mentees affirmed that the absence of link coordinators is a problem hampering the smooth implementation of the programme.

In sum, the mentees were of the view that the major problems they face in the internship programme range from difficulty to get schools to undertake the programme, absence of link-coordinators to visit partnership schools to find out the problems mentees and mentors face to lukewarm attitude shown by some mentors as a result of the meager yearly allowance paid to them.

Table 19

**Problems of the internship (Mentors Responses)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. I am overburdened with the internship responsibilities.	13	14.3	50	55.0	28	30.7	-	-	91	100
2. The yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough.	70	77.0	21	23.0	-	-	-	-	91	100
3. Not all the mentees are observed by the university supervisors.	34	37.4	42	46.2	15	16.4	-	-	91	100
4. Mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around.	15	16.4	12	13.2	34	37.4	30	33	91	100
5. Mentees are not fully prepared for the internship	34	37.4	33	36.3	15	16.4	9	9.9	91	100
6. It is difficult to write the action research while outside the university campus.	29	31.9	38	41.8	24	26.3	-	-	91	100
7. Partnership schools are not cooperating with mentees.	6	6.6	13	14.3	41	45.1	31	34.0	91	100
8. Absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on problems of students and mentors.	37	40.7	54	59.3	-	-	-	-	91	100

From Table 19 the following results could be inferred. 69.3% of the mentors hold the opinion that they are overburdened with the internship responsibilities. Only 30.7% disagreed with the statement. Item two on Table 19 reads 'the yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough'. From the responses, it could be seen that all the 91 (100.0%) mentors agreed that the yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough.

Item three on Table 19 reads 'not all the mentees are observed by the university supervisors.' The analysis indicates that 83.6% of the respondents were of the opinion that not all the mentees are supervised by the university supervisors. Item 4, mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around had 70.4% of the respondents disagree that the mentees leave their work when supervisors are not around. However, 29.6% of the mentors agreed with the statement.

Item 5 on Table 19 which reads 'mentees are not fully prepared for the internship' indicates that majority (73.7%) of the respondents are of the view that mentees are not fully prepared for the internship. Item 6 reads 'it is difficult for mentees to write the action research while outside the university campuses' had 73.7% of the respondents indicate that it is really difficult to write the action research while outside the campus.

The seventh item on Table 19 'partnership schools are not cooperating with mentees' shows that 79.1% of the respondents were of the view that partnership schools do cooperate with the mentees. Item 8 which reads 'absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on problems of mentees and mentors, had the following respondents choosing the various response options. 40.7%

chose strongly agree, 59.3% chose agree, none of the respondents chose neither disagree nor strongly disagree. The analysis shows that there is a consensus among the mentors that the absence of link coordinators to monitor the programme is one of the factors affecting the smooth running of the programme.

In summary, mentors indicated that the meager yearly allowance paid to them, absence of link-coordinators, mentees not fully prepared for the programme, university supervisors inability to supervise all the mentees and the mentees inability to undertake their action research project as the major problems confronting the programme.

Table 20

**Problems of the internship (Supervisors Responses)**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. I am overburdened with the internship responsibilities.	1	1.5	21	32.3	29	44.6	14	21.5	65	100
2. Absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on problems of students and mentors.	15	23.1	37	56.9	13	20.0	-	-	65	100
3. The yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough.	9	13.8	41	63.1	15	23.1	-	-	65	100
4. Not all the mentees are observed by the university supervisors.	18	27.7	27	41.5	15	23.1	5	7.7	65	100
5. Mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around.	8	12.3	23	35.4	25	38.5	9	13.8	65	100

**Table 20 continued**

ITEM	SA		A		D		SD		TOTAL	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
6. Mentees are not fully prepared for the internship.	12	18.5	35	53.8	16	24.6	2	3.1	65	100
7. It is difficult to write the action research while outside the university campus.	3	4.7	35	53.8	22	33.8	5	7.7	65	100
8. Partnership schools are not cooperating with mentees.	8	12.3	17	26.1	33	50.58	7	10.8	65	100
9. It is difficult to get schools to undertake the internship.	15	3.1	29	44.6	22	33.8	-	-	65	100

From Table 20 the following results could be inferred. With regards to the first item which reads ‘I am overburdened with the internship responsibilities’, majority (66.1%) of the supervisors hold the opinion that they are not overburdened with the internship responsibilities while 33.9% hold contrary view

The second item on Table 20 which reads ‘absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on the programme’ had 80% of the supervisors agreed with the statement that the absence of link coordinators to monitor the effectiveness of the programme is hampering the smooth operation of the programme 20% however disagreed. Item three on research question 6 reads, ‘the yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough’ From the responses, it could be seen that majority (76.9%) of the respondents hold the view that the yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough.

Item four on Table 20 reads ‘not all the mentees are observed by the university supervisors. The analysis indicates that 69.2% of the respondents were of the opinion that not all the mentees are supervised by the university supervisors. Item 5 reads ‘mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around’ had 52.3% of the respondents disagree that the mentees leave their work when supervisors are not around. However 47.7% agreed with the statement.

Item 6 on Table 20 which reads ‘mentees are not fully prepared for the internship’ majority (72.3%) of the respondents are of the view that mentees are fully not prepared for the internship. Item 7 reads ‘it is difficult to write the action research while outside the university campus.’ Majority (58.5%) of the

respondents indicates that it is really difficult to write the action research while outside the campus.

The eighth item on Table 20 which reads, 'partnership schools are not cooperating with mentees' shows that 61.6% of the respondents were of the view that partnership schools do cooperate with the mentees. 38.4% of the supervisors agreed that partnership schools do not cooperate with the mentees.

For item 9 which reads 'it is difficult to get schools to undertake the internship,' 67.7% of the respondents were of the view that it is difficult to get schools to undertake the internship while 32.3% agreed with the statement.

Analysis of research question 6 for university supervisors indicated that the major problem confronting the programme were inadequate partnership schools, absence of link-coordinators, the meager allowance paid to mentors and students inability to undertake their research projects while undertaking the internship programme.

