UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

ASSESSMENT OF SUPERVISION IN PUBLIC BASIC SCHOOLS

IN THE CAPE COAST METROPOLIS

BY

FAUSTINA BAIDOO

Dissertation Submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of master of Education Degree in Educational Administration.

OCTOBER, 2010

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

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

Signature ……………………………..   Date ………………………...

Candidate's Name: Faustina Baidoo

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of this dissertation was supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of dissertation laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Signature ……………………………..   Date… …………………….

Supervisor's Name: Dr. Mrs Rosemary Bosu

ABSTRACT

The study was concerned with supervision in public basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Data were collected using questionnaire and interview guide for head teachers, circuit supervisors, teachers and prefects in public basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The sample was made up of 125 teachers, 25 headteachers, 5 circuit supervisors and 45 prefects. Interview guide and the questionnaire were the instruments used for data collection. The instruments were pre-tested in 10 schools that did not form part of the main study. Data collected were analysed according to the research questions that guided the study.

The main findings were: Firstly, supervision of basic public schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis was not effective. Secondly, lack of logistics and motivation has caused ineffective supervision as head teachers, circuit supervisors and all teachers needed motivation before they could supervise effectively. Thirdly, head teachers, circuit supervisors and teachers agreed there was the need for logistics, motivation and regular visits by higher officials to enable them function effectively to improve teacher performance.

It is recommended among others that circuit supervisors and head teachers should make supervision a regular affair which could make teachers become familiar with supervision and the modern supervisory skills of circuit supervisors to improve teachers' performance in public basic schools. Again, circuit supervisors should be able to issue supervisory reports and also discuss observations with head teachers after supervision to enable them become aware of their teachers problems and help them to improve upon performance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my husband, Mr. M. S. Baidoo and my children,

Aba Otuwa Baidoo and Esi Duoduwa Ofori.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BECE   Basic Education Certificate Examination

CS   Circuit Supervisor

EO   Education Officer

GES   Ghana Education Service

ID   Inspectorate Division

MoE   Ministry of Education

INSET   In-service Training

NGOs   Non Governmental Organizations

COMEU   Conference of Managers of Education Units

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This study is focused on school supervision in public basic schools in Ghana with particular reference to the Cape Coast Metropolis. Supervision of teacher performance is a very important activity in schools that could lead to high output or academic performance. This chapter gives details of the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitation, limitation, definition of terms, and organization of the study.

Background of the Study

Teachers spend most of their instructional time to facilitate the learning process in the classroom. It has been stated that quality education for all children of school going age, which is now one of the government policies, can not be achieved without proper emphasis on the need for well trained teachers and supervisors who are motivated by appropriate conditions of service and social status (Ghana Education Service [GES], 2002). Due to this, the school inspectors who are circuit supervisors need to ensure that lessons are delivered as effectively and as efficiently as possible. It is the demand of the policy that gives rise to instructional supervision, which is the interactive process of helping a teacher to improve standards of teaching in a learning situation.

According to the GES (2002), there are two types of supervision in schools; the traditional supervision and clinical supervision. Traditional supervision emphasizes the teacher's defects. It also casts the supervisor the role of telling the teacher he cannot operate unless directed by someone. The inspectors during that time were seen as tin gods, all-knowing people who could have ultimate authority to fire, dismiss teachers, to discipline anybody in the school and to open or close schools at their own volition. Inspectors tiptoed to schools without the knowledge of teachers; sometimes leaving their cars miles away from the school premises. Inspectors were sometimes expected during weekends when the school was out of session to go round and reports were sent to the region and headquarters.

GES (2002) states that clinical supervision emphasizes teacher growth and assumes that teachers possess the drive and personal resources to solve their problems. It again tends to produce a self-directed teacher. There are also two forms of supervision, which are Internal and External Supervision. Internal supervision is done by the head teacher, teachers and prefects who co-ordinate with the circuit supervision at the basic level to maintain the school for higher output. External Supervision covers the performance of inspectors from Inspectorate Division (I.D.) from Ghana Education Service (G.E.S) who come to schools to conduct investigations into all aspect of activities in the school. The officers who come to the Basic schools are called circuit supervisors. The post of Circuit Supervisor was created in 1990, and the first batch of circuit supervisors replaced the circuit officers. Before then, the qualification of a circuit officer was

passes in five subjects in Ordinary Level and be of the rank of Principal Superintendent. Today, some circuit supervisors are first degree holders who give clinical supervision to teachers at the basic level and have to report to the Assistant Director in charge of supervision. In addition, the G.E.S. (Act 506) established the District Oversight Committee to oversee proper functioning of education at the District Level and to work with the School Management committee to promote teaching and learning. These officers have been trained to visit schools under their jurisdiction to ensure that maximum performance standards set by the government are maintained.

Presently the roles of circuit supervisors include: visiting schools during instructional time, promoting effective teaching and learning in schools, interpreting educational policies to teachers and helping them to understand the policies, promoting effective school management, liaising between the schools and the District Education Directorate, organizing in-service training (INSET) for the professional development of teachers, promoting healthy school-community relations, monitoring the achievement and performance of pupils and staff, preparing work schedule approval of the District Director of Education, and submitting reports on individual schools. The Circuit Supervisor (C.S) collates statistics on the schools in the circuit, undertakes other special assignment or request of district education directorate, the school or the community, recommends teachers promotion and awards and appraises the performance of head teachers (GES, 2002).

A supervisor should have supervisory skills and strategies for working with individuals or group of teachers in an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence. A supervisor must consider the characteristics of individual and the influence of work environment and the teaching profession to help improve quality teaching and effective participation and efficiency in teaching (Glickman, 1990).

Currently, a supervisor needs not always to find faults with a teacher but should encourage him or her to build confidence in him or herself to overcome some of the difficulties in teaching. This is because the supervisor is expected to mentor and develop the teacher to succeed. In this process, the teacher is allowed to request for a feedback on specific aspects of the teaching profession. It entails reflecting on the significance of what is happening around and how to get them to work together. Again, it involves the attempt of getting all concerned aware of the supervision so as to know what is expected of them to make the vision work to bring transformation which is satisfying and productive. The process requires an open, flexible and inquiring attitude by both the supervisor and the teacher. Comparing the Circuit Supervisor with that of Education Officer the latter is more or less a manager of the school who, 'tiptoed' to the school without informing even the head, likewise the class teacher.

The headteacher, teachers and prefects conduct internal supervision in the school. The head manages people, instructional time, co-curricular activities, learning resources and financial matters. This involves delegating duties, maintaining discipline, organizing staff meetings, communicating better with

pupils, teachers and educational personnel and maintaining good interpersonal relationships.

Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) saw the head's roles as a supervisor who is to work collaboratively with the teachers under him to create favourable circumstances for learning in schools. To him, the head looks for the teachers' hidden talents and encourages him to come out, and to establish good rapport between himself and his subordinates and provides leadership roles for teachers. An effective head during supervision should be an active and a collaborative leader who works with the community people to shape the school as a work place in relation to shared goals with teacher collaboration, teacher learning opportunities, teacher certainty, teacher commitment and pupils learning. To achieve these, the head ensures that teachers make effective use of curricular materials by managing time which is put on the time table, syllabuses and scheme of work, notebooks and pens as tools for planning that the headteacher obtains from the appropriate source and make them available to teachers. He also, manages the time a teacher reports for duty and instructional time for teaching by making use of time book.

Concerning co-curricular activities, he schedules activities, supervises the activities, organizes open days and special occasions, and issues rules and regulations about co-curricular activities. He also manages school funds by keeping financial records and accounts for all funds collected and disbursed. The head is also, responsible for accurate and effective vetting of lesson notes and ensuring that continuous assessment records are kept up–to–date by teachers. The head reviews the preparation of lesson notes, so as to guide the teacher to teach in

an orderly and planned manner, not deviating from the syllabus and teaching from known to unknown. It is imperative that the head vets lesson notes for quality teaching. The head must regularly check the continuous assessment records to ensure that reliable records are kept and produced in good time. All these are supervisory roles done by the head teacher (Ministry of Education [MOE], 1994).

Teachers supervise children's work in both classroom and outside classroom. They manage pupils' instructional time and seek to maintain discipline in the classroom and on the school compound. There are series of courses such as; in-service training, refresher courses, workshops and seminars which have been introduced to review teaching techniques. These are organized for personnel in educational institutions to effect higher output. Effective supervision is needed to direct the instructional professional activities of education to improve teacher performance.

Despite these transformational efforts, there is still the need for teachers to improve performance especially in the public basic schools. A number of people attribute the problem to factors such as lack of logistics and equipment, natural environment and classroom infrastructure, poor condition of service for teachers, large class size, workload of teachers, motivation for teachers, many subjects found in the curriculum and lack of teacher dedication to work. The current consensus is attributed to ineffective supervision in basic schools. This is proved by the Minister of Education's statement at Ho during the 23rd National Conference of Managers of Education Units (COMEU) that "Ineffective

supervision has made otherwise good teachers to perform poorly resulting in low teaching and learning outcomes" (Daily Graphic, 1997, p. 12).

Due to the prevailing situation, on 8th December 2003, a workshop was organized by the Inspectorate Division (ID) for basic school head teachers in the Cape Coast Metropolis, to be trained to carry out effective supervision at the grass root level to improve the situation. The head teachers have now been trained and thereafter a lot of in-service trainings (INSET) are organized for them. They have been given the veto power to supervise properly in schools together with the circuit supervisors to ensure that maximum performance standards are achieved. Therefore, head teachers and circuit supervisors have to carry out their responsibilities well to improve supervision to enhance the falling standard of education in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

In the Cape Coast Metropolis, when the Basic Education Certificate Examination (B.E.C.E) results are released, the private schools that recruit majority untrained teachers perform creditably well due to effective supervision. Attached to the appendices is the statement of results of 2008 Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) aggregate and position. In the private schools, the proprietors are strict in supervising the activities of the school. They always put pressure on the teachers to perform effectively for higher output and good results. This does not happen in the public basic schools where teachers take things for granted that the public schools are for the government. However, today, some teachers' lateness to work and complete absence from school are having a great toll on the academic performance in public basic schools. Effective external

supervision is needed to check this and apathy towards work among most teachers to complement the efforts of internal supervisory roles. This study seeks to find out whether the influence of courses and Inset given to circuit supervisors and head teachers on supervision contribute to effectiveness or otherwise of supervision in Basic Schools in Cape Coast Metropolis on teacher performance.

Statement of the Problem

The Minister of Education affirmed that "Ineffective supervision has made many otherwise good teachers to perform poorly resulting in low teaching and learning outcomes" (Daily Graphic, 1997, p. 12). This means the nation perceives that performance of teachers and learning outcomes of students have fallen due to ineffective supervision. It is therefore worrisome, more especially to the public basic schools, which have professional teachers perform below average as compared to private schools. This is the time the nation needs quality education, which should go with quality teaching and learning. All stakeholders, Donor Agencies and Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have channelled material and financial resources for supervision in public basic schools to improve the process. As a result, of the current perception of ineffective supervision in Ghanaian Public Basic Schools, this study is set out to assess the frequency and scope of supervision in public basic schools, its effect on teacher performance in Cape Coast Metropolis and the factors that influence supervision.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study was to assess the extent of supervision in public basic schools in Cape Coast Metropolis. The specific objectives of the study were to find out the following:

1. The nature of supervision in public basic schools

2. The frequency and scope of supervision in basic schools in Cape Coast Metropolis.

3. The factors that influence supervision

4. The effect of supervision on teacher performance

Research Questions

The following Research Questions guided the study.

1. What is the nature of supervision in basic schools?

2. What is the scope of supervision in basic schools?

3. What are the factors that influence supervision in basic schools?

4. What is the influence of supervision on teacher performance?

Significance of the Study

School supervision is very important to determine what and how teaching and learning are done in schools. According to Educational Committee Report (MOE, 1994), everybody in education accepts that supervision has a great potential to improve performance but this is not working because of lack of commitment.

9

The study provides documentary evidence to supervisors; headteachers and circuit supervisors of the nature of supervision in relation to teachers' performance. This would help to provide information on factors that influence supervision in terms of facilities needed by teachers, head teachers, and circuit supervisors to become more committed to improve teacher performance.

The study would also, enable head teachers and circuit supervisors to examine the influence of supervision on teacher performance. The findings provide evidence to policy makers and school management to make informed decisions towards the improvement of supervision in basic schools.

Delimitation

The study restricted to the public basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The reason was that Cape Coast metropolis has a sizeable number of public schools with an appreciable pupil attendance. This meant that there are several professionally trained teachers who can help implement effective supervision in schools. Besides, data collection covered instructional supervision as well as internal and external supervision, which are carried out by headteachers, circuit supervisors and external supervisors from the Metro Education Directorate.

Limitations

A research study on the assessment of school supervision should have covered all basic schools in Cape Coast Metropolis and even the whole of Central Region. However, as a descriptive research, it was necessary to conduct it on a

small scale. The study therefore, covered only twenty five schools made up of twenty mixed schools, three girls' only schools and two boys' only schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. In view of this it is believed not every aspect of supervision in the basic schools was brought into the open. In spite of using the representative sample for the study, the findings can still be generalised to all the public basic schools in the metropolis because data collection and analysis met the standards in scientific research.

Definition of Terms

Certain words and terms were used which might not be familiar to the reader due to the purpose of the study. Such words and the terms have been explained below.

Quality Education: this is an educational policy referring to better environment for learning, competencies and skills of teachers, good school attendance, good pupil interaction, good pupils output of work and good learning outcome.

Teacher Performance: this refers to what the teacher actually does in the course of executing his duties in the classroom, outside the classroom, his punctuality and regularity.

Circuit: a specific location with a number of schools assigned to an officer for a purpose of supervision.

Situational report: this refers to a form which gives information on conduct of teachers and all other events that happen in the school.

11

Organisation of the Study

The organization of the study was done in five chapters. Chapter One touched on the background to the study, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitation and limitation, definition of terms and organization of the study.

Chapter Two focused on review of literature. Documents that have information on the topic were reviewed. These include books, newspapers, journals and many others.

Chapter Three comprised the methodology used in the study. Contents of the chapter included the research design and rationale, population and sample, instrument used for collection of data and pilot testing of the instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis.