### **Discussion of Findings**

In this section, the findings are discussed in relation to:

1. Adequacy of preparation of mentees, mentors, and university supervisors.
2. The duration of the internship
3. Performance of mentees duties
4. Views of mentees and mentors about the university supervisor.
5. Benefits of the internship and,
6. Problems of the internship



### **Adequacy of preparation**

The first research question sought to find out the adequacy of preparation of mentees, mentors, and university supervisors for the programme. The result indicated that the level of preparation for mentees, mentors, and supervisors was not adequate. The results were inconsistent with the observation of Olaitan and Ogusiobo (1992) who state that adequate preparation of the student teacher is very important and teaching practice is the first opportunity to participate in activities involved in actual teaching situations.

The findings indicate that mentees were adequately taught how to prepare lesson plans and teaching materials. This findings collaborates the findings of Cohen and Manion (1986) who suggest that in preparing students for teaching practice, they should be taught how to make and use teaching aids from locally assembled materials and preparation of lesson plan.

The result also indicated that mentees were equipped with practical skills for teaching. This result is in line with that of Tamakloe (1999) who sees the period of teaching practice as one during which the student teacher has to bring to bear all the knowledge, skills and values that he has acquired both in his academic and professional studies. Tamakloe also stated that if the student has not been taking his academic studies seriously, he is likely to give inaccurate information to the students thereby exposing himself to ridicule.

The findings revealed that mentees were not given adequate preparation in writing of action research, teaching philosophy, and reflective practice and in the content areas they are to teach. This is indicated by 71.2% of the mentees who indicated that the pre- internship did not equip them with the skills of undertaking

action research. Also 70.6% and 55.4% of the mentees indicated that the pre – internship programme did not equip them with the skills of writing teaching philosophy and reflective practice. The findings revealed that mentees were not actively involved in the pre-internship programme. This is indicated by 76.8% of the mentees who indicated that they were not actively involved in the pre-internship programme. Also 75.6% of the mentees indicated that the duration of the pre-internship was not adequate.

The study revealed that the time allotted to the pre internship programme was inadequate. The pre- internship last for a maximum of 12 weeks of 3 hours each week. The researcher had the privilege of observing the pre- internship activities at the Kumasi campus of the university during the 2007/2008 academic year. The researcher observed that as many as thirty five students were assigned to a lecturer for supervision. Judging from the number of activities that take place within the 3 hour period, the researcher agrees with the respondents that the period is really inadequate, hence students’ participation is very minimal. Thus, this confirms the findings of Chiromo (1999) who indicated that 70% of the mentees he studied suggested that more time should be allocated to micro-teaching and peer teaching. The general impression, therefore, is that the respondents felt that the time allotted for the various components of the pre-internship was not adequate.

The findings also show that the mentors and the university supervisors were taken through the necessary activities related to the internship in order to perform their duties as expected by the university. Table 5 also indicates that just

like the mentees, mentors were not given enough training in reflective practice and action research.

In summary, the respondents were of the view that the level of preparation for the participants was not adequate.

### **Duration of the Internship**

The second research question sought to find out the views of respondents about the duration of the internship. The results showed that in general the respondents view the duration to be very long. This finding is consistent with the memo sent by the Student Representative Council of the University of Education, Winneba to the Vice – Chancellor about the duration of the internship. The memo in part states “we consider the one year internship as too long, superfluous and not too necessary. This is in consideration of the fact that 95% of the students are trained teachers who have undertaken teaching practice at the initial teacher training and have also had at least two years full time teaching before entry into the university.”

The finding is also in line with the suggestions of Danahar (1994) who was of the view that a minimum of 12 weeks and a maximum of 18 weeks should be allowed for teaching practice. Avalos (1991), quoting the duration of teaching practice at the Keele Institute of Education, said there is a minimum of 12 weeks teaching practice for 3 year teacher training students. This finding is also in line with the findings of Mensah (1991) who reports that in the University of Cape Coast students are exposed to on-campus teaching practice for a period of 12

weeks and then off campus teaching practice for a period of 4 weeks, making a maximum of 16 weeks.

However, the findings are in contrast with the findings of other writers. Cooper (1990) was of the view that there should be a lengthy period of time for teaching practice in order to conduct it at a reasonably leisurely time. Maynard and Furlong (1992) were of the view that teaching practice should be done throughout the term. They posit that a prolonged period of teaching practice will help students acquire more professional skills and experience.

The result also reveals some interesting findings. While in general the respondents were of the view that the duration of the internship is very long, they however objected to the idea that the university should revert back to the four weeks off campus teaching practice. This is indicated by 74.0% and 50.5% and 58.5 of the mentees, mentors and the university supervisors respectively who dissented that the university should revert back to the four weeks off-campus teaching practice. This may imply that though the 36 weeks (9 months) internship is very long, they consider the 4 weeks also very short.

Respondents were also of the view that one year duration of the internship is not good for only mentees who are not professional teachers. Although the Memo the SRC presented to the vice-chancellor on the duration of the internship cited one of the reasons for their concern as “95% of the students have already had teaching practice experience at the initial teacher training colleges”, respondents were of the view that both professional and non-professional teachers should have the same duration with regards to teaching practice. This finding

contradicts Dent's (1965) findings that all student teachers do not need the same period of practice teaching.

Another finding from Tables 8, 9 and 10 was that the internship should be for one term and not one full year. This still goes to buttress the point that respondents see the one year duration as being very long, but advocates for a period of one term.

### **Performance of Mentors Responsibilities**

Research question three sought to find out the extent to which mentors are performing their responsibilities as outlined in the Student Internship Handbook (2005). The result indicates that mentors did not perform their responsibilities adequately. This finding is in sharp contrast with the suggestion of Linda, Philip and Jones (1982) that one way to prepare teachers for schools is to mentor the teacher trainees and beginning teachers. The findings revealed that mentors organize periodic conferences and counselling sessions for students and also encourage them to experiment with new styles of teaching. This finding is also consistent with that of Anderson (1988) who posited that the mentor's major responsibility is to nurture support, encourage, counsel and befriend the mentee.

Table 14 reveals that majority of the mentees reported that they were not given any help in developing their action research and portfolios and mentors did not arrange for mentees to observe them (mentors) teach. The mentees also indicated that mentors do not conduct parallel supervision with the university supervisors. Majority of the mentors also indicated that they did not conduct parallel supervision with the university supervisor as indicated in the Student

Internship Handbook, 2005. Though guiding mentees on writing action research and development of teaching philosophy were the major support mentors are to give mentees, the low support given to mentees to develop and write these aspects of the internship on their own, make mentees to travel very often to consult their lecturers, thus reducing class contact hours they should have had with pupils.

In summary, mentors performed their responsibilities very effectively in some areas and very little in other areas. As such, mentees did not receive the required support from the mentors. This finding does not support the views of Cameron-Jones and O’Jara (1995), that mentees should be given maximum support from mentors.

#### **Views of Mentees and Mentors about the University Supervisors**

The fourth research question sought the views of mentees and mentors about the university supervisor. The result shows that both mentees and mentors do not hold positive views about the university supervisors.

Table 11 shows that university supervisors do not mostly find out from mentors problem mentees face in the school. This is indicated by 83.6% of mentees and 86.3% of mentors who agreed with the statement that the supervisors do not find out problems the mentees face in the school before the supervisors undertake their observation of the mentees. Other areas in which mentees complain about the supervisors are pre-observation and post observation. Mentees were also hardly given the chance to explain why they acted in a way which seems wrong to the supervisor. Table 11 also indicates that supervisors award grades before holding post-observation conferences. The table also shows

that post- observation conferences are always a one-way-communication from the supervisor to the mentee. The findings from Table 11 confirms Adesina (1990) conviction that the pre-observation conference has been relegated to the background, and the post-observation conference if held at all is usually a one-way-communication, only the supervisor expresses his views. Adesina also argues that supervision does not mean “Policing” which he argued is the type found in most schools.

The table also revealed that the sudden and unannounced appearance of supervisors for supervision is unsettling to both mentees and mentors. This finding confirms Mensah’s (1991) finding that it is traditional for teachers to look upon supervisors as natural enemies because of the unprofessional practice such as snooping, looking secretly around schools and classrooms to find something or obtain information to use against teachers indulged in by some supervisors.

One major finding in tables 11 and 12 relate to both mentees and mentors view that the university supervisors should continue to supervise mentees. This indicates that despite some problems both mentees and mentors have with the supervisors; they should continue to supervise in the internship.

### **Benefits of the internship**

Research question five sought the views of respondents on the perceived benefit of the internship programme. The findings in Table 15, 16 and 17 show that respondents were of the view that the internship has a lot of benefits not only to the mentees but also the partnership schools. The study revealed varied benefits among others, include offering the mentees opportunity to experience the

job while under training, preparing mentees to meet the types of demand they would face as beginners, mentees meeting and interacting with experience teachers from whom they learn a lot and also the cordial relationship between the university and partnership schools as well as the programme having a better potential of producing competent teachers than the 4 weeks off campus teaching practice

The findings confirms Tamakloe's (1999) assertion that teaching practice is the period in which the student teacher brings to bear all the knowledge, skills and values that he has acquired both in his academic and professional studies. The findings also are in line with that of Fianu (1996) who was of the view that the transition from teacher training to the first teaching job could be a dramatic one and argues that provisions be made to factor some of the experiences of real classroom situation into the training programme of teachers. The evidence gathered from Tables 15, 16 and 17 suggest that the designers of the internship programme factored in some of the experiences into the training programme. It could therefore be inferred that the programme is of much benefits to all stakeholders.

### **Problems of the internship**

The sixth research question sought to find out from the respondents problems confronting the internship programme. One major problem that majority of the respondents indicated was allowance paid to mentors. The respondents were of the view that the allowance paid to mentors is not enough. In the 2007/2008 academic year, a mentor was given an allowance of seven Ghana cedis



fifty Ghana pesewas per mentee for the entire duration of the programme (CETDAR, 2008).

This finding signals two dimensions to the problem of poor supervision of mentees. First mentors did not derive any benefit from helping in the professional development of mentees, and secondly, the output of mentors was not being recognised.

Results from Tables 18, 19 and 20 indicated that majority of the respondents agreed to the question that absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on problems of students and mentors are a major problem facing the internship. This finding is in direct contrast to what is stated in the student internship handbook (SIP 2005). It is stated that “link coordinators are to serve as the liaison between partnership schools and the university. They are to visit the partnership schools and report on problems facing both mentees and mentors. In addition they are to offer counselling services to the mentees and offer help to mentees in writing their action research”. An enquiry at the Centre for Teacher Development and Action Research (CETDAR) as to whether the link coordinators do visit partnership schools as stipulated in the SIP (2005) revealed that the work of the link coordinators has been suspended since the beginning of the 2007/2008 academic year. No reasons were given for the suspension.

Another problem indicated by the respondents as hindering the programme was the fact that mentees are not fully prepared for the internship. This findings collaborates the finding in table 5 in which the mentees were of the view that the period for the pre-internship was not adequate, hence each mentee was not actively involved in the pre-internship. This finding also contravenes

Cohen and Manion (1986) assertion that one of the most crucial factors in the teaching practice situation for the student teacher is preparation.

Other problems which the respondents perceived as hindering the implementation of the programme were difficulty in writing the action research while outside campus, not all the mentees are supervised by the university supervisors and difficulty in getting schools for the internship. The issue of difficulty in getting schools has been discussed by (Quaigrain, 1999). He was of the view that “whereas the schools favour a school-oriented and school focused initial training course, most schools see student teachers participation in schools as disruptive to their academic programme”. He was of the view that this resentment by the schools might be due to the lack of properly co-ordinated partnership agreement.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Overview**

The chapter presents a summary of the study, conclusions to the main issues of the study and recommendations.