Chapter Four consisted of data presentation, analysis and discussion. Chapter Five deliberated on summary, conclusion drawn after the analysis, recommendations and suggestions for further research work.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews related literature documented by other recognized authorities and researchers. In this respect, this literature review focuses on: Concept and brief history of supervision, Types of supervision, Clinical supervision, Collegial supervision, Self–directed supervision and Informal supervision. It also, focuses on Inspection, Laissez–faire supervision, Coercive supervision, Supervision as Training and Guidance for the teacher, Supervision as Democratic Professional Leadership, Determinants of effective supervision, the Supervisor, the General supervisor, the Specialist supervisor, Functions of supervision, Supervisor behaviour, Attitude towards supervision, Teacher performance and Importance of supervision

Concepts and Brief History of Supervision

Supervision is a necessary function of the school administration. The term supervision is typical of the semantic difficulty that is unfortunately present in the field of education. Supervision is interpreted or explained differently by different observers within the field of professional education.

Administration is the totality of organizing, directing, coordinating and evaluating a formal organization. Supervision is one of the functions required of administration. From this point of view, supervision is that sub division of the

13

total process of educational administration, which is devoted principally to increasing the effectiveness of those engaged in the direct performance of the central task of educational enterprise. It deals with improving the teaching-learning process, and it is at the centre of both the instructional programme and the productive organization of the school.

The generalized idea formed about supervision is to have authority to direct teachers to work well. Supervision emerged slowly as a distinct practice that was always in relation to institutions' academic, cultural and professional dynamics that have historically generated the complex idea of schooling. Supervision is a factor that influences standards of schools in the country. Its immediate purpose is to improve teachers' performance and to assist teachers to study pupils and to adjust learners to their needs, interest and capabilities.

Supervision of educational personnel has come to stay with us since the colonial period to help to address the needs of the quality education. In 1852, Governor Stephen Hill passed an Educational Ordinance to provide better education for inhabitants of the Gold Coast (McWilliams & Kwamena-Poh, 1975). Another Education Ordinance provided in 1882, was Inspection of Schools, which required the inspectors to report their findings to the General Board of Education. As an improvement to this Ordinance, there was the appointment of the Director of Education for the Gold Coast alone in 1890, whose sole responsibility was to ensure that teachers would be better supervised and instructed for best methods of teaching children (McWilliam & Kwamena-Poh, 1975).

The term inspector was gradually replaced in British West Africa by that of Education Officer. During that time, the Ministry of Education was both the implementing and authorizing agent. There was a Chief Education Officer known as Inspector whose main pre-occupation was to see to the efficient running of schools, proper disbursement of government funds, keeping government informed of the work in the schools, sometimes encouraging the teachers, and at other times coercing them. The exercise of control that characterized traditional supervision of teachers has definitely given way to the one that encourages teachers to set their own standards and improve upon their work. The supervisor looks for a teacher's hidden talent and encourages it to come out. Since the relationship between the supervisor and his co-workers affects the smooth running of a school, the establishment of good rapport between them is important (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978).

Musaazi (1982) indicates that supervision focuses upon the improvement of instruction. It deals with a continuous redefinition of goals with the realization for learning and for co-operative efforts, and with the nurturing creativeness to the problem of teaching and learning. Gray (1984) defines supervision as getting things done through people. Also, supervision is an activity centered on what teachers do in the performance of their assigned roles and have, as its central function, a continual search for improvement in their performance. Drake and Roe (2003) also argue that supervision is the general overseeing and controlling, management, administration, evaluation and accountability of schools and teachers. They contend that authors of professional literature use supervision

interchangeably with administration, management and evaluation. They also illustrate much of criticism of current supervisory practice with the observation that the teacher viewed them (supervisory) as being perfunctory with little or no impact on actual teaching performance. This attests to the fact that teachers work under duress when there are supervisors as it was found during the study and as soon as supervisors leave the scene they coil into their shells. Glickman (1990) on the other hand, supports the practice of instructional supervision with his observation that "we can think of supervision as the glue of a successful school" (p.17). If the supervision is the glue, one must wonder just how strong the bond is and why the practice comes under such condition.

Lucio and McNeil as cited in Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand (1977) are of the view that supervision is about the determination of ends to be achieved, the process and procedures for attaining the goals, and the evaluation of results. Swearingen as cited in Musaazi (1982) indicates that supervision focuses upon the improvement of instruction. Thus, supervision is a consciously planned programme for the improvement and consolidation of instruction. Supervision deals with improvement of on-the-job performance of teachers, administrators and all classifications of professional workers. The Commonwealth Secretariat (1975) also stipulates that, supervision cannot precisely be distinguished from the word "administration".

It seems more useful to think of supervision as encompassed within administration. It continues that supervision is one of a subset of functions required by the administrative process, which are, organizing, managing,

directing, coordinating and evaluation. Its distinction of supervision is more concerned with the relationship between people of whom one is more by status or acknowledged expertise is superior; administration is about management to achieve its objectives. It further argues that 'supervision' and 'administration' are involved in the following process: planning, decision-making, organising communicating, influencing and evaluating.

Neagley and Evans (1980) see supervision as any service for teachers that eventually results in improving instruction, learning and the curriculum. It consists of positive, dynamic, democratic actions designed to improve instruction through all concerned individuals – the child, the teacher, the supervisor, the administrator and the parent or the other layperson.

In Ghana, supervision of instruction in schools started in the early part of the 15th century with the inception of the castle schools at Elmina and Christiansborg. Teaching and supervision in such schools were the responsibility of the clergy, catechists, church leaders and chaplains. Supervision took the form of super ordinate and subordinate relationship.

When the administration of the castle schools improved, organised supervision of teaching and learning activities in the school system began, and this could be said to have begun in 1852, when the British Colonial Government passed the Education Ordinance. It aimed at providing education for the indigenes of the Gold Coast Colony. According to McWilliam and Kwabena-Poh (1975), this ordinance laid down the structures for the management and supervision of schools which qualified for government 'grand in aid'. There were to be a Board

of Education to administer the school system and an inspector of schools whose duty was to inspect schools and to see that the various bodies managing the schools observed the conditions under which 'grants in aid' were to be paid. The inspector of schools was to send reports to the Board of Education.

At this time, supervision was transferred to full time officials. These supervisors were indeed a terror to head teachers alike as their roles or techniques and procedures were crude and highly subjective and contributed little to instructional improvement. Their unprofessional approach to supervision was due to lack of training that has left a legacy of terror, fear and intimidation that is associated with instructional supervision. In 1857, Rev. Hassells, the colonial chaplain was appointed supervisor and inspector of schools. He was also, instructed to train and recruit good and efficient teachers who were later sent to open schools in Eastern and Western Wassa and Akyem (McWilliam & Kwamena-Poh, 1975). A brief history of Ghanaian Education System reveals that supervision in Ghana was done to control education for Mulatto children and to promote quality education and good character in children. That made formal system of supervision well recognized as an outgrowth of universal education.

Among the provisions in the Ordinance was the payment of government grants to government-assisted and mission schools and that was based on enrolment. In order to enforce this provision, a centralized general school board was set up in Ghana with a mandate to establish local boards in other colonies. The Education Act of 1882, provided for the appointment of an inspector of schools to supervise the work of the schools, to ensure that managers of schools

observed the conditions for the award of grants and report to the Board of Education. However, for lack of personnel, Rev. M. Sunter, a former Principal of Fourah Bay College in Sierra Leone was appointed the first inspector of schools under the general now called the supervisor in the British Colonies. As a supervisor, he criticized the method of teaching in the schools and reported in 1884 that the English Language was the only civilized and useful medium of instruction for the schools. Thus, a high premium was placed on English Language at the expense of local language during the colonial period. Sunter was ineffective due to the vast area of coverage of work so he described the Ordinance as unworkable and ridiculous complicated. Supervision placed emphasis on pupils' enrolment and attendance to school. Supervision was largely limited to Cape Coast schools due to impassable nature of the roads, thereby making travelling ''difficult and impossible''.

Upon the report and recommendations made by Sunter, amendments were made on the Educational Ordinance, and in 1887, another ordinance was passed to replace that of 1852. These two ordinances could be said to be the first legal force behind the management and supervision of educational activities in Ghana. In 1890, an education department was established under the new ordinance. It was to make rules and regulations for the maintenance of standards of work in the schools and to provide a system of certification of teachers. One of the rules made by the education department which directly affected teaching and learning activities in the schools was the obnoxious 'payment by result' system. Under this system, 'grants in aid' and teachers' salaries were paid in accordance with the

number of pupils who passed the inspector's test (McWilliam & Kwamena-Poh, 1975).

In 1908, John Roger who was appointed Governor of the Gold Coast quickly set up a committee to make recommendations for the advancement of education in Ghana. Among the recommendations were the termination of the payment by results and the introduction of payment by general efficiency of schools. In order to enforce and maintain this provision, the concept of school boards was withheld and some inspectors of schools were appointed. These inspectors were assigned the responsibility of inspecting schools to ascertain their general efficiency in classroom illustration, pupil and teacher attendance to school and environmental cleanliness (Graham, 1971).

During that period, supervision simply meant inspection of work of the teachers and other kinds of activities undertaken in the schools. Inspection was not to improve instructions but to determine whether teachers had performed the task assigned them and if not, measures were taken against them. The supervisor was seen as a knowledgeable person who had to teach the teacher the right methodology. It is questionable if much improvement of teaching and learning resulted from the activities of these early inspectors of schools since their main objective was to see whether rules and conditions laid down for the payment of government 'grants in aid' were complied with by head teachers. They did not concern themselves with offering suggestions as to how teaching and learning could be improved in the schools (McWilliam & Kwamena-Poh, 1975).

The years just after 1920 were a period that began a system of supervision that aimed at improving standard of teaching and learning in the schools. During this period, which began with the governorship of F.W.G. Guggisberg, the training of Africans for appointment as inspectors of schools was given prominence. The eleventh of Guggisberg's sixteen principles for education states: "A sufficient staff of sufficient African inspectors of schools must be trained and maintained" (McWilliam & Kwamena-Poh, 1975). A thorough system of supervision is indispensable for the vitality and efficiency of the educational system. The staff of Government Inspectors must be adequate and their reports should be based on frequent and unhurried visits and not primarily on the results of examinations. It is their duty to make educational aims understood and give friendly advice and help in carrying them out. In pursuit of this policy, the government organised training programmes and appointed inspectors and assistant inspectors of schools who worked more towards the improvement of teaching and learning.

Two types of supervisors evolved during the period. They were government-trained and appointed inspectors of schools (later known as education officers); and the superintendents of schools as well as visiting teachers who were appointed by the managing bodies (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978). The inspectors of schools were civil servants and were considered agents of the government. They were to see to it that teachers worked to the maximum satisfaction of the employer, the government. The superintendents of schools and the visiting teachers were experienced elementary school teachers or tutors of training

colleges. Their duties included visiting schools to give professional guidance to teachers and to see to the administration and the moral aspects of the schools.

It should be noted, however, that a sharp distinction existed between teachers and supervisors, especially between teachers and the government-appointed education officers. There was a kind of 'master-servant' relationship in which the master ensured that the servant worked to his satisfaction. The servant (teacher) was coerced and threatened with various punishments. Education officers in those days were considered as people with the master-mind. They felt they could assess teachers' performance and teach them the best methods of teaching. They therefore, took to themselves the right to punish school workers and teachers who did not perform to the standard set up by them.

The primary objective of school visits and inspections was to find what had gone wrong and not to assist the teacher. To perform this duty effectively, the education officer was to have very little fraternal interactions with teachers. He was to visit the school without giving prior information to teachers in order to get teachers red-handed in the act of their wrong-doings. It was alleged that some inspectors went into classrooms through windows in order to conceal their presence from teachers. The unannounced visits, it was also believed, enabled the inspector to find out exactly what went on in the school (Musaazi, 1982).

Supervision of learning and teaching activities was seen as an aspect of educational administration specifically concerned with raising teachers to a set standard of performance and not the improvement of the general learning and teaching environment in the school. Emphasis was therefore, upon maintaining

the 'status quo' of the system, the teacher was to follow closely the accepted practices of the educational system and thus a close eye was to be kept on him in order that he might not deviate from the accepted principles and methods. This system of supervision could only be compared with a system practised in America in the early 1800s which Neagley and Evans (1980) described as "snoopervision" instead of supervision.

One other major role played by the educational officer was that of a teacher-educator. It was assumed that there were definite methods of teaching and because of the superior mind of the supervisor he could educate teachers on these methods. The inspector, therefore, demonstrated to the teachers the methods which he considered best and expected the teachers to adopt without questioning. This role of the teacher-educator could be justified to some extent considering the fact that most teachers in those days were mostly untrained.

By the 1960s, a new wind of supervision began to blow. The terror that surrounded the education officers' and the principal supervisors' visits began to dwindle. Modern educational administration has realised that the time has come when the objective of supervision should be considered in the light of trends which have become tested common educational experiences. There has, therefore, been a gradual evolution of the concept of supervision and the 'master-servant' relationship is giving way to a system in which teachers and supervisors interact and consider one another as co-workers working towards a common goal (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978; Amuzu-Kpeglo, 1987).

Obviously, the nature of supervision has undergone some changes. With the establishment of Ghana Education Service and its new structure, Inspectorate Directorates were created at the District, Regional, Municipal and Metropolitan levels respectively. The Inspectorate Division was responsible for school inspections and evaluating administrative standards in pre-university educational instructions. Inspecting officers worked at the district and circuit levels inspecting and visiting Primary and Junior Secondary schools. The early inspectors assessed the work of teachers and pupils through inspection, which was characterised by force, issuing of orders and commands. Today, supervision is collaborative and democratic. It aims at giving professional guidance towards teaching learning process.

Generally, teachers are said to have no zeal for supervision because it is done cursory and therefore, it has no impact at all on actual teaching performance. However, Musaazi (1985) and Gray (1984) view supervision to centre around what teachers do in performance of their assigned roles and to search for improvement in their performance. They further considered supervision as a subset of administration. This view is supported by the argument of Drake and Roe (2003) together with Commonwealth Secretariat (1975) stipulated that supervision is part of administration which involved the process of planning, organizing, decision making, communicating, influencing and evaluating. Here, supervision is a subset of administration and therefore, if supervisory roles are well performed, teachers would be spurred on to work better for their efforts to be

appreciated and directed. Effective supervision should be conducted constantly to improve teacher performance and not only when a teacher is due for promotion.