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the implementation of the internship programme (teaching practice) of teacher education at the University of Education, Winneba.

A sample size of 333, comprising 177 mentees of the 2007/2008 academic year, 91 mentors and 65 university supervisors was used for the study. Data was collected using the questionnaire. The study was a descriptive survey, which was targeted at finding out the perception of the three main stakeholders about the internship programme.

The responses to all the research questions were analyzed using frequency counts and percentages. This is because the variables in the research questions were measured on a nominal scale.

## Summary of Key Findings

The study revealed that:

1. The preparation of mentees, mentors and university supervisors was not adequate. Mentees were not given enough preparation in doing action research, writing teaching philosophy and reflective practice. Just like the mentees, mentors were not given enough preparation in reflective practice and in action research. In general, the level of preparation was not adequate for all the respondents.
2. Although the respondents were of the view that the duration is very long, they objected to the university reverting back to the traditional four weeks off-campus teaching practice. Rather they were in favour of one term duration of the internship.
3. Mentors performance of their responsibilities was not adequate. Mentees were of the view that the mentors did not help them in doing their action research and reflective practice. Mentors did not arrange with supervisors to conduct parallel supervision. The mentors did not orient the mentees to the school and the community. However, mentors did organize counselling sessions for the mentees as well as encouraged mentees to experiment with new teaching techniques and methods.
4. University supervisors used the same old traditional 'policing' type of supervision. Supervisors still visited schools without pre-informing both the mentee and the mentor and most of the time awarded grades at the end of the lesson before holding any post-observation conference. There was hardly any pre-observation conference. Communication was usually a one-

way affair- from the supervisor to the mentee. Despite the low perception mentees and mentors have about the university supervisor, they felt the supervisors should continue to supervise the internship programme

5. Problems hindering the successful implementation of the internship include the meagre allowance paid to mentors, absence of link coordinators to liaise between partnership schools and the university and to report any problem both mentees and mentors face. Difficulty of mentees doing their action research while outside the university campus as well as difficulty mentees face in getting partnership schools for the internship.
6. Benefits of the programme were the opportunity to experience the job while under training, ability to prepare practicing teachers to know the types of demand they would face as beginners, opportunity to meet and interact with experience teachers from whom mentees learn a lot and establishment of cordial relationship between the university and partnership schools.

### **Conclusions**

The overwhelming evidence from the study supported much of the researcher's previously cited studies and at the same time went contrary to other studies. However, it could be concluded that differences existed between the implementation of the programme on ground and the standards set in the policy document guiding the implementation of the programme.

These differences occurred mostly in the preparation of mentees and mentors, the support that link coordinators and mentors were supposed to give mentees, the number of years a teacher should have taught before being appointed a mentor, responsibilities of mentors and the roles of the university supervisors.

The study, however, established that, all the respondents have positive view about the internship and attach a very high importance to the objectives and activities of the programme.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The programme is in its seventh year and as with all new innovations is beseted with some teething problems, some of the information gathered might be exaggerated since some of the respondents may not be truthful with regard to the information they provided during the process of the study. First, there was not enough finance to cover more than one region and the 333 respondents. This resulted in geographical disadvantage since the study covered only the Ashanti region. Second, the researcher could not move to the other two sister campuses, Winneba and Mampong to observe their pre-internship sessions. Third, the use of university supervisors from Mampong and Kumasi campuses is likely to have some adverse effect on the generalizability of the result.

### **Recommendations**

1. Considering the pivotal role mentors play in the implementation of the internship programme, it is strongly recommended that some incentives be provided for them by the university to stimulate their interest in the programme. The university should consider increasing the yearly allowance paid to mentors.
2. One of the priority actions which the university need to take to sustain and develop the internship programmes is the establishment of reliable structures for effective monitoring and evaluation. In this line, it is

strongly recommended that Centre for Teacher Development and Action Research (CETDAR) should write a memo to the university authorities on the need to re-introduce the work of the link coordinators. Link coordinators should be a liaison between the university and partnership schools.

3. The present time allocation for pre-internship seems inadequate taking into account activities that mentees have to understand during the season. It is therefore suggested that the Centre for Teacher Development and Action Research (CETDAR) should put in a formal request for the period to be increased.
4. There is overwhelming evidence that the one academic year duration of the internship is too long. It is recommended that the internship should be carried out in the first and second terms of the school year. Mentees should then return to campus during the third term and undertake the post-internship activities.
5. The Centre for Teacher Development and Action Research should organize forums for the university supervisors before the start of the internship supervision. The supervisors should be reminded of what they are expected to do when they get to the partnership schools. Each supervisor must be given a copy of the Student Internship Handbook to go through so as to be conversant with the 'dos' and the 'don'ts' of the internship programme.
6. Mentees should be taken through the rudiments of doing action research by the various research lecturers in the departments. The Centre for

Teacher Development and Action Research should also organize seminars for both lecturers and students on action research.

### **Suggestions for Further Research**

To further extend the literature on programme evaluation and its attendant problems and benefits, the following suggestions are made for further research:

1. A comparative study between the effectiveness of the old programme (4 weeks-off-campus teaching practice) and that of the one year internship programme.
2. A longitudinal study of the performance of students taught by graduates of the internship programme.



## REFERENCES

- Adams, H. P. & Dickey, F.G. (1956). *Basic principles of student teaching*. New York: American Bok Company.
- Aina, L. O. (2004). *Library and information science text for Africa*. Ibadan: Third World Information Services Limited.
- Adentwi, I. K. (2000). *Principles, practices, and issues in teacher education*. Kumasi: Skies Printing Press.
- Adesina, S. (1990). *Educational management*. Enugu. Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Adu, J. K. & Baku, J. K. (1990). *Evaluation of JSS established in Ghana between 1976-1981*. Unpublished, CRDD, Accra.
- Aggarwal, J. C. (2003). *Teacher education in a developing society*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House
- Akyeampong, K. (2002). Reconceptualizing teacher education in Sub-Saharan African context. *Journal of International Cooperation In Education* 5 (1) 11-30.
- Akyeampong, K. & Lewin, K. (2002). From student teachers to newly qualified teachers in Ghana: Insights into being a teacher. *International Journal of Education Development*. 22 (3 ) 339-352
- Akyeampong, K., Fobih, D. & Koomson, A. (1999). *Ghana primary school development. Final evaluation of project performance*. Accra, Ghana
- Alkin, M. C. (1969). Evaluation theory development. *Evaluation Comment*. 2 (1) 2-7.
- Alkin, M. C. (1972). Evaluation and decision making: *The Title VII experience*. Los Angles, California: Centre for study of evaluation.
- Alkin, M. C. (1990). *Debates on evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Alkin, M. C. (1985). Curriculum evaluation models. *The International Encyclopedia of Education*, 2 1189-1190.
- Alkin, M. C., Daillak, R. & White, P. (1979). *Using evaluation: Does evaluation makes a difference?* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications
- Anderson, L. W. & Shannon, A. L. (1988). Towards a conceptualization of mentoring. *Journal of Teacher Education* 39 (2), 38-42.

- Antwi, M. K. (1992). *Education, society, and development in Ghana*. Accra: Unimax Publishers.
- Arends, R. I. (1991). *Learning to teach*. New York. McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Razavieh, A. (1990). *Introduction to research in education* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed). Forth Worth: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston Inc
- Avalos, B. (1991). Contexts, training theories and teaching practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7 (2), 169-184
- Awuku, K. A. (1986). Trends in teacher education with its implication for Ghana. *In a report of the national conference on teacher education and its agencies in Ghana*. 19-28. University of Cape Coast.
- Babbie, A. (1990). *Survey research methods*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall, India.
- Best, J. W. & Khan J. W. (1996). *Research in education* (7<sup>th</sup>ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall Inc
- Bishop, G. (1986). *Innovation in education*. London; Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Blumberg, A. (1974). *Supervision of teachers: A private cold war*. London: Berkeley.
- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1993). *Educational research: An introduction* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Longman Publishing Company.
- Borich, A. (1991). Decision- oriented model. In A. Lewy (Ed). *The International Encyclopedia of Curriculum*. (456). Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Brew- Riverson, E. H. (1972). Principles of teaching practice supervision in Ghana. *Faculty of Education Bulletin*, 3 (1), 20-22.
- Cameron-Jones, M. & O'Hara, P. (1995). Mentors perceptions of their roles with students in initial teacher training. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 25(2) 189-2000
- Casley, D. J. & Kumar, K. (1988). *The collection, analysis, and use of monitoring and evaluation data*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Caswell, H. I. (1950). *Curriculum improvement in the public schools*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Chiromo, A. S. (1999) Teacher education courses in relation to preparation for teaching practice: Views from student teachers. *Zimbabwe Journal of Educational Research*, 11 (1), 58-69.

- Clarke, K. (1992). *Keynote speech at the north of England education conference*, 4<sup>th</sup> January, Southpost.
- Cobbold, C. (1999). *Implementation of the social studies programme in teacher training colleges in Ghana: An evaluation approach*. Unpublished M. Phil Thesis. UCC, Cape Coast.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1986). *A guide to teaching practice*. New York: Methuen and Co.
- Conant, J. B. (1963). *The education of American teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Cooper, J. M. (1990). *Classroom teaching skills*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Toronto: D.C. Health and Company.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1963). Course Improvement Through Evaluation. *Teachers College Records*, 64, (672-683).
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. California: Sage Publications.
- Dare, A. L. (1998). Obstacles to reforming Ghanaian education: A case of non-fulfillment of necessary conditions. *The Journal of the Institute of Education*, 4, (2) 34-57.
- Danahar, P. A. (1994). Pupil Perceptions of the Teacher Education Practicum: The Results of Two Surveys Administered in a Melbourne Independent Secondary School. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 2, 114-121.
- Djangmah, J. S. (1986). Innovation programmes and practices in teacher education and training. *Report of the national conference of teacher education and its agencies in Ghana*. 30-38. University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.
- Dzobo, N. K. (1972). The content of teaching and its role in the evaluation of teaching. *Faculty of Education Bulletin*, 3 (1), 7-9.
- Duke, L. (1990). *Teaching: An introduction*. New York: McGraw Hill Publishing Co.
- Eisner, E. W. (1979). *The educational imagination: On the design of evaluation of school programmes*. New York: Macmillan
- Ekuban, E. E. (1972). Supervision: A social process. *Faculty of Education Bulletin*, 3 (1), 10-13.

- Essilfie, N. A. (1982). *Teaching practice tips*. Accra: Afram Publications
- Farrant, J. S. (1992). *Principles and practice of education*. Harlow, Essex: Longman Group Limited.
- Fianu, E. K. (1996). *TESOL Practicum in the context of teaching practice assessment: Proposals for improvement in Ghanaian initial teacher training colleges*. Unpublished dissertation. U.C.C., Cape Coast.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, R. J., & Worthen, R. B. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education (5<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Boston. McGraw Hill.
- Friedson, E. (1986). *Professional powers*. The Chicago University. Chicago: Chicago Press.
- Fullan, M. G. & Hargreaves, A. (1992). *Understanding teacher professional development*. New York : Teacher's College Publication.
- Fullan, M. G. (1982). *The meaning of education change*. New York: Teacher College Publication.
- Gay, L. R. (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application (4<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.
- Glasser, R. & Nitko, A. J. (1971). Curriculum and reality in Africa and instruction. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.). *Curriculum improvement (pp.98-101)*. America council on Education Washington D.C.
- Glass, G. V. (1969). *The growth of evaluation methodology*. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research.
- Graham, C. K. (1977). *The history of education in Ghana*. Tema: Ghana Publishing Corporation.
- Gullickson, A. R. (1986). Teacher education and teacher – Perceived needs in educational measurement and evaluation. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 23 (8), 347-354.
- Gyan, K. (1972). Teaching Practice. *Faculty of Education Bulletin*, 3 (1) 1-3
- Hama, J. (1998). The role of professional development of the teacher as a factor in educational achievement of pupils. *The Oguaa Educator* 12, 64 – 73.