Types of Supervision

Supervision is the interactive process of helping a teacher to improve standards of teaching in a learning situation. This is put in place to ensure that lessons are delivered as effectively as possible. There are two types namely: Internal and External supervision. Neagley and Evans (1980) have provided literature on these two types of supervision within various institutions by heads, together with teachers and prefects of a school and state that whilst external supervision focuses on supervision with local and national offices, internal supervision is conducted within the school level. Witziers, Bosker and Krüger (2003) confirm the duties of a headteacher as sustaining staff supervision and ensuring continuous programme of curriculum improvement.

The Ministry of Education (2002) and the Ghana Education Service (2002) state the duties of the headteacher as: managing people, managing financial matters, managing co-curricular activities, managing instructional time, managing teaching and learning resources, assessing teacher and pupil performance and improving relationship between school and the community.

On his part, Musaazi (1982) stipulates that internal supervision to be where the head is to ensure the improvement and making of instructional process effective. External supervision is viewed by Halpin (1965) as a process where a complementary role is played. His perception on external supervision is "as complementing the role and duties of internal supervision by providing

professional advice and guidance to teachers" (p.135). External supervision in basic schools is district based. The districts are divided into circuits, which are the centres of operation under circuit supervisors (GES, 2002). According to the GES (2002), circuit supervisor's roles include monitoring the achievement and performance of staff and pupils and promoting quality teaching and learning in all basic schools. Their roles also seek to be promoting effective school management, organising in-service training for teachers, interpreting educational policies to teachers, liaising between schools and the District Education Office, promoting healthy school-community relations, appraising head teachers, and recommending teachers for promotion.

External supervision is conducted in Ghanaian Basic Schools but twice a term according to Ministry of Education (2002) and only when a teacher is due for promotion. Internal supervision is conducted daily and one would have expected that external supervision by circuit supervisors would have been stepped up to promote the performance of classroom teachers.

Currently, new forms of supervision have been developed. Sergiovanni (2009) mentions four options of supervision namely: clinical supervision, collegial supervision, self-directed supervision and informal supervision. He considers how these options could be successfully matched to the needs, professional development levels and personality characteristics of the teacher.

Clinical Supervision

A form of supervision which educational writers have directed their attention to is clinical supervision. This type of supervision over the years has been developed to change the unproductive pattern of communication and supervision (MOE, 2002).

Cogan (1973) developed clinical supervision in the field of supervision at Harvard University. Additionally, Ghana Education Service has also recognized the critical leadership role the circuit supervisor must play. The supervisor has been provided with reference material that is the Circuit Supervisor's Handbook, which has spelt out what clinical supervision is, for effective supervision to improve teacher performance. In the handbook of circuit supervisors; clinical supervision aims at helping the teacher, identifying and classifying problems, receiving data from the supervisor and developing solutions with the aid of the supervisor (MOE, 2002). Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1980) state that clinical supervision has been defined as a phase of instructional supervision, which draws its data from first-hand observation of actual teaching events and involves face to face (and associated) interaction between the supervisor and the teacher in the analysis of teaching behaviours and activities for instructional improvement. This type of supervision is based on teacher supervisor mutual relationship and the two, work together as colleagues rather than supervisor-subordinate relationship.

Cogan (1973), Acheson and Gall (1987) describe clinical supervision as comprising five stages or phases. Even though, they have different names for the

stages, they all have similar content, which establish the supervisor-teacher relationship, agree on the focus of the observation, observing and collecting descriptive data, analyzing and strategizing the data, discussing the meaning of data and its implication for the teachers' behaviour and planning for long-term development and future observations. Many scholars have discovered evidence of teacher growth in self-confidence and self-directed because of clinical supervision experiences. In the clinical supervision setting, several studies have proved that desirable changes in the teacher's classroom behaviour do occur. Studies on the perceptions of clinical supervision by teachers and administrators concluded that educational writers agree with basic assumptions of clinical supervision, even though the teacher tends to agree more strongly with assumptions than specific procedures. Openness and rapport are important characteristics in the clinical supervisor-teacher relationship. Clinical supervision is more democratic than the other supervisory approaches.

Collegial Supervision

Glatthorn (1984) defines collegial supervision as a "moderately formalized process by which two or more teachers agree to work together for their own professional growth, usually observing each other's classroom, giving each other feedback about the observation and discussing shared professional concerns" (p. 287). Glatthorn uses the phrase co-operative professional development to describe a collegial process within which teachers agree to work together for their own professional development. He prefers this term to peer supervision or collegial supervision, fearing these labels might suggest that teachers are supervising one

another in a management sense. Co-operative professional development is a non-evaluative strategy for teachers to help one another as equals and professional colleagues.

Co-operative professional development or collegial supervision can take many forms. In some schools, teachers may be organised into teams of three. In forming such teams, teachers will have opportunity with which they like to work. Very often, the principal or the supervisor selects at least one member of the team, but there are no rigid rules for selecting teams. Once formed, the teachers may choose to work together in a number of ways. They may for example, simply agree to observe each other's classes, providing help according to the desires of the teacher being observed. The teachers then might confer, giving one another informal feedback and otherwise discussing issues of teaching considered to be important (Silins, Mulford & Zarins, 2002).

It is a good idea for collegial supervision to extend beyond classroom observation. It should provide a setting in which teachers can informally discuss problems they are facing, share ideas, help one another in preparing lesson and provide other supports to one another (Murphy, 1990).

Self-directed Supervision

Glatthorn (1984) suggests another form of supervision, which he calls 'self-directed' supervision. Here, teachers working alone assume responsibility for their own professional development. They develop a yearly plan comprising targets derived from an assessment of their own needs. This plan is then shared with the supervisor, principal or other designated individual. Teachers are allowed

a great deal of leeway in developing the plan, but the supervisor should ensure that the plan and selected targets are both realistic and attainable. At the end of the specified period, normally a year, the supervisor meets to discuss the teacher's progress in meeting professional development targets. Teachers are expected to provide some form of documentation, such as time logs, tapes, samples of students' work and other artifacts, illustrating progress towards goals.

A number of problems are associated with approaches to supervision that rely heavily on target setting. The supervisor, for example, sometimes rigidly adheres to pre-specified targets and sometimes imposes targets on teachers. Rigidly applying a target setting system unduly focuses on the evaluation and it limits teachers to the vent originally anticipated or stated. When this happens, teaching energies and concerns are directed to a pre-stated target and other areas of importance not targeted can be neglected. Target setting is meant to help and facilitate not to hinder the self-improvement progress (Mulford & Silins, 2003).

In the words of Leithwood and Jantzi (2000), individual approaches to supervision are ideal for teachers who prefer to work alone or who because of schedule or other difficulties are unable to work with other teachers. This supervisory option is efficient in use of time, less costly and less demanding in its reliance on others than the case with other options. For these reasons, self-directed supervision is a feasible and practical approach. This approach is ideally suited to competent and self-directed teachers.

Informal Supervision

According to Leithwood and Jantzi (2000), informal supervision is a casual encounter between supervisor and teachers at work and is characterised by frequent but brief and informal observation of teachers. Typically, no appointments are made and visits are not announced. Successful informal supervision requires that the teacher anticipates certain expectations. This approach requires that supervisors have the right and responsibility to be part of all teaching that takes place in the schools. They are instructional partners to all teachers in every classroom for every teaching-learning situation. When informal supervision is properly in place, principals and supervisors are viewed as relatively common figures in the classrooms, coming and going as part of the natural flow of a school's daily work.

From the perspective of Glatthorn (1984) differential system of supervision should require all teachers to participate in informal supervision. In addition to informal supervision, he will be involved in one additional approach, such as clinical, collegial or self-directed supervision. In selecting additional options, principals and supervisors should try to accommodate teacher preferences but should retain final responsibility for deciding the appropriateness of a selected option and indeed should reserve the right to veto teacher choice.

Elsbree and Nully (1967) observe that there had been changes in the leadership roles. The supervisor is called upon to play and for that matter supervisory activities have also undergone changes. These changes, according to them, have come about as a result of the rapid development in modern socio-

economic and political activities and the growth in technology which have affected educational thought and practices.

Supervision has to undergo changes in purposes, scope and nature in order to keep abreast of the time. Modern supervision, according to Elsbree and Nully (1967) has gone through five stages of development described as inspection, laissez-faire supervision, coercive supervision, supervision as training and guidance for the teacher and supervision as a democratic professional leadership (Mulford & Silins, 2003).

Inspection

In viewpoint of Hallinger and Heck (1998), inspection refers to the specific occasion when the school is examined and evaluated as a place of learning. It also means the constant and continuous process of guidance based on frequent visits which focus attention on one or more aspect of the school and its organization. How well this purpose is achieved depends upon skills and efficiency of the inspector in working with the teachers Musaazi (1985). Inspection has now been replaced by supervision which meant to inspect the work of teachers to help teacher to conform to lay down principles of teaching methods, Nwokafor, Ighalo, Ogunsanwo, Olu and Nwankwo (1981); Kochhar (1970). They claimed that inspection is focused on teacher in school during instructional period. Kochhar (1970) contends that this type of supervision perceived that things should be as static as they were originally, even against the stark reality of changing trends. This type of supervision was conducted by one person who was the inspector who inspected classroom, school compound, school records including accounts and

this type of inspection was used as threats of discipline to instil fear or stamp his authority among teachers and pupils. Gywnn (1961) also concluded that inspection was not used to help teachers to improve upon instructional delivery, rather it was meant to retain teachers who performed well and fire those who could not perform.

Laissez – faire Supervision

Laissez-Faire supervision is another type of supervision, which a teacher is allowed to teach in the manner that he wants (Gywnn, 1961). With this type of supervision, little effort is made to assist teachers to improve the instructional programme. As soon as the superior leaves the work place, the staff also leaves and on his return, he would find the task incomplete and the work place deserted, (Drake & Roe, 2003).

Although, the basic tenets of clinical supervision appeal to many educators, there is little evidence to indicate that it is being widely used. These types of supervision are used to check the work of teachers to ensure that they are in conformity with the laid down principles and methods of teaching (Glatthorn, 1984).

Coercive Supervision

With the extension of educational opportunities to many people in the society, Elsbree and Nully (1967) indicate that there is the need for a standardised and structured curriculum which all pupils in the school system must go through. Closely linked with the structured curriculum was the belief in 'time-tabling'. The

result of this, the authors indicate, was the practice which gave some authority, the power to decide which body of knowledge was necessary, which method of teaching was the best and at which grade level should a pupil be considered as having acquired enough knowledge. This practice, the writers posit, undoubtedly, came out with a coercive method of supervising teaching and learning activities. Supervision was seen as a process of getting the teacher to teach the prescribed subjects on the curriculum according to schedule and in the manner the authority thought to be the most effective.

The supervisor, in this practice, was considered as a person who was more knowledgeable than the teacher and could teach the teacher the best methods of teaching. Gurr, Drysdale and Mulford (2006) state that the supervisor's duties are to visit schools and observe teachers in the classroom and at the end of his observations, he holds conferences or meetings with them. At such meetings, the principal commends teachers whose teaching he feels is in accordance with what he knows to be good teaching. He criticises those he thinks performed poorly and recommends better methods of going about their work to them. He expects teachers to go strictly by his recommendations. There are follow-up visits to check whether teachers had followed the recommendations and had modified their teaching to conform to the dictates of the superior authority.

For Gurr, Drysdale and Mulford (2006), this type of supervision is based on fallacious assumptions. They argue that "It is ridiculous to assume that some 'authority' or 'group of authorities' should be able to decide those things with children whom they do not know how they should learn" (p.142). They note

further that the idea that there is one best way of teaching is rejected in modern educational practices. This concept of supervision is not only very narrow in purpose, scope and nature but it is also based on wrong assumptions.

Supervision as Training and Guidance for the Teacher

This concept of supervision, according to the writers, was developed as a result of the philosophy that education should be a process of guiding growth. This philosophy made educators realise the loopholes in coercion as a technique in attaining learning outcomes and recognised the need to solicit learners' voluntary co-operation in the learning process (Hord & Sommers, 2008; Elsbree & Nully, 1967; Neagley & Evans, 1980).

The imprints of the discovery on supervision were the realisation that instead of coercing the teacher to teach according to the dictates of the authority, supervision should aim at assisting the teacher to improve upon his skills. In-service training was therefore, the most important aspect of this supervision. There was, however, a change in the area of emphasis but the assumptions that were best known methods of teaching which the supervisor knew still prevailed (Drake & Roe, 2003).

Elsbree and Nully (1967) observe that these assumptions still dominate many school systems in which it is believed that the best teacher in the classroom makes the best supervisor or the best headmaster. Supervisors were therefore, appointed by transferring teachers who have been rated 'good' in the classroom to fill vacant supervisory positions. There were no serious training facilities and programmes to enable these teachers to acquire the skills they needed for the

performance of the new duties. Supervision, according to this belief, was simply teaching teachers how to teach and so it was quite logical to appoint the person who knew best how to do the job to the position where he can teach others. This concept, according to Hord and Sommers (2008), is narrow, because supervision is never simply teaching teachers how to teach.

Supervision as Democratic Professional Leadership

Many educational systems, according to various writers, have realised the flaws in the concepts of supervision discussed above and have adopted a new concept, whereby supervision is seen as a democratic professional leadership (Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford, 2006). Describing this new concept, Mulford and Silins (2003) stress that "Modern supervision is positive, dynamic and democratic action designed to improve instruction through continual growth of all concerned individuals - the child, the teacher, the supervisor, the administrator and the parent or the other lay person" (p.179).

Additionally, Silins, Mulford and Zarins (2002) note that whereas it could be true to say that the ultimate objective of any form of supervisory programme is the improvement of the teaching–learning programme, it could be observed that certain immediate purposes could be differentiated when modern concept of supervision is considered in the light of its purpose, scope and nature. The previous concept of supervision according to Elsbree and Nully's (1967) emphasis was that the best way of improving the teaching-learning process was to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of teachers. The supervisor's job now covers the total teaching–learning situation of the school which includes the

teachers, pupils, the classroom and materials for teaching and learning, as well as the community in which the school is situated (Witziers, Bosker & Krüger, 2003).

Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore (1995) in describing the duties of the supervisor, believe that the supervisor is involved in the total administrative factor of the teaching and learning programme. This, according to them, includes school and curricula organisation, policies of pupils' progress, methods of pupils' evaluation and reporting to parents, organising for the provision of materials and equipment, organising for the effective use of materials for teaching and learning and maintenance of teachers' morale.

The new concept of supervision, according to Neagley and Evans (1980), requires a high level educational leadership for its implementation. The supervisor must possess some personal qualities and abilities in addition to the acquisition of some professional and academic skills. Among the personal qualities are the attributes that make a good teacher thus, love for children and understanding of their problems and likable personality and skills in human relations. The supervisor must also, possess the qualities of sincerity, fairness, respect for the rights and feelings of other persons, humility and sympathy.

Douglas, Bent and Boardman (1962) agreed with the notion captured above and suggested some professional and academic studies which the supervisor must undergo during his training. Among the academic courses are psychology, sociology, philosophy, guidance and administration. Regarding professional studies, Douglas, Bent and Boardman suggested are: general mythology, research techniques and the principles techniques of supervision. For

them, though the supervisor cannot possibly be an expert in all the fields he co-ordinates, he must have a general working knowledge that would enable him give teachers direction as to where they can get expert information and assistance.

Determinants of Effective Supervision

Determinants of effective supervision are viewed as the conditions that can make supervision effective to promote teaching and learning in schools. Effective supervision aims at motivating the teacher, recognising and supporting different phases within the teacher's life cycle in a positive manner to provide job satisfaction. In this sense, supervisors should never hesitate to compliment for good work and use diplomacy to offer constructive criticisms for shortcomings (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Errors recognized should be used to improve chances of future success.

In the view of Halpin (1965), "supervision can be effectively carried out when materials and logistics are provided to support it" (p.32). Provision of logistics and materials to supervisors can spur them to carry out supervision well. Lack of these items hinders effective supervision. Kochhar (1970) on his part viewed a supervisor as a respectable leader. He stressed that a supervisor "…must earn the right to be a respected leader" (p.90). The perception of supervisor's leadership is a crucial determinant of how effective he can perform his supervisory roles. Neagley and Evans (1980) wrote on the determinants necessary for effective supervision. They stated that general limit of responsibilities must be well established so that all members of supervisory staff are able to function effectively as a team. From his perspective, Alfonso (1984) pointed out that a

major deterrent to full professionalism status of educational supervisors is an ill-defined knowledge base and a lack of an agreed-upon set of professional skills which have remained remarkably undefined and random, partly because the theoretical base is so thin (p.598).   This sometimes makes supervisors to be non-performing as they lack practical training (Boschee, 2009).

Again, boards of education poorly write policies governing the practice of supervision. "The policy which was intended … often turns out not to be the policy which is written or the policy adapted in the process of devising the rules and regulations which accompany it; promulgation" (Lincoln & Guba, 1986, p.467). This proves that if policies governing supervision are well defined, there would be effective supervision in basic schools to improve teacher performance. To this end, Neagley and Evans (1980) stated that "effective supervision of instruction can improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom" (p.98).

Additionally, Eye and Netzer (1965) viewed effective supervision as being able to helping supervisors and teachers to have consensus on methods that can promote learning in the school. They emphasized that learning can be promoted if teacher performance is good to guide learners. For supervision to achieve this aim it must "institute an evaluation programme that is comprehensive enough to include the participation of pupils, teachers and administrators and also to examine the effectiveness of learning in the light of instructional supervisory and other administrative procedures" (Boschee, 2009, p.67).

Musaazi (1985) was of the view that for supervision to achieve its aims to improve instructional process in the school, the supervisor must organize courses, workshops, seminars for teachers and headteachers to infuse in them new techniques in teaching. The supervisor must provide "…pleasant, stimulating and wholesome environment in which teachers will want to work" (p.34).

Furthermore, Musaazi (1985) stated that in order for supervision to be successful "the supervisor must provide accurate, honest and positive reports on the school he supervises, on the teachers he observes and on the educational values obtained from expenditure of public money" (p.35). It must be stressed that reports from supervision processes can be beneficial to heads of schools and their staff members as guidelines for effective work done, managers of schools to be able to compare their schools with others for necessary improvement and supervisors themselves as records of their recommendations and the needs of their schools (Burton, 2007).

It is quite evident that supervision can be effective in schools if it is systematically planned and organized as integral part of administrative process with well-defined policies, good working conditions, existence of neat and decent school environment, proper pupils' management, delegation of duties by school heads, provision of logistics and materials to the supervisor to enable him function effectively. In addition, for supervision in schools to be successful, supervisors must respond to teachers as changing adults. Knowledge of how teachers can grow or develop as competent adults must be the guiding principle for supervisors in finding ways to return wisdom, power and control to both the

individual and collective staff in order for them to become true professionals (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Burton, 2007).

The Supervisor

Many writers find it convenient to put supervisory personnel into two broad categories: the generalist or the administrative supervisor and the specialist or the consultative supervisor (Douglas et al, 1962; Neagley & Evans, 1980; Elsbree & Nully, 1967). These two broad categories are discussed into some detail in the two subsequent subsections.

The Generalist Supervisor

According to Drake and Roe (2003), the generalist supervisor has skills in areas overall leadership. He sees to the general improvement of performance in the school system. His duties include the general planning of teaching and learning programmes (curriculum development), quality control and evaluating work in the school in general.

They point out that the evaluating duties of the generalist supervisor may involve a thorough examination and appraisal of all activities in the school and reporting to the administrative authorities. He also evaluates the work of individual teachers for the purpose of promotion and other administrative purposes. In this sense, he can be regarded as playing the role of a co-ordinating and communicating link between the school and the administrative authorities (Drake & Roe, 2003).

In addition to these duties, the generalist supervisor is also a consultant and a co-ordinator of the programme of duties in the school under him. He sees to it that the schools and individual teachers are supplied with the necessary materials for the performance of their duties (Boschee, 2009).

The Specialist Supervisor

The specialist supervisor is more directly involved in helping teachers to improve their methodology. His activities are normally directed towards specific goals such as identifying special teaching and learning problems and helping teachers to find solutions to them. Also, his evaluation of teachers' performance is, therefore, more from a diagnostic point of view than administrative. His main duties include organisation of in-service training programmes, workshops and seminars, thereby helping teachers to interpret and implement new curriculum materials (Drake & Roe, 2003).

In Ghana, the Monitoring and Evaluation Division of the Ministry of Education is responsible for assessment, supervision and evaluation of the educational system. In our educational system, two parties are involved in supervisory process: the supervisor and the supervisee. Also, all schools in the districts do have personnel who are designated as supervisors. There are many other people with various titles who perform supervisory functions related to improving instruction. The focus here is on the supervisor, the one who has direct responsibility for improving classroom and school instruction. Inspectors and supervisors at various levels of education carry out this responsibility. Circuit supervisors are the personnel who carry out supervision at the district levels and

this is limited to only basic schools. Musaazi (1982) contended that supervisors have two sources of authority: (i) authority from the Government or Ministry and (ii) authority that come from the expert performance of the person. The supervisor's knowledge and understanding of his job command for him, the respect of all teachers with whom he works. The knowledge and understanding of the job automatically give him his authority. He should be able to observe, know what to observe and how to observe to enable him assist the supervisee identify his strengths or weaknesses and to improve upon them. He should show different strategies of teaching to be able to help teachers to co-ordinate teaching approach within the curriculum content. After assessing the supervisee's approach to lesson delivery, the supervisor should be able to suggest new or other approaches to him.

According to Musaazi (1982), supervision evolved from inspection where inspectors possess qualities of good behaviour and better qualification to work with. Therefore, supervisors must possess a recognised teaching qualification. This qualification must prove the supervisor to be a teacher from training institution and has obtained a certificate diploma or degree authorizing him to teach. A supervisor should possess outstanding skills as a teacher, which would enable him, pass those skills to teachers in the course of his work. Supervisors should possess experience in the teaching profession to make them outstanding in application of skills to enable them be helpful to other teachers. In addition, supervisors should possess personal qualities such as willingness and eagerness to go on learning good relationship with other people, to make constructive

criticism, tolerant, and positive attitude towards others. He should have the zeal and enthusiasm to encourage teachers to build confidence in them.

Farrant (1983) observed that the tutor must be able guide to the student-teacher to suggest what action to take when he finds his teaching is not meeting with success. To be able to do this, the tutor will have to observe his students while they are teaching and stay with them long enough to see them overcome their difficulties.

From a different perspective, Lamb (1965) stated that the supervisor is a college staff who visits the student-teacher at his assigned location and works with the co-operative teacher in guiding and evaluating the students' progress. He is in a unique position to help the student-teacher turn theory into practice.

In the viewpoint of Pecku (1976), counselling is a major duty of the supervisor. He opines that the counselling duties of the supervisor could start even before the student - teacher begins his lessons. He must assist the student - teacher to clarify his objectives and methods of teaching. According to him, this ensures that the student – teacher's aims and objectives are appropriate and adequate. He goes on to say that the counselling function of the supervisor occurs after the lesson where he meets the student - teacher to discuss the lesson with him.

Looking at qualification and qualities of a good supervisor and the nature of service they offer, they should have been provided with the logistics and materials and improved working conditions that could enable external supervisors to pay regular visits to complement the supervisory roles played by the other internal supervisors to make supervision effective to improve teacher

performance. Lack of logistics, materials, basic necessities and improved working conditions would make supervision ineffective as stated by the Minister of Education "… ineffective supervision has made otherwise good teachers to perform poorly resulting in low teaching and learning outcomes" (Daily Graphic, 1997, p.12).

Functions of Supervision

Supervisory functions are encompassed in administration which involves; organizing human fiscal and material resources and time, planning, commanding, controlling communicating, directing, influencing, and evaluating the activities of the organization. Studies on the perceptions of elementary school teachers, administrators and supervisors in relation to classroom visitation concluded that teachers were subjected to evaluation criteria established by personnel other than themselves. Those teachers wanted to be involved more in the formulation of policy and procedure for classroom visitation, as there existed lack of teacher involvement at the pre-planning stage for classroom visitation. Indeed, supervision is the function in the school that draws together elements of instructional effectiveness in the whole school action. That is all activities of the school are harnessed in such a way as to bring about effective teaching and learning (Musaazi, 1982).

Carlton (2001) undertook a survey that involved over 1000 elementary teachers and 52 principals in selected Florida schools and found out few similarities between respondents perceptions' and supervisors actual role and the

ideal role. The ideal role played by the supervisor was noted as centering on these activities:

> visitations to observe promising practices, assisting teachers in location, planning and arranging in-service training selection and interpretation of materials, assisting in orientation of new and beginning teachers' selection and interpretation of materials and coordinating instructional programme visiting and observing classrooms (p.78).

In another study, Colbert (1995) discovered that teachers perceived supervisors to be most effective when they assisted teachers with learning techniques, held conferences, followed observations of teaching, gave specific advice, demonstrated teaching, offered constructive criticism, were unobtrusive during visitation and assisted teachers with evaluation of their teaching. In contrast, Carmon (1999) reviewed 1235 studies completed between 1955 and 1969 and concluded that the responsibilities most often reported for general supervision were: coordinating in-service education, fostering improvement in human relations and providing consultative and instructional services. She also discovered that the degree of consensus among supervisors and other local school personnel regarding the actual and ideal roles of supervision was relatively high.

To simplify the functions of supervision, Harris (1985) listed ten tasks of supervision, which are pertinent to supervisors. The first task had to do with developing curriculum. This means designing or redesigning that which is to be

taught by teacher, the time the lesson is to be delivered and the place and in what pattern the lesson is to be treated. Developing curriculum guides, establishing standards, planning instructional units and instituting new courses are examples of this task.

The second task is organising for instruction. It is a process of managing arrangements whereby pupils, staff, space and materials are related to time and instructional objectives in co-ordinate and effective ways. It also involves grouping of students, planning class schedules, assigning spaces, allocating time for instruction, planning events and arranging for teaching teams are examples of responsibilities associated with organising for instruction.

According to Harris (1985), the third task is providing facilities. This task is primarily about designing or redesigning and equipping facilities for instruction. The development of space and equipment specification is included in this area. The fourth task has to do with the provision of staff where by the supervisor ensures that there is the availability of instructional staff members, in adequate numbers and with appropriate competencies for facilitating instruction. Recruiting, screening, selecting, assigning and transferring staff is part of this responsibility.

The remaining six tasks Harris (1985) made mention of are:

i.   Providing materials – it is a process of selecting and obtaining appropriate materials for use in implementing curriculum designs. Previewing, evaluating, designing and otherwise finding ways to provide appropriate materials are included.

ii.   Arranging for in-service education – a process of planning and implementing learning experience that will improve the performance of the staff in an instructional related ways. This involves workshops, consultations, field trips and training sessions as well as formal education.

ii.   Orienting staff members – a process of providing staff members with basic information that are necessary to carry out assigned responsibilities. This includes getting new staff acquainted with facilities, staff and community. It also involves keeping the staff informed of organisational development.

iv.   Relating special pupils' services – a situation where the supervisor arranges for careful co-ordination of services to children to ensure optimum support for the teaching process. This involves developing policies, assigning priorities and defining relationships among service personnel to maximize relationship between services offered and instructional goals of the school.

v.   Developing public relations – in this instant the supervisor makes provision for free flow of information on matters of instruction to and from the public while ensuring security and optimum levels of involvement in the promotion of better instruction.

vi.   Evaluating instruction – it is a process of planning, instrumenting, organising and implementing procedures for data gathering, analysis and interpretation and decision-making for improvement of instruction.

Supervisory function is an administrative work which really helps teacher performance to improve and this is evident when a teacher is to be supervised for

promotion, he plans, organizes, directs and co-ordinates all activities and resources to make teaching meaningful to its recipients of which all these functions mentioned are integral part of administration (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Supervisor Behaviour

Supervisor behaviour talks about how a supervisor acts in the course of executing his duties. His behaviour should link to teacher's development of instructional service to schools. Musaazi (1982) stated that while a supervisor has to be friendly, he has a duty not to be familiar with his teachers. The supervisor is to provide his supervisory roles; that, his skills and experiences should readily be placed at the service of teachers to encourage necessary change in any aspect of school life.