- Hamilton, D. (1976). *Curriculum evaluation*. London: Open Books.
- Hammond, R. L. (1973). Evaluation at the local level. In B. R. Worthen & J. R. Sanders *Educational evaluation: Theory & practice* (pp. 123-125). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hargreaves, D. (1994). *Changing teacher: Changing times*. London: Caswell.
- Hargreaves D. & Hopkins, D. (1991). *The empowered school*. London: Caswell.
- Hirst, P. H. (1969). The logic of the curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1, 142-158.
- Hopkins, K. D. & Glass, G. V. (1978). *Basic statistics for the behavioural sciences*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ Prentice Hall.
- House, E. R. (1980). *Evaluating with validity*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Jarvis, S. (1990). *An international dictionary of adult education*: London Routledge
- Lawton, D. (1973). *Curriculum studies and educational planning*. London: University of London Press.
- Lewy, A. (1977). Responsive Evaluation: An Interpretation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 3 (2), 143-148.
- Linda, J., Philips, S., & Jones, D. (1982). Classroom intellectual and academic Management. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23, 357-374.
- Lockheed, M. E. & Vespoor, M. A. (1991). *Improving primary education in developing countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Looney, J.M. (1996) Mentoring the beginning teacher: A study of influencing variables. Doctoral dissertation, Seaton Hall University. *Dissertation abstract international*. 1999. UMI, No. 9623562.
- Lusky, M., & Hayes, R. (2001). Collaborative Consultation and Program Evaluation. *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 79 (26) 35-41.
- Machario, S. N. & Wario, L. H. (1989). *Teaching practice in primary schools*. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Maddaus, G.F., Scriven, M. & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1983). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

- Matthews, J. (1989). *Curriculum exposed*. London: David Fulton Publishers
- Maucher, J. W. (1962, January) *Imperatives for excellence in teacher education*. Proceedings of the 1962 annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. Chicago.
- Maynard, T. (1992). *Learning to teach and models of mentoring*. London: Croom Helm
- McCormick, R. & James, M. (1990). *Curriculum evaluation in schools*. London: Croom Helm.
- McIntyre, D., Hagger, H. & Wilkins, M. (Eds). *Mentoring: Perspectives on school based teacher education*. London. Kogan.
- McIntyre, D. (1988). Designing a teacher education curriculum from research and theory in teacher knowledge. In J. Calderhead, (Ed.). *Teachers' Professional knowledge* (pp. 47-49). London: Falmer Press.
- McMillan, J. H. (1996); *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- McWilliam, H. O .A. & Kwamina-Poh (1975). *The development of education in Ghana*. London: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.
- Mefessel, N. S. & Michael, W. B. (1967). A paradigm involving multiple criterion measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of school programmes. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 27, 931-943.
- Mensah, S. K .E. (1991). Organization and supervision of student teaching *Journal of Institute of Education*, (2), UCC, Cape Coast.
- Olaitan, S. O. & Agusiobo, O. N. (1992). *Principles of practice teaching*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire design and attitude measurement*. London: Heinemann.
- Osuala, E. C. (2001). *Introduction to Research Methodology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), Ibadan: Africana Feb Publishing Ltd
- Pecku, N. K. (1998). *Teacher education in Ghana: Evolutions and prospects*. Accra: Elorm Electronics and Business Services.
- Popham, W. J. (1988). *Educational evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Posner, K. (1992). *Analyzing the curriculum*. New York: Harcourt Braced and Word Inc.
- Provus, M.M. (1973). Evaluation of ongoing programmes in the public schools. In B.R. Worthen & J.R. Sanders, *Educational evaluation: Theory & Practice* (Eds)(pp. 32-37) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Quaigrain, A. K. (1999), Professional training of teachers: Partnership between Universities and schools. *Journal of the University of Education of Winneba*, 1(3), 2-17
- Rosenshine, B. (1971). Teaching behaviours and student achievement. IEA Studies (1). *National foundations of educational research*. New York. Methuen & Co.
- Sadker, M. P. & Sadker, D. M. (1998). *Teachers, schools, and society*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Scriven, M. (1988). Duty – based teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1(4), 319-334.
- Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R.E. Stake(Ed.). *Curriculum Evaluation* (pp. 97-100). American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Evaluation (1). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Scriven, M. (1972). Pros & cons about goal free evaluation. *Evaluation Comment*, 3 (4), 1-7.
- Sproull, N. L. (1988). *Handbook of social research methods*. London: Metuchen, N.J.
- Stake, R. E. (1991). Responsive evaluation. In A. Lewy (Ed) *The international encyclopedia of curriculum* (pp. 204-212). Oxford. Pergamon Press
- Stake, R. E. (1969b). Generalizability of programme evaluation: The need for limits. *Educational Product Report*, 2 (5), 39-40.
- Stake, R.E. (1982). How sharp should the evaluator's teeth be? *Evaluation News*, 3 (3), 79-80.
- Stecher, B. M. & Davies, W. A. (1987). How to focus an evaluation. In J. L. Herman (Ed.) *Programme evaluation kit* (pp. 37-43,) (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stenhouse, L. (1976). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann.