Blumberg and Amidon (1965) made a conclusion on the behaviour of supervisor by adapting Flander's classroom observation system to describe supervisor-teacher verbal interaction as: "when supervisors are highly direct, teachers perceive freedom of communication curtailed" (p.4). Teachers are most dissatisfied with supervisors who exhibit high direct behaviour and low indirect behaviour. When supervisors are either pre-dominantly indirect (eliciting and accepting teacher ideas and teachings and positively reinforcing them) or both indirect and direct (telling, suggesting or criticizing) teachers perceive supervisory conferences as more productive. Blumberg and Amidon's (1965) research on supervisor-teacher interactions during conferences suggests, that although a combination of direct and indirect styles are viewed positively, teachers prefer supervisors who use indirect style as opposed to a direct one.

49

In practice, personal issues are avoided in supervision. Supervision tends to be direct rather than indirect and the interaction between teachers and supervisors tend to be the kind that neither of them wants to have both parties prefer to discuss "safe" topics. To Blumberg and Amidon (1965), interactions of this kind do not appear to have much chance in helping teachers to improve instruction.

There have been many researchers and writers, who have reviewed literature in the areas of supervision to the present study. At the local front, Asiedu (1997) explored the performance of instructional supervision as the nature of two types of supervision being carried out in two educational districts of Ghana. The type of supervision preferred by teacher in these districts is the teacher's perceptions of the effectiveness or otherwise supervision in promoting teaching and learning in the districts. He used interview and documentary evidence gathered from 390 respondents from 32 Junior Secondary Schools. Griffin (1974) examined the effect of having teachers set objectives for themselves and concluded that a commitment to specific objectives followed up with supervisory conference is associated with significant changes in teacher behaviour relevant to the stated objectives. A number of studies investigated the type and amount of feedback given to a teacher during and after the supervision. The studies demonstrated that teachers provided with videotape feedback on their teaching change in teacher classroom behaviour. Effective supervisory behaviour as perceived by local school personnel is characterised by showing a willingness to help, sincerity, consideration of teachers problems, being unobtrusive during

visits. Inspiring teachers to improve their performance, giving support to teachers to improve their performance, and giving support to teacher-made decision. Existing research makes one to believe that there is little significance happening in face-to-face interactions between supervisor and teachers and concluded that teachers involved in the study, preferred internal supervision to external one and that the emphasis is on the former one in the two districts. More so, he stated that teachers' perceptions on internal supervision facilitate teaching and learning more than external supervision. Asiedu (1997) recommended that internal supervision should be supported and sustained to enhance quality teaching and learning in schools. Here, whilst supporting internal supervision, external supervision should also be given serious attention by providing logistics, materials and good working conditions to external supervisors to enable them function effectively to complement the efforts of internal supervisors.

Attitude towards Supervision

This section of the literature review looks at the feelings or opinions of individual writers, experience teachers and educators on supervision in schools. Firstly, Khauchak, Peterson and Driscoll as cited in Tunison (1998), studied teachers attitudes toward supervision and observed that "teachers viewed supervisory visits as being perfunctory with little or no impact on actual teaching performance" (p.2). Glickman as cited in Tunison (1998) on the other hand supported supervision with his observation that ''…we can think of supervision as the glue of a successful …'' (p. 4). In comparing experienced teachers to less experienced teachers, Goldstein (1993) in a study, discovered that teachers

interact more with supervisors, perceive supervisors as being more supportive and less involved with the rules and regulations, perceive supervisors as being more available for assistance and are more cognisant of conflict in supervisor – teacher interaction. A study conducted on teachers' perceptions, supervisory personnel and principles in a school in America discovered that over 80% of the teachers' response claimed that there existed no observation and conferences with supervisors. Those of observation and conferences reported over 93%. It lasted between a minute and thirty seconds and 13% viewed the observation as disruptive whilst 69% of the teachers reported the observation not disruptive. Also a study conducted on supervision revealed a survey of elementary school teachers in Western New York of which 70% claimed that the supervisor is often perceived as potentially dangerous but 82% of teachers felt there was the need for supervision and evaluation in the schools (Heichberger & Young, 1975).

The practice of supervision of teachers in schools is a contentious issue in today's educational circles. Many educators are critical about current supervisory practice and of those officers who perform the tasks while at the same time, they tend to support it. From the observation gathered there is the need for effective supervision in schools to improve teacher performance as majority of the reporters reported supervision not being disruptive (Boschee, 2009).

Teacher Performance

This refers to what teachers actually do that relays to performance on the part of their pupils. According to Day and Leithwood (2007), standards in basic education are influenced by teacher's performance and attitude towards work.

Teacher's instructional behaviour constitute part of the determinants of pupils performance as the teachers organization, questioning, quality of explanation, structuring ,the teacher's use of praise, approval, criticism and enthusiasm. A teacher using these aspects in performance of his duty encourages pupils to perform very well. Teacher performance influences standards in basic schools and it is an understatement to say that teacher's attitude to work has given rise to decline in educational standards. It is a common fact that the work of the teacher does not end in the classroom. In recent times, it was a common practice among teachers to visit homes and interact with parents and pupils to share ideas on the welfare of their wards. This helped check truancy and loitering of pupils after school hours. However, today, teachers' lateness to work and complete absence from school is having a great toll on the academic performance in basic schools. This can be viewed from the fact that teachers are not satisfied with their rewards as compared to what their colleagues receive in other organizations. For a person to give up his best in whatever he does, he needs to be motivated either intrinsically or extrinsically but motivation is overlooked in the teaching profession, as the teacher is expected to ''receive his rewards in heaven''. Due to this, apathy towards work is now a common feature among most teachers, interest in their pupils' academic work in particular, and their personal well-being in general appear to have dwindled considerably and therefore, supervision has to be strengthened.

Inkari (1990) expounded on the contribution of teachers to the academic performance of pupils in basic schools in Ghana. He said, among other things

that when teachers of today go about their lessons with special reference to the use of teaching and learning aids, one wonders how such teachers went about their practical teaching and learning successfully. Inkari continued that majority of teachers are not able to read their intended topics let alone have time to prepare relevant learning and teaching aids to help pupils do effective learning. Such teachers always adopt the classroom teaching method, which is the easy way out not bothering themselves about their work. This laissez – faire attitude on the part of some teachers in a way or the other made many pupils lag behind. The attitude he observed has contributed immensely to the downward trend of standard in the nation's educational institutions, especially at the basic level with particular reference to teaching methodology.

Teaching strategy implied the deliberate planning and organization of teaching and learning experiences and the situation in the light of psychological and pedagogical principles with the view of achieving specific goals. In talking about competency of the teacher in the classroom, the expectation from the teacher, among other things is to invent ways of tapping the individual abilities, motives and needs so that in the process he can maximize his level of assimilation. For any meaningful learning, which gives easier understanding of teaching, learning strategy must take note of the age, rote learning and active involvement of learners. Based on these facts the child would understand learning experiences well and once the materials are understood he can contribute meaningfully (Caldwell, 2004).

Teacher performance has really made many pupils lag behind and therefore, leaves much to be desired. Here, effective supervision is to be used as a factor to influence standards in basic schools. All supervisors are to be provided with logistics, materials, improved working conditions and any other facilities that could facilitate effective supervision to improve teacher performance. Teachers' motivation is to be equated to their colleagues in other organisations and they must be provided with improved working conditions to enable them improve their performance to promote effective learning (Caldwell, 2004).

The Importance of Supervision

Supervision is very important in our day-to-day activities. This is confirmed by McGregor's theory X assumptions, which states; man is by nature lazy and therefore, he should be forced to work with inducement, sanctions and close supervision. Man is irresponsible and so workers prefer supervisors to direct them, man is not smart, not creative in solving organizational problems and therefore, he should be under extreme pressure and close control to work. All these prove that supervision is needed everywhere to make people work effectively and efficiently (Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford, 2005).

Glickman, Gordson and Ross-Gordon (1995) discovered finding some education researchers concerning the need of supervision in schools. They focused on individual schools that were consistently achieving results for superior to other schools in general. The researchers discovered the difference and that was the manner in which supervision was carried out. In schools where, teaching and

learning were successful, supervision was effective but the opposite were schools where supervision was ineffective.

According to the Educational Committee Report (MOE 1994), school based and instructional supervision is very important to determine what and how teaching and learning go on in the school. The report states that even though everybody in education accepts that supervision has a great potential to improve education, it is not working because of lack of commitment. The importance of supervision dates back to 70 AD when Moses selected leaders to work under him as supervisors during the time the Israelites were moving from Egypt. Moses at that time compounded three levels of management; top level - that is rulers of thousands, middle management - rulers of hundreds and supervisors. Supervision, which was the last level of management, manages operative employees are those who can physically produce organization's goals and services. These leaders made the work of Moses easier (Gurr, Drysdale, Di Natale, Ford, Hardy & Swann, 2003).

Students are confident to predict that all schools can be effective if effective supervision is used as an intervention. An outstanding feature seen here is that supervision is very important because the various concepts of supervision point to the fact that supervision is a prerequisite to success in any kind of organization and above all the school (Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford, 2005).

Summary

On concept of supervision, effective supervision should be conducted constantly to improve teacher performance and not only when a teacher is due for

promotion. Types of education had indicated that external supervision over the years has been developed to change the unproductive pattern of communication and supervision in public basic schools where teachers were put under pressure to perform. Although, the basic tenets of clinical supervision appeal to many educators, there is little evidence to indicate that it is being widely used. All types of supervision discussed are used to check the work of teachers to ensure that they are in conformity with the laid down principles and methods of teaching.

Also for supervision in schools to be successful, supervisors must respond to teachers as changing adults. Knowledge of how teachers can grow or develop as competent adults must be the guiding principle for supervisors in finding ways to return wisdom, power and control to both the individual and the collective staff in order for them to become true professionals.

For supervisors to perform effectively they should be provided with logistics, materials, necessities and improved working conditions. Lack of these, make supervision ineffective as stated by the Minister of Education "… ineffective supervision has made otherwise good teachers to perform poorly resulting in low teaching and learning outcomes (Daily Graphic, 1997, p.12). An outstanding feature seen here is that supervision is very important because the various concepts of supervision point to the fact that supervision is a prerequisite to success in any kind of organization and above all the school.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the methods used to conduct the research on the assessment of school supervision in public basic schools in Cape Coast Metropolis. It describes the research design and explains the rationale behind the selection of respondents. The strength and weakness of research design have also been discussed. The population, sample and sampling procedure are also identified and explained. The instruments used in collecting the data, pre-testing of the instruments, data collection and data analysis procedures have also been enumerated.

Research Design

The design selected for the study was descriptive survey. This method helps in collection of original data for studying a large population which would be too difficult to observe directly to make generalization.

Babbie (1990) believes that the survey method is an excellent means of measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population and allows the researcher the opportunity to ask many questions on a given topic. This gives the researcher enough flexibility to analyse the findings of the study. Babbie (1990) goes further to argue that in a survey research operational definitions could be developed from actual observations. Surveys give room for personal interaction

which questions can be asked personally through interviews and impersonally through questionnaires about phenomena which cannot be easily observed as well as attitude and behaviour. She added surveys can provide valid and theoretical meaningful information which are reliable. She also observes further that survey methods contribute substantially to our knowledge of society, economy and the government and to provide up to date information on policy–related issues as well as making useful contributions to the theory. Gray (1976) maintains descriptive survey is simple and easily applicable to all social problems especially in our part of the world.

Therefore, the researcher selected descriptive survey to be able to study a large population which would be difficult to observe directly. Also, this survey would enable the researcher to make personal contact to ask questions and to get the information needed for the study. The researcher would then again, have enough flexibility to analyse the findings of the study to draw meaningful conclusions.

According to Kumekpor (1999), survey research is used to provide guidelines to plan, revise or to improve upon the existing conditions. It is used to influence policy –makers especially government on policies in relation to social issues. Gray (1976) and Babbie (1990), also, state that descriptive survey has population validity where research uses standardized questionnaires or structured interviews with the aim of making generalizations from a sample to a large population. This occurs when a good number of people with a known background are asked the same questions. Here it is possible to get accurate and a broad view

of responses to certain issues and to test theories on social relationships. The study used a number of teachers, head teachers, and supervisors who have a known background and answered the same questions.

The researcher chose descriptive design due to the purpose of the study which was to find out; the extent of supervision in public basic schools in Cape Coast Metropolis, the factors that influence supervision and the effect of supervision on teacher performance. Again, the research questions which were to find out; the nature of supervision, how effective supervision is, factors that can influence supervision, the influence of supervision in basic public schools made it possible for the researcher to choose this design. The researcher deemed it appropriate to select this design to be able to achieve the purpose of the study and to draw meaningful conclusions to the findings.

Population

The population of the study comprised all 43 public basic schools and circuit supervisors in Cape Coast Metropolis. The 43 schools were made up of 35 mixed, 3 boys and 5 girls. The target group population included head teachers, teachers and prefects of the public basic schools and the circuit supervisors in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

Sample and Sampling Procedures

The sample used for the study comprised 25 public basic schools and the sample size was 200. The sample size of 200 was made up of 25 head teachers, 125 teachers, 45 prefects and 5 circuit supervisors.

Three sampling methods were used for the selection of respondents. First all respondents were selected using stratified sampling method since they were put into strata of headteachers, teachers, prefects and circuit supervisors. Secondly, circuit supervisors and headteachers were selected using the purposive sampling technique. The purposive sampling procedure was used because the 25 schools had earlier been selected randomly and the headteachers have to be part of the study at all cost to contribute relevant information. For the circuit supervisors, they oversaw the same running of the schools within the five circuits and they needed to be part of the study as well.

Teachers and prefects were selected using the simple random sampling procedure. The selection of prefects took two steps – in the first step, two prefects each were selected from 20 mixed schools and in the second step, a prefect each was selected from the two boys and three girls schools. This gave a figure of 45 prefect respondents. With the selection of teachers in each of the 25 schools five teachers were selected randomly using the lottery method which gave every teacher the opportunity to be part of the data collection.

Instruments Used for Data Collection

The main instruments used for the study were questionnaire and interview guide. They were developed by the researcher. There were three questionnaires that were used because the respondents were educated and would be able to respond to the items. It also, offers the respondents complete anonymity and they had enough time to reflect over the questions and that enabled them to give

meaningful answers. The researcher used open-ended as well as close-ended questions to elicit the information needed for the study. The questionnaire was prepared for head teachers, Appendix A; teachers, Appendix B; and circuit supervisors, Appendix C and Appendix D was the interview guide for prefects and (Appendix F) was the list of schools.

The questionnaire was structured into five sections. Section A- sought for information on personal data of the respondents. Section B - was designed to find out the nature of supervision in public basic schools, Section - sought to find out the frequency and scope of supervision in the public basic schools, Section D - sought information on factors that influence supervision and Section E - was to find out the influence of supervision on teacher performance.

The interview guide Appendix D was used to solicit information on teachers' punctuality, regularity, use of instructional hours, output of work and marking of exercise by teachers. The prefects used by the researcher to answer the interview guide comprise; 20 head prefects, 10 grounds prefects, 10 class prefects and 5 sectional leaders.

Pre-testing of Instruments

The validity and reliability of a research instrument is the extent to which the instrument elicits the accurate information or responses needed for the study. In order to ensure the validity and reliability of the research instrument, the questionnaire items and interview guide were first given to a circuit supervisor from a different district who was not part of the sample to read through for his suggestions to refine the items. Again, the instruments were shown to my

supervisor for clarity of expression and for pre-testing. Then, the instruments were pre-tested in ten selected basic schools that were not included in the main sample in the Cape Coast Metropolis, which have similar features to the sample chosen. Based on the outcome of the pre-test, the questionnaire and the interview guide were revised to remove ambiguities. That ensured clarity of expression and enabled the researcher to undertake the actual study.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher presented a letter of introduction from the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration to the head teachers of the selected schools to seek permission to administer the questionnaire and the interviews. The researcher administered the instrument after explaining the purpose of the study to the respondents. Concerning the circuit supervisors, the researcher made personal contact at the Metropolitan District Education Office to administer the instruments. Also, every respondent was assured of anonymity and confidentiality. The respondents were implored to answer the questionnaire according to their own feelings and views rather than influence of other respondents. A month was used for the data collection.

Concerning the prefects, the researcher asked permission from the head teachers and the class teachers to make personal contact with the prefects, to explain the purpose of the study to them. They were also assured of anonymity and confidentiality. The respondents were made to answer the questions according to their own feelings and views. The researcher guided the respondents throughout the interview to get the response needed for the study. At the end of

data collection, all respondents participated in the study and this gave a 100% return rate.

Data Analysis

Data collected was analysed according to the research questions which were: what is the nature of supervision in public basic schools, the extent of supervision in basic schools, what factors that influence supervision in basic schools and the influence of supervision on teacher performance. The demographic data of teachers, head teachers and circuit supervisors' academic and professional qualifications and the years of teaching experience were presented. The items of the instrument were coded. Frequencies and percentages were used to analyse the data from the questionnaire. Prefects' responses were categorised according to similar themes in response. These were then summarised according to how the respondents answered the research questions.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to find out the nature, frequency and scope of supervision in the Cape Coast Metropolis, the factors that influence supervision and the effect of supervision on teacher performance. This chapter is concerned with the presentation of the findings for the study based on the analysis of data derived from the administered questionnaires. Data was collected from a sample of 200 respondents made up of 25 head teachers, 5 circuit supervisors, 125 teachers and 45 prefects. The characteristics of the respondents are described, followed by the presentation of the findings according to the research questions of the study.

Demographic Data on Respondents

Respondents for this study as stated in the introduction were head teachers, teachers, circuit supervisors from 20 selected schools and circuits in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Table 1 presents the background information of the respondents from Mixed Schools, Boys' Schools and Girls' Schools with regards to academic and professional qualifications and the years of teaching experience in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

With reference to the respondents' academic and professional qualifications and years of teaching experience in Cape Coast Metropolis, Table 1

shows that the basic school head teachers and circuit supervisors have had the highest academic and professional qualifications.

Table 1

Academic and Professional Qualifications and Years of Teaching Experience of Respondents

	BHS	BST	CS
Academic qualification	[25]	[125]	[5]
	N %	N %	N %
M. S. L. C.	0 (0)	30 (24)	0 (0)
S. S. S. C. E.	0 (0)	20 (16)	0 (0)
G. C. E. 'O' Level	3(12)	30 (24)	0(0)
G.C. E. 'A' Level	5 (20)	4(3)	0(0)
Diploma	7 (28)	25 (20)	1 (20)
Degree	10(40)	16(12)	4(80)
Professional qualification			
Cert 'A' 4 – Years	4 (16)	35(28)	0 (0)
Cert 'A' 3 – Years	4(16)	44(35)	0(0)
Diploma	7(40)	30(24)	1(20)
Degree	10(40)	16(12)	4(80)
Teaching experience			
0 - 4 Years	4(16)	16(13)	3(60)
5 - 10 Years	2(8)	25(20)	0(0)
10 - 15 Years	6(24)	30(24)	1(20)
Over 15 Years	54(43)	1(20)	1(20)

Also, Table 1 clearly indicates that more than half of the school head teachers (52%) have had 15 years teaching experience. Again, 43% of teachers have had over fifteen years teaching experience.   In summary, Table 1 states that majority of head teachers and teachers were experienced teachers. They had taught for at least five years in Ghana Education Service.

Analysis and Presentation of the Main Data

Data collection was guided by four research questions. Each research question is presented taking into consideration the objective it was developed to achieve. It should be emphasised that each research question is designated as a heading under which the responses to that research question are presented and discussed.

Research Question One: What is the nature of supervision in basic school?

This research question was aimed at obtaining knowledge about the nature of supervision in public basic schools in terms of how they are supervised. Responses were elicited from teachers, head teachers and circuit supervisors on their impressions on how supervision is carried out in the public basic schools. Tables 2, 3 and 4 present separate responses of teachers, headteachers and circuit supervisors in that order. Each of the tabular presentation would be preceded and/or followed immediately by a discussion of the results.

Table 2 clearly shows that majority (76%) of teachers stated that supervision was not done regularly in schools. In the views of Glickman, Gordson and Ross-Gordon (1995) for supervision to be effective it should be regular. They

found in a study that they found that schools that consistently did well also benefited from regular supervision.

Table 2

Teachers' Impressions to Nature of Supervision in Basic Schools

	Agree	Disagree
Nature of supervision	N(%)	N(%)
Regularly exercised in school	30(24)	95(76)
Done during instructional hours	9(7)	116(93)
Maximum use of time	9(7)	116(93)
Resulted in increase output of work	105(84)	20(16)

Key: A = Agree, Disagree.

 N = 125 (Number of Basic School Teachers)

Also from Table 2, 93% of teacher respondents maintained that they were not supervised during instructional hours and on maximum use of time. Indeed, from the revelation from classroom teachers who should have resisted regular supervision as has been the case in some studies (Boschee, 2009; Heichberger & Young, 1975) and observations, teachers captured in this study indicated supervision had not be very effective as expected.

Lastly, Table 2 shows that 84% of teachers agreed that supervision carried in the school resulted in increased output of work. This is a positive aspect to

supervision carried out in the schools. The preceding responses have not been good for instruction supervision. It is true that effective supervision results in improved work performance. This is attested to by Gurr, Drysdale and Mulford (2005) that students are confident to predict that all schools can be effective if effective supervision is used as an intervention. An outstanding feature is that supervision is very important because various concepts of supervision point to the fact that supervision is a prerequisite to success in any kind of organization and above all, the school.

The views of headteachers on the nature of supervision in the public basic school selected for the study are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Headteachers' Impressions of Supervision in Public Basic Schools

Nature of supervision	A	S	N
	N %	N %	N %
It is regular and punctual	7(28)	18(72)	0(0)
Close supervision exercise	4(16)	17(68)	4(16)
Teachers are informed of new policies of education	2(8)	3(12)	20(80)
Strengths and weaknesses identified to adopt measures for teacher improvement	2(8)	4(16)	19(76)

Key: A = Agree, S = Sometimes, N = Never; N = 25 (Number of Headteachers)

Table 3 depicts that only 28% of headteachers agreed that supervision in the public basic school was irregular, none of the heads disagreed but the majority (72%) indicated that sometimes supervision was irregular. When the responses are consolidated, it means supervision was not regular. This is also a confirmation of the responses of teachers as displayed in Table 2. It should also be stressed that headteachers are internal supervisors and if they agree supervision in the schools was irregular, they cannot escape blame. However, they can help make supervision effective and regular at least as internal supervisors.

Again, Table 3 shows that 68% of headteachers were of the view that, close supervision, which is a type of supervision, was conducted sometimes, 16% agreed and another 16% disagreed with that proposition. The crux of the matter is that supervision in the public basic schools were conducted but what remains is how effective it would be that is where the close supervision aspect came in. Beyond that supervision is supposed to effective and close supervision is a way of making the schools achieve quality teaching and learning at the end of the process.

Also Table 3 shows that 80% of headteachers disagreed that supervision is used to inform teachers about new policies of education. However, 12% indicated sometimes it is used for that and 8% agreed with that proposition. The views expressed by a few of headteachers are also supported the views of Harris (1985) when he indicated that it is used in oorientating staff members. It is a process of providing staff members with basic information that are necessary to carry out assigned responsibilities. This includes getting new staff acquainted with

70

facilities, staff and community. It also involves keeping the staff informed of organisational development.

In a similar vain, the table shows that 76% of headteachers disagreed that supervision in schools help to identify strengths and weaknesses, which also help to adopt measures to improve performance. It is rather strange that the majority of headteachers taught this way since supervision is used as diagnostic measure to identify strengths and weaknesses so that corrective measures could be implemented to improve the teaching and learning process. To this end, Musaazi (1982) lends credence that supervision is the function in the school that draws together elements of instructional effectiveness in the whole school action, that is, all activities of the school are harnessed in such a way as to bring about effective teaching and learning. Further to that Musaazi intimated that supervision as an administrative function is used for controlling, directing and evaluating and replanning of the teaching-learning process.

To cap it all, the views of circuit supervisors were sought on issues that related to the nature of supervision in the public basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The responses of circuit supervisors are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 shows that 3 out of the 5 circuit supervisor selected for the study indicated that morning visits to the schools under their command was regular. This was because 60% of circuit supervisor respondents disagreed that they made visits in the mornings to the schools under their supervision. Another, 60% of circuit supervisors disagreed that supervision was regular. In actual fact, this finding is an objective analysis of the situation even though respondents were not

given the opportunity to explain the reasons for their inability to pay the visits as regularly as practicable. It is also a confirmation of responses by teachers and headteachers.

Table 4

Circuit Supervisors' Impressions of the Nature of Supervision in Public Basic Schools

Nature of supervision	A	S	N
	N %	N%	N%
Made visits to schools in the mornings	0(0)	2(40)	3(60)
It is regular	0(0)	2(40)	3(60)
Written supervisory report issued after visits	0(0)	0(0)	5(100)
Regular visit to classroom to demonstrate teaching-learning techniques	0(0)	1(20)	4(80)

Key: A = Always, S = Sometimes, N = Never; N=5 (Number of Circuit Supervisors)

Again, circuit supervisors continued with their objective analysis of the situation when all of them admitted that post supervision reports were written. This has confirmed suspicions that circuit supervisors and other supervisors did not write reports about supervision they undertook. It is not a good practice for supervisors to fail to write reports but that is the reality. This point is even made clearer by Musaazi (1985) that in order for supervision to be successful "the

72

supervisor must provide accurate, honest and positive reports on the school he/she supervises, on the teachers he observes and on the education values obtained from expenditure of public money" (p.35).

Finally, Table 4 shows that 80% of circuit supervisors indicated they rarely paid regular visits to classrooms to demonstrate teaching-learning techniques. It is not clear whether circuit supervisors as part of their supervisors tasks should go into classrooms and demonstrate the proper means of instruction, this is issue is being raised because 20% indicated they sometimes visited the classrooms and demonstrate the appropriate teaching-learning techniques.

From the responses elicited from teachers, headteachers and circuit supervisors, one is tempted to argue that there is lack of commitment on the part of supervisors. This assertion is given credence by the Ministry of Education (MOE, 1994) that even though everybody in education accepts that supervision has a great potential to improve education, it is not working because of lack of commitment. The various concepts of supervision point to the fact that it is a prerequisite to the success of a school yet it is not working in our present day supervision

From the perspective of the head teachers, teachers and circuit supervisors, supervision in public basic schools was not done regularly or closely. Even when it was done, it was hardly done during instructional hours. No supervisory report was also issued to enable teachers identify strengths and weaknesses to improve teacher performance but output of work improved during supervision.

Research Question Two: What is the Scope of Supervision in Public Basic Schools?

Research question two was aimed at obtaining knowledge on the extent of supervision in terms of how head teachers and circuit supervisors supervise schools. The responses are view points of headteachers, circuit supervisors and teachers. Responses of headteachers, circuit supervisors and teachers are presented in that other followed by the requisite discussions. Table 5 presents headteachers' views on the scope of supervision in public basic schools.

Table 5

Headteachers' Views of Scope of Supervision in Public Basic Schools

Scope of supervision	VO	O	N
	N %	N%	N %
Check the use of instructional time	2(8)	5(20)	18(72)
Teachers are supervised during lesson delivery	0(0)	4(16)	21(84)
Observations are discussed after supervisions	0(0)	6(24)	19(76)
Vet lesson notes according to scheme of work every four weeks	0(0)	4(16)	21(84)
Complete situational report in every four weeks	0(0)	4(16)	21(84)
Build teacher capacity through inset	0(0)	4(16)	21(84)

Key: VO = Very Often, O = Often, N = Never N = 25 (Number of Headteachers)

From Table 5, it can be seen that the majority (72%) of headteachers from public basic schools rarely checked on the use of instructional time. When the responses 'Very Often' and 'Often' are collapsed, we get 'Often'. On the basis of this 28% headteachers indicated they checked the use of instructional time in their respective schools as required by laid down rules and regulations. The problem is with the majority who objectively but sad pointed out they did not check the use of instructional time. It is incumbent on supervisors including headteachers to ensure that the instructional process is effective but in this context, it has been revealed that the instructional process was not checked to verify its effectiveness or otherwise. It runs contrary to the expositions of Musaazi (1982) and Ghana Education Service (2002). The GES (2002) admonishes headteachers to ensure that lessons are delivered as effectively and as efficiently as possible.