- Stones, E. (1985). *Supervision in teacher education: A counselling and pedagogical approach*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Stones, E. & Morris, B. (1972). *Teaching practice: Problems and perceptives*. London: Methuen.
- Student Internship Handbook*, (2005). Winneba, Ghana: Centre for teacher Development and Action Research.
- Student Representative Council, UEW. (2006) *Memo on the one year internship programme*. Winneba: Ghana.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1973a). An introduction to the PDK book: Educational evaluation and decision making. In B. R. Worthen & J. R. Sanders, *educational evaluation: Theory & Practice* (pp. 167-179). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: The practice*. New York: Harcourt, Br. World Inc.
- Tamakloe, E. K. (1997). *An evaluation of the national conference on teacher education: 1986*. Accra: Ghana Universities Press.
- Tamakloe, E. K. (1999). *Guidelines for students on teaching practice*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). Accra : Ghana Universities Press.
- Tamakloe, E. K., Atta, E. T. & Amedahe, F. K. (1996). *Principles and methods of teaching*. Accra: Black Mask Ltd.
- Tozer, S. E., Violas, P. C. & Senese, G. B. (1995). *School and society: Historical and contemporary perspective*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- University of Education, Winneba. (2007). *Basic statistics*. Winneba: Ghana.
- Worthen, B. R. & Sanders, J. R. (1987). *Educational evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. New York: Longman.
- Worthen, B. R. (1984). Programme evaluation. In International encyclopedia of education research and studies. Oxford-England: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Worthen, B. R. & Sanders, J. R. (1984). *Content specialization and educational evaluation: A necessary marriage?* (Occasional Paper No. 14). Kalamazoo. Western Michigan University Evaluation Centre.



Wragg, E. C. (1993). *Primary teaching skills*. London: Routledge.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Zeichner, K. M. (1980). Myths and realities: Field- based experiences in pre-service teacher education. *Journal of Education*, 31(6), 45-57.

## APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MENTEES

This is a research study intended to evaluate the one year internship programme of the University of Education, Winneba. The study is purely for academic purpose and will therefore, not be used for any other purpose. Be assured that the information you provide will be treated as confidential. I therefore implore your indulgence to respond to the following items as truthful as possible.

#### SECTION A

##### BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

Please tick (✓) the appropriate boxes

1. Gender: Male   
Female
2. Are you a professionally trained teacher?  
Yes   
No
3. If yes, how many years have you taught as a professional teacher?  
1-3 years   
4-6 years   
7-9 years   
10 and above years

4. Professional Rank: Certificate 'A'
- Asst Supt
- Senior Supt
- Principal Supt
- Asst Director

## SECTION B

### PREPARATION OF MENTEES

Please tick (✓) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. During the pre-internship, mentees were taught how to prepare lesson plans and teaching materials				
6. The pre-internship equipped me with practical skills for teaching				
7. I have been prepared adequately in the content area I am to teach before embarking on the internship.				

8. I acquired the skills of reflective practice during the pre-internship				
9. The pre-internship equipped me with the skills of writing action research				
10. The pre-internship equipped me with the skills of writing teaching philosophy				
11. The period for the pre-internship was adequate for the Mentees.				
12. Each mentee was actively involved in the pre- internship.				

## SECTION C

### DURATION OF THE INTERNSHIP

Please tick (✓) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Duration</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
13. The duration of the internship is too long				
14. The duration of the internship is quite enough to help me acquire the needed teaching skills				
15. The University should revert back to the four weeks off-campus teaching practice				
16. The one year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher training				
17. The internship should be for one term and not one full academic year				

**SECTION D**

**MENTEES VIEWS ON MENTORS ROLES**

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Views On Mentors</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
18. My mentor oriented me to the school and the community.				
19. My mentor arranged for me to observe him teach during the first three weeks of the internship.				
20. My mentor guided me to develop my action research.				
21. My mentor organizes periodic conferences and counselling sections for me.				
22. My mentor conducts parallel supervision with the university supervisor.				
23. My mentor encourages me to experiment with new ideas and styles of teaching				

**SECTION E**

**MENTEES' VIEWS ABOUT UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS**

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Views about University Supervisors</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
24. The sudden and unannounced appearance of university supervisors is unsettling to me (mentee)				
25. University supervisors do not find out from mentors the problems mentees face are				
26. University supervisors are too authoritative in their dealings with mentees.				
27. Supervisors do not organize pre-observation conferences before supervising mentees.				
28. The post observation conferences are always one-way-communication process from the supervisor to me				

29. I am hardly given the chance to give reasons why I acted in a certain way or used techniques which seemed wrong to the supervisor				
30. Supervisors award grades at the end of my teaching before holding post – observation conference				
31. University Supervisors should not be made to grade me during the internship				

## SECTION F

### BENEFITS OF THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
32. The internship programme offers me more opportunity to experience the job while under training				



<p>33. The internship programme helps to practicalise all the skills, knowledge and professional education I acquired theoretically</p>				
<p>34. The internship programme helps prepare me to meet the types of demand I would face as a beginning teacher</p>				
<p>35. The internship enables me to interact with, experience teachers and supervisors from whom I learn a lot</p>				
<p>36. The internship programme has brought cordial relationship between partnership schools and the University</p>				
<p>37. The internship programme helps to introduce me to a wide range of administrative duties and co-curricular activities</p>				
<p>38. The one year internship programme has helped in</p>				

transforming my teaching skills				
39. The programme has a better potential of producing competent teachers than the 4 weeks off campus teaching practice				

## SECTION G

### PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNSHIP

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Problems</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
40. I am overburdened with the internship responsibilities				
41. The yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough.				
42. Not all the mentees are observed by the University supervisor				
43. Mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around				
44. Mentees are not fully				

prepared for the internship				
45. It is difficult to write the action research while outside campus				
46. Partnership schools are not cooperative enough				
47. It is difficult to get a school for the programme				
48. Absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on problems of students and mentors				

## APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MENTORS

This is a research study intended to evaluate the one year internship programme of the University of Education, Winneba. The study is purely for academic purpose and will therefore, not be used for any other purpose. Be assured that the information you provide will be treated as confidential. I therefore implore your indulgence to respond to the following items as truthful as possible.

#### SECTION A

#### BACKGROUND TO RESPONDENTS

1. Gender

Male

Female

2. Professional qualification

Graduate professional

Graduate non-professional

3. Number of years as a teacher

1-5 years

6-10 years

11-15 years

16 and above

4. Number of years as a mentor

1 year

2 years

3 years

4 years and above

5. Did you do four weeks off – campus teaching practice of the on – year internship teaching practice?

4 weeks practice

1 year teaching practice

6. Have you been given official training by the university?

Yes

No

## SECTION B

### PREPARATION OF MENTORS

Please tick (✓) the response that reflects the extent to which agree or disagree with the following statement.