Apart from the above which gave a negative outlook of supervision in the schools by headteachers, the remaining issues point to the same direction. This is because an average of 80% of headteachers admitted they never supervised teachers during lesson delivery; never discussed their observations with teachers; never vetted teachers lesson notes; never completed situational report in every four weeks and did not build teacher capacity through in-service training. In all these cases, few headteacher respondents indicated they carried those tasks out as part of the supervisory duties. When the situational report is taken, for instance, it is a form which gives detailed information on teachers conduct, output of work, regularity and punctuality of teachers and visits made by other Educational Officers and any other activities carried out by the schools. This form should be

completed in every four weeks to provide information to the scope of supervision in schools. Headteachers are enjoined to fill them genuinely to enable offenders to be sanctioned. This would serve as deterrent to teachers to put up their best to improve teacher performance. If not, even good teachers would perform poorly to result in low teaching and learning outcomes; but all that was not done.

The views of circuit supervisors are presented relative to the scope of supervision in public basic schools. Table 6 presents the responses.

Table 6

Circuit Supervisors' Viewpoints on the Scope of Supervision in

Public Basic Schools

Scope of supervision	VO	O	N
	N %	N %	N %
Check the use of instructional time	1(20)	0(0)	4(80)
Teachers are supervised during lesson delivery	0(0)	0(0)	5(100)
Observations discussed after Supervision	0(0)	1(20)	4(80)
Check vetted lesson notes according to scheme of work	0(0)	0(0)	5(100)
Check pupils output of work	0(0)	0(0)	5(100)
Check situational report	0(0)	0(0)	5(100)
Build teacher capacity three times a term	0(0)	2(40)	3(60)

Key: VO = Very often, O = Often, R= Rarely

N = 5 (Number of Circuit Supervisors)

A closer look at the Table 6 shows that the responses of circuit supervisors on almost all the issues raised about the scope of supervision was not encouraging. This is because only 20% of circuit supervisors indicated they often checked the use of instructional time; again, only 20% discussed supervisory observations with teachers and lastly, 40% of circuit supervisors indicated they organised in-service training for teachers to build their capacity. There is no doubt that the views expressed by teachers were largely confirmed by those of circuit supervisors.

There is ample evidence in literature to show that headteachers and circuit supervisors are internal supervisors. For instance, Ministry of Education (2002) has recognised the critical leadership role circuit supervisors play by developing the Circuit Supervisor's Handbook. In this book, the duties of circuit supervisors are spelt out and some include helping teachers to identify and classify problems and develop solutions to the problems for effective instructional process.

Table 7 presents the views of teachers on the scope of supervision in public basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis.

Table 7

Teachers' Views of Scope of Supervision in Public Basic Schools

Scope of supervision	VO	O	N
	N%	N%	N %
Supervised on maximize use of time	2(1.6)	8(6.4)	115(92)
Supervised regularly	0(0)	8(6.4)	117(93.6)
Check on output of work	0(0)	8(6.4)	117(93.6)
Check on prepared vetted lesson notes	8(6.4)	117(93.6)	0(0)

Key: VO – Very often, O – Often, N – Never.

N =125 (Number of Teachers)

Table 7 shows that majority (92%) of the teacher respondents indicated that they were never supervised on maximum use of instructional time. This confirms responses from headteachers and circuit supervisors. It is an objective way of looking at the issue even though, the inability of supervisors to carry out this task of supervisors is unacceptable. In spite of the overwhelming non-performance of that task, few (8%) respondents noted that they were supervised on maximum time use. The views of the few teacher respondents is in tandem with what Neagley and Evans (1980) emphasized that supervision is any service for teachers that eventually results in improving instruction, learning and the curriculum. By inference when teachers are effectively supervised their performance improves.

Also, Table 7 shows that majority (93.6%) of teachers admitted they were never supervised during lesson delivery and same proportion of teacher respondents affirmed that there was no check on their work leaving only 6.4% who were supervised. These responses are somehow in tune with those given by headteachers and circuit supervisors.

In spite of the fact that other aspects of supervision are not conducted, Table 7 shows that all teacher respondents noted that their lesson notes were vetted. In reference to Table 5 72% of headteachers indicated that they never vetted teachers' lesson notes. May be these teachers were not selected from the schools of the heads who participated in this. The core issue is that if teachers are supervised according to the standards, then all is well since supervision of instruction is being looked from the universal viewpoint as espoused by scholars like Neagley and Evans (1980), Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand (1977), Musaazi

(1985) and Gray (1984). For example Musaazi (1985) and Gray (1984) stressed that supervision is centered around what teachers do in performance of their assigned roles and to search for improvement in their performance.

From the view points of head teachers, circuit supervisors and teachers, there was no regular supervision on maximum use of instructional time, lesson delivery, output of work and they were not properly checked on prepared and vetted lessons notes according to scheme of work. This showed apathy and laxity towards work in public basic schools. Comparing the findings to the literature review in this study, the supervision that occurs in the public basic schools is laissez faire; a supervision that allows the teacher to teach in a manner he wants. In this type of supervision, little effort is made to assist the teacher to improve the instructional programme. The work place becomes deserted as soon as the supervisor leaves leaving the task incomplete according to Drake and Roe (2003). This also, confirms the statement made by Minister of Education and reported in a Daily Graphic publication in 1997 that, ''Ineffective supervision has made otherwise good teachers to perform poorly resulting in low teaching and learning outcomes'' (p.12).

Research Question Three: What factors influence supervision in public basic schools?

Research question three sought to bring out information on factors that influenced supervision in terms of facilities needed by headteachers, circuit supervisors and teachers. The responses are the impressions of headteachers, teachers and circuit supervisors. The responses elicited respondents are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Responses on the Factors that Influence Supervision in Public Basic Schools

The factors	Responses by teachers (N=125)		Responses by headteachers (N=25)		Responses by Circuit Supervisors (N=5)	
	A	D	A	D	A	D
	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
i. Provision of logistics	125(100)	0(0)	23(92)	2(8)	5(100)	0(0)
ii. Provision of motivation	100(80)	25(20)	20(80)	5(20)	3(60)	2(40)
iii. Regular visits by Education Officers	125(100)	0(0)	23(92)	2(8)	5(100)	0(0)

Key: A = Agree, D = Disagree

Table 8 shows that all teachers and circuits supervisors as well as 92% of headteacher respondents agreed that the provision of logistics greatly influenced supervision in the public basic schools. It should be stated that there have to be adequate provision of logistics and materials for teachers and headteachers to carry out their assignment tasks of teaching so that supervising them would be meaningful. If the required teaching and learning materials are unavailable, effective teaching cannot take place to warrant supervision. On the side of supervisors, like the circuit supervisors, they need means of transport to move around the schools to see to what goes on there. Elsewhere in this presentation it was discovered circuit supervisors could not go round as often as they should have done. In view of the importance attached to the provision of logistics, Halpin (1965) stressed that "supervision can be effectively carried out when materials and logistics are provided to support it" (p.32). Therefore the provision of logistics and materials to supervisors can spur them to carry out supervision well and lack of these items hinders effective supervision.

Again, Table 8 shows that 80% each of teacher and headteacher respondents and 60% of circuit supervisors agreed that provision of motivation was another factor that influenced supervision in the public basic schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. It is clear from the various responses that motivation is crucial to make instructional supervision effective in the schools. Bolman and Deal (2008) helped to solidify the fact that motivation can influence effective supervision of public schools. Specifically, they emphasised that "effective supervision aims at motivating the teacher, recognising and supporting different

phases within the teacher's life cycle in a positive manner to provide job satisfaction" (p.67).

On the issue of education officers paying regular visits to the schools, the table shows that all circuit supervisors and teachers agreed it influenced supervision in the schools. With this issue too, 92% of headteachers agreed it influenced supervision. The philosophy of supervision as have been stressed by a host of writers is focused upon the improvement of instruction. To Drake and Roe (2003), supervision is the general overseeing and controlling, management, administration, evaluation and accountability of schools and teachers. The important of Drake and Roe's input is clear because education officials are manager who undertake all the tasks that have outlined in the supposition given there scholars. Indeed, if the education officials were visit the schools regularly as agreed to by respondents; they would improvement in instruction carried in the schools.

From the perspectives of headteachers, circuit supervisors and teachers the factors that influenced supervision were logistics and motivation. Also, there was the need of regular visits by higher officials to the schools for proper supervision in the public basic schools as supervision was "… to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of teachers" (Elsbree & Nully, 1967, p.45).

Research Question Four: What is the influence of supervision on teacher performance?

Research question four was meant to obtain information on the influence of supervision in terms of improvement in normal routine duties of teachers,

headteachers and circuit supervisors. The views of teachers, headteachers and circuit supervisors are presented in Tables 9, 10 and 11 in that order.

Table 9

Teacher Views on the Influence Supervision has on Teacher Performance

Influence of supervision	A	D
	N %	N %
Regular preparation of lesson notes	115(92)	10(8)
Use instructional time effectively	115(92)	10(8)
Increase in output of work	118(94)	7(6)
Marking of exercises	118(94)	7(6)
Punctuality and regularity	120(96)	5(4)

Key A=Agree, D=Disagree

N = 125 (Number of teacher)

Table 9 shows that 92% of teachers indicated that they prepared lesson notes before going to class because they knew supervision will take place. This occurs when teachers are due for promotion or interview. It was only 8% of teachers who disagreed that was the practice. If teachers would prepare lesson in anticipation of supervision then it is defeating the purpose of supervision. In deed this revelation is buttressed by Khauchak, Peterson and Driscoll as cited in Tunison (1998) who studied teachers attitudes toward supervision and observed that "teachers viewed supervisory visits as being perfunctory with little or no impact on actual teaching performance" (p.2).

Also it is seen from Table 9 that teachers would do what is right if supervisors are going to around otherwise, they would not do what is expected of them. Since teachers would not do what is right in the absence of supervisors, it would be necessary to ensure that supervision of teachers is unannounced so that teachers who are caught unawares would also sit up and perform their assigned tasked without outside influence.

Table 10

Headteachers' Views on the Influence Supervision has on Teacher Performance

Influence of supervision	A	D
	N %	N %
Preparation of lesson notes improved	20(80)	5(20)
Punctuality and regularity improved	23(92)	2(8)
Maximise use of instructional time	21(84)	4(16)
Increased in output of work	18(72)	7(28)

Key: A= Agree, D= Disagree

N = 25 (Number of Head Teachers

Table 10 displays the views of headteachers on the same issues that were given to teachers to react. Similar to the responses given by teachers, 80% of headteachers agreed that supervision helped in the improvement of teachers lesson notes preparation. Also, all the other activities performed by teachers improved. For instance, punctuality and regularity to school and classes improved; maximum use of instructional hours by teachers and increased output

of work. In the viewpoints of headteachers in so far as concerned supervision has achieved it purpose of enhanced teacher performance.

Table 11

Circuit Supervisors' Views on the Influence Supervision has on Teacher Performance

Influence of supervision	A	D
	N %	N%
Improvement in preparation and vetting of lesson notes	3(60)	2(40)
Improvement of punctuality and regularity	4(80)	1(20)
Maximise use of instructional time	5(100)	0(0)
Improved output of work	4(80)	1(20)

Key: A= Agree, D = Disagree

N = 5 (Number of Circuit)

Table 11 shows that on the four issues that circuit supervisors were asked to expressed their views, an average of 80% agreed there was improvement with 20% disagreeing in two cases and 40% in another. The views of circuit supervisors corroborate those expressed by teachers and headteachers. All that have been said is that without supervision, teacher performance would not improve and this supervision of instruction a crucial aspect in the education delivery process. in giving credence to the important role supervision plays in the school system, Glickman, Gordson and Ross-Gordon (1995) who conducted a study into the effectiveness of supervision of schools found that schools that

consistently achieved good results were superior to other schools with little or no supervision. It was clear from that study that in schools where there is regular supervision teaching and learning were successful. The ultimate aim of every school system is better performance of learners which is a function of good teacher performance.

Prefects' Perceptions of Supervision in the Public Basic Schools

The researcher thought it prudent to solicit the view school prefects on some of the issues raised in the study. Consequently six issues that bother on teachers and headteachers' punctuality and regularity, use of instructional hours, output of work, staying in the school throughout the day, giving and marking of exercises in class. Table 12 presents the responses as given by the 45 prefects.

Table 12

School Prefects' Views on How Teachers and Headteachers Conducted Themselves

Responses	Agree		Sometimes		Rarely	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
i. Coming to school on time.	4	(9)	41	(91)	0	(0)
ii. Coming to school everyday.	40	(89)	5	(11)	0	(0)
iii. Teaching every subject on the timetable for the day.	5	(11)	40	(89)	0	(0)

Table 12 continued

Responses	Agree		Sometimes		Rarely	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
iv. Staying in school till the end of the day.	4	(9)	41	(91)	0	(0)
v. Giving exercises on every subject taught for the day.	5	(11)	40	(89)	0	(0)
vi. Marking of exercise done pupils within the day.	4	(9)	41	(91)	0	(0)

Table 12 shows that the majority (91%) of prefects indicated that majority of teachers and head teachers sometimes came to school after 8.00 in the morning. Then (89%) of the prefects maintained that teachers sometimes come to school everyday. Also, (91%) of the prefects admitted that teachers sometimes did not stay till the end of school. Again, majority of the prefects (89%) responded that sometimes teachers did not teach all subjects indicated on the table and sometimes some of them did not come to school at all. Furthermore, 89% of prefects maintained that teachers sometimes gave exercises and (91%) stated that even when they were given exercises, sometimes they were not marked promptly.

This indicates that supervisors should step up supervision to check punctuality and regularity of teachers in school. Also, supervisors should be vigilant on how teachers use instructional hours, and they should be able to do

regular checking on pupils output of work and marking of exercises to improve teacher performance.