<b>Preparation</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
7.. I acquired the skill of reflective practice from the workshop				
8. The workshop equipped me				

with knowledge on action research				
9. The workshop equipped me with the skills of writing teaching philosophy				
10. I was equipped with the skills of evaluating interns lesson during the workshop				
11. was taken through the process of organizing pre-observation and post observation conferences				
12. I was taken through the process of assessing mentees based on the university performance standard.				

**SECTION C**

**DURATION OF THE INTERNSHIP**

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which agree or disagree with the following statement

<b>Duration</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
13. The duration of the internship is too long				
14. The duration of the internship is quite enough to enable mentees acquire the needed teaching skills				
15. The university should revert back to the four weeks off – campus teaching practice				
16. The one – year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher training				
17. The internship should be for one term and not one full year				

**SECTION D**

**RESPONSIBILITIES OF MENTORS (MENTORS RESPONSE)**

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which agree or disagree with the following statement

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
18. I oriented the mentee to the school and the community				
19. I arranged for the mentee to observe me teach during the first three weeks				
20. I guided the mentees to develop their action research and portfolios				
21. I organize periodic conferences and counselling sections for mentees				
22. I conduct parallel supervision with the university supervisor				



**SECTION E**

**MENTORS VIEW ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR**

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which agree or disagree with the following statement

<b>Views</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
23. The sudden and unannounced appearance of supervisors is unsettling to me as mentor				
24. The university supervisors does not find out from mentors problems the mentees face				
25. The university supervisors are too authoritative in their interaction with students				
26. Supervisors do not organized pre observation conferences before supervising the mentee				
27. Post observation conference by the supervisor are always a one – way				

communication from the supervisors to mentees				
28. The mentee is hardly given the chance to explain why he acted in a way or used a technique which seemed wrong to the supervisor				
29. Supervisors award grades at the end of mentees teaching before holding post-observation conferences.				
30. University superiors should not be made to supervise students during internship.				

## SECTION F

### BENEFITS OF THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which agree or disagree with the following statement.

<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
31. The internship programme offers the mentees more opportunity to experience the job while under training				
32. The internship programme helps to practicalise all the skills, knowledge, and professional education acquired theoretically.				
33. The programme helps prepare practicing teachers to meet the types of demand they would face as beginners.				
34. The internship enables mentees to interact with experienced teachers and supervisors from whom they				

learn a lot.				
28. The internship programme has brought cordial relationship between partnership schools and the university.				
35. The internship programme helps introduce mentees to a wide range of administrative duties and co-curricular activities.				
36. The internship programme has contributed in transforming the teaching skills of mentees.				
37. The internship programme has a better potential of producing competent teacher than the 4 weeks off campus teaching practice.				

**SECTION G**

**PROBLEM OF THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME**

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which agree or disagree with the following statement

<b>Problems</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
38. I am overburdened with the internship responsibilities				
39. The yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough.				
40. Not all the mentees are observed by the university supervisors.				
37. Mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around.				
41. Mentees are not fully prepared for the internship programme.				
42. It is difficult for mentees to write the action research while outside the university campus.				
43. Partnership schools are not				

cooperating with mentees				
44. Absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on problems of students and mentors				

## APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

This is a research study intended to evaluate the one year internship programme of the University of Education, Winneba. The study is purely for academic purpose and will therefore, not be used for any other purpose. Be assured that the information you provide will be treated as confidential. I therefore implore your indulgence to respond to the following items as truthful as possible.

### SECTION A

#### BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

Please tick (✓) the appropriate boxes

1. Gender:      Male        
                                Female
2. Are you a professionally trained teacher?  
                                Yes        
                                No
3. Have you been given official training by the university?  
                                Yes        
                                No

## SECTION B

### PREPARATION OF SUPERVISORS

Please tick (✓) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Preparation</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
4. I acquired the skill of reflective practice from the workshop				
5. The workshop equipped me with knowledge on action research				
6. The workshop equipped me with the skills of writing teaching philosophy				
7. I was equipped with the skills of evaluating interns lesson during the workshop				
8. was taken through the process of organizing pre-observation and post observation conferences				



9. I was taken through the process of assessing mentees based on the university performance standard.				
---	--	--	--	--

**SECTION C**

**DURATION OF THE INTERNSHIP**

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Duration</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
10. The duration of the internship is too long				
11. The duration of the internship is quite enough to help me acquire the needed teaching skills				
12. The University should revert back to the four weeks off-campus teaching practice				
13. The one year duration is good for mentees who have not had any initial teacher				

training				
14. The internship should be for one term and not one full academic year				

## SECTION D

### BENEFITS OF THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME

Please tick (✓) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
15. The internship programme offers me more opportunity to experience the job while under training				
16. The internship programme helps to practicalise all the skills, knowledge and professional education I acquired theoretically				
17. The internship programme helps prepare me to meet the types of demand I would face				

as a beginning teacher				
18. The internship enables me to interact with, experience teachers and supervisors from whom I learn a lot				
19. The internship programme has brought cordial relationship between partnership schools and the University				
20. The internship programme helps to introduce me to a wide range of administrative duties and co-curricular activities				
21 The one year internship programme has helped in transforming my teaching skills				
22. The programme has a better potential of producing competent teachers than the 4 weeks off campus teaching practice.				

## SECTION E

### PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNSHIP

Please tick (√) the response that reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<b>Problems</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
23. I am overburdened with the internship responsibilities				
24. The yearly allowance paid to mentors is not enough.				
25. Not all the mentees are observed by the University supervisor				
26. Mentees neglect their work when supervisors are not around				
27. Mentees are not fully prepared for the internship				
28. It is difficult to write the action research while outside campus				
29. Partnership schools are not cooperative enough				

30. It is difficult to get a school for the programme				
31. Absence of link coordinators to monitor and report on problems of students and mentors				