Conclusions

The analysis presented on demographic data of respondents proved that the majority of head teachers, circuit supervisors and teachers were experienced. They had also, taught for over fifteen years in the public basic schools. The analysis on nature of supervision reveals that supervision was not a regular affair. Head teachers and circuit supervisors together with teachers were not regular and punctual. They rarely inform their teachers on new policies of education or identify strengths and weaknesses of teachers to improve teacher performance in public basic school.

The findings in relation to the scope of supervision revealed that supervisors did not supervise during instructional hours. Then also, majority of headteachers hardly vetted lesson notes according to scheme of work or checked output of work or write situational report. The circuit supervisors did not discuss observations with teachers and head teachers. The findings showed that supervisors did not give supervisory reports to head teachers and also, both head teachers and circuit supervisors did not pay regular visits to classrooms during instructional hours.

It was found out that factors that influence supervision in Basic Schools from the perspective of head teachers, teachers and circuit supervisors were motivation, logistics and regular visits by higher officials from Ghana Education Service. The findings on influence of supervision on teacher performance

indicated that checking and preparation of lesson notes, regularity and punctuality of head teachers and teachers, and maximum use of instructional hours improved and also, there was increase in output of work only when supervision is conducted which was also not regular.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary of the study, presents findings, conclusions drawn from the study and recommendations that would improve supervision in Public Basic Schools. The chapter also presents suggestions for further research work.

Summary

The study was a descriptive sample study which was undertaken to assess school supervision in Public Basic Schools. The researcher found out how supervision was conducted in mixed schools, girls' schools and boys' schools in public basic schools in Cape Coast Metropolis in the Central Region.

Relevant and related literature to the study was also reviewed. Data was collected from teachers, head teachers and circuit supervisors. Three sets of questionnaires were administered to teachers, head teachers and circuit supervisors.

The population targeted for the study were; teachers and head teachers, from Mixed, Girls and Boys' schools in public basic schools and all Circuit Supervisors from Municipal Education Office, Cape Coast Municipality. Also a sample size of 200 respondents was selected for the study. They comprised 25,

head teachers, 125 teachers and 45 prefects from Mixed, Girls' and Boy's public basic schools and 5 circuit supervisors from Municipal Education Office.

The researcher used stratified, purposive and simple random sampling methods to select respondents from the public basic schools and (Municipal Education Office) for the study. The data collected were analysed according to the research questions. The items of the word processing instrument were coded and frequency tables were constructed into percentages using computer software, which is Statistical Package for Social Science. The respondents were all professionals and had the characteristics; example the qualification essential for supervision. About half of the public basic schools head teachers (40%) had higher education to have enough teaching experience to supervise their schools. Also, (80%) of Circuit Supervisors had the highest qualification that is degree that would enable them to guide teachers to improve performance. Majority of the respondents (76%) claimed that supervision was not a regular affair.

Summary of Findings

The study found out that the majority of Circuit Supervisors had hardly issued supervisory reports to head teachers after supervision. Majority of circuit supervisors rarely visited classrooms to demonstrate teaching and learning techniques during visits. They also never discussed their observations with teachers after supervision. Both head teachers and circuit supervisors claimed that they never vetted and checked lesson notes according to scheme of work. Vetting and checking of notes are normally done when there is supervision from a higher education officer. Also, they hardly completed situational reports concerning

teachers working under them. Again, they rarely checked output of work of pupils.

In-service training was the major means by which the head teachers improved their teacher's skills which was not done regularly due to inadequate funds from G.E.S. Again, majority of the head teachers claimed they were not supervised regularly during lesson delivery. Majority of teachers accepted that they were never checked on output of work. Both head teachers, Circuit Supervisors and teachers agreed there was the need for logistics, motivation and regular visits by higher officials to enable them function effectively to improve teacher performance.

Majority of the respondents claimed punctuality and regularity improved when there was supervision in schools or supervision for teacher promotion. Respondents claimed that there was improvement on use of instructional time when there was supervision.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn based on the findings of the study. Modern supervision is geared towards teachers' improvement as it is now a relationship built between the teacher and the supervisor. If supervision in public basic schools is not a regular affair then it could be concluded that supervision is not effective.

Issuing a supervisory report and discussion of observations after supervision would make head teachers and teachers become aware of the problems at hand. As it was found out that this was hardly done by circuit

supervisors. It could be concluded that head teachers would not be able to effectively identify their teachers' problems in order to help them to improve performance.

Situational report gives information about teachers' performance in class and in all activities in the school. If the report is filled even the higher education officer would get to know what is really happening on the ground. Since that was not done by head teachers it could be concluded that there would be not much information about teachers' performance and this would make good teachers to perform poorly which would result to low teaching and learning outcomes.

Lack of logistics and motivation has caused ineffective supervision as head teachers, circuit supervisors and all teachers needed motivation before they could supervise effectively. It could be concluded that it was not that supervision was ignored but it was not conducted effectively due to lack of logistics and motivation. Also, regular visits by higher education officers could complement the effort made by head teachers and circuit supervisors.

Using maximum instructional hours effectively by teachers could have improved teachers performance but since teachers were left alone in the classroom without supervision, it gave room for teachers to manipulate instructional hours at their own pace. It could be concluded that teachers were not supervised closely during lesson delivery and therefore, this would affect teachers output of work.

Recommendations

These recommendations are made based on the findings of the study and the conclusion drawn from it.

1) Circuit supervisors, higher officials from Ghana Education Service and head teachers should make supervision a regular affair which could make teachers become familiar with supervision and modern supervisory skills of circuit supervisors to improve teachers performance in public basic schools

2) Circuit supervisors should be able to issue supervisory reports and also discuss observations with head teachers after supervision to enable them become aware of their teachers problems and help them to improve upon performance, through regular In - Service Training.

3) Also, head teachers should be encouraged to complete situational reports of their teachers and submit them to the circuit supervisors who could also forward it to the higher officials to enable them identify non-performing teachers in their schools for proper sanctions to be taken against them.

4) Ghana Education Service should do everything possible to provide the necessary logistics and motivation to circuit supervisors, head teachers and teachers to energise them work effectively to improve teaching and learning outcomes in public basic schools.

5) The Code of Ethics of Ghana Education Service for the staff in the public basic schools should be employed to enable teachers use maximum instructional hours effectively to improve output of work which could improve teachers' performance.

Suggestions for Further Research

Supervision is said to be effective when examination results are better as supervision is basically to improve teaching and learning outcomes. It is for this reason that supervision in private schools is believed to be more effective than the public basic schools as it has been indicated in the background of this study with the support of 2004 and 2008 Basic Education Certificate Examination Results.

Therefore, it has been suggested that there should be further research to deal with;

1) Frequency and scope of supervision in public basic schools

2) The influence of supervision in public basic schools on teacher performance.

REFERENCES

Acheson, A. A. & Gall, M. D. (1987). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers* (3rded.). New York: Longman Inc.

Amuzu-Kpeglo, A. K. (1987). *Training to Obtain the Skills and techniques of Inspection*, Unpublished Seminar paper, Cape Coast, IEPA, University of Cape Coast.

Alfonso, R. J. (1984). Will peer supervision work? *Educational Leadership,* 34, 594 - 601.

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

Asiedu, B. D. (1997). *Supervision of junior secondary schools in the New Juaben District of the Eastern Region of Ghana*. Unpublished thesis presented to Faculty of Education. University of Cape Coast. Cape Coast.

Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods* (2nded.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall.

Blumberg, A. & Amidon, E. (1965). Teacher perceptions of supervisor/teacher interaction. *Administrator's Note Book,* 14, 1-4

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boschee, F. (2009). *Performance-based education: Developing programs through strategic planning*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Burton, R. M. (2007). *Organizational design: A step-by-step approach*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Caldwell, B. J. (2004). *Re-imagining the self-managing school*. London: Specialist Schools Trust.

Campbell, R. F., Bridges, E. M. & Nystrand, R. O. (1977). *Introduction to Educational Administration.* (5th ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical Supervision*. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Commonwealth Secretariat. (1975). *Handbook for educational supervisors' commonwealth regional seminar: Freetown, Georgetown and Kuala Lumpur.* London. Commonwealth Printing Press.

Cuberly, E. P. (1963). *Elementary school administration and supervision.* New York: Litton Educational Publish Inc.

Carlton, E. M. (2001). *Handbook of clinical social work supervision.* Florida: Howard Pr. Inc.

Carmon, N. (1999). *Teacher's rule.* Washington: Garborgs.

Colbert, J. (1995). *Interactive case in teacher education classroom management.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Ministry of Education (1997, September 11). Ministry of Education speaks on supervision in schools. *Daily Graphic*, p.12.

Day, C. & Leithwood, K. (2007). *Successful principal leadership in times of change*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Douglas, H. R., Bent, R. K. & Boardman, C. W. (1962). *Democratic supervision in secondary schools*. New York: The Riverside Press.

Drake, T. L. & Roe, W. H. (2003). *The principalship*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Elsbree, W. S. & Nully, H. J. (1967). *Elementary school administration and supervision*. New Delhi: Wurasia Publishing House.

Eye, G. G. & Netzer, L. A. (1965). *Supervision of inspection phase of administration*. New York: Haper and Row Publishers.

Farrant, J. S. (1983). *Principles and practices of education*. Hong Kong: Sheck Wah Tony Printing Press Ltd.

Ghana Education Service. (2002). *Headteachers' handbook on supervision*. Accra: Ghana Publishing Company.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). *Differentiated supervision*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). *Supervision of instruction. A developmental approach* (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P. & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (1995). *Supervision of instruction. A developmental approach*. Massachusettes: Allyn and Bacon.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H. & Krajewski, J. (1980). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. (2nded.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Graham, C. K. (1971). *History of education in Ghana*. Tema: Ghana Publishing Corporation.

Gray, C. A. (1976). *A study of the working class in post war era*. London: Longman Green Ltd.

Gray, J. L. (1984). *Supervision.* Boston: Kent Publishing Company.

Griffin, G. A. (1985). *The school as a workplace and the master teacher concept. Elementary School Journal*, 86; 1 – 16.

Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., Di Natale, E., Ford, P., Hardy, R. & Swann, R. (2003). Successful school leadership in Victoria: Three case studies. *Leading and Managing*, 9(1), 18–37

Gurr, D., Drysdale, L. & Mulford, B. (2005). Successful principal leadership: Australian case studies. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(6), 539-551.

Gurr, D., Drysdale, L. & Mulford, B. (2006). Models of successful principal leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(4), pp. 371-395.

Gwynn, M. J. (1961). *Theory and practice of supervision.* New York; Dodd, Mead and Co.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principals' contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 9(2), 157-191.

Halpin, A. W. (1965). *The leadership behaviour of our superintendents. The School Community Development Study Monograph:* No. 4, Columbus: The Ohio State University.

Harris B. M. (1985). *Supervisory behaviour in education (3rded.).* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Heichberger, R. L. & Young, J. M. (1975). Teacher perception of supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 57, 210.

Hord, S. M. & Sommers, W. A. (2008). *Leading professional learning communities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Inkari, J. C. (1990, *January*, 6). The place of resource centre in teaching. *Daily Graphic,* (No.12171).

Kochhar, S. K. (1970). *Secondary school administration*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt.

Kumekpor, T. (1999): *Research method &techniques of social research.* Accra: Sonlife Press & Service.

Lamb, P. (1965). *The student teaching process in elementary schools*. Ohio: Merrill Book Inc.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. (2000). Principal and teacher leadership effects: A replication. *School Leadership & Management*, 20(4), 415-434.

Lincoln, B. & Guba, E. (1986). Research, evaluation, and policy implementation*:* An Organizational Perspective. *Public administration review.* 593, 465-474.

McWilliams, H. O. A. & Kwamena-Poh, M. A. (1975). *The development of education in Ghana*. London: Commonwealth Printing Press.

Ministry of Education. (1994). *Handbook on supervision in schools*. Accra, Ghana Publishing Company.

Ministry of Education (2002). *Policies and strategic plans for the education sector.* Accra: Ghana Publishing Company.

Mulford, B. & Silins, H. (2003). Leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(2), 175-195.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In, *Advances in Educational Administration: Changing Perspectives on the School*. Thousand Oaks, Cal: Corwin Press.

Musaazi, J. C. S. (1982). *The theory and practice of educational administration* (2nded.). London: Macmillan Publishers.

Musaazi, J. C. S. (1985). *The theory and practice in educational administration* (3rded). London: Macmillan Publishers.

Neagley, R. & Evans, L. (1980). *Handbook for effective supervision of instruction* (2[nd]ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:: Prentice- Hall, Inc.

Nwankwo J. J. (1981). *Educational planning theory and methods*. Karachi: Izharsons.

Nwokafor, J. N., Ighalo, A. A. S., Ogunsanwo, A., Olu, P. & Nwankwo, J. J. (1981). *Educational Administration and Supervision.* Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books.

Pecku, N. K. (1976). Reaching the student-teacher: The problem of the supervisor. *Oguaa Educator*, 7, 12-13.

Sammons, P., Hillman, J., & Mortimore, P. (1995). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research*. London: OFSTED.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). T*he principalship: A reflective practice approach.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Silins, H., Mulford, W. R., & Zarins, S. (2002). Organisational learning and school change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 613-642.

Tunison, S. (1998). *Instructional supervision policies and practices*. SSTA Research Centre Report. Saskatoon, SK: Saskatchewan School Boards Association.

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J. & Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 398-425.

Appendix A

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

Introduction

This questionnaire is designed to help the researcher to solicit your views on the nature of supervision in public basic schools. Indicate the frequency and scope of supervision in school, the factors that influence supervision and the influence of supervision on teacher performance. The data provided will be treated with utmost of confidentiality.

SECTION A

1) Name of District

2) Name of School

3) Name of Circuit

4) Type of School Public

5) What is the highest academic qualification?

   [a] SSSCE [b] GCE 'O' Level [c] GCE 'A' Level [d] Diploma [e] Degree

6] What is the highest professional qualification?

   [a] Cert 'A' 4yrs. [b] Cert 'A' 3yrs [c] Diploma [d] Degree

7] Year of teaching experience; [a] 0 – 4 yrs. [b] 5-10 yrs.

   [c] 10 – 15 yrs   [d] Over 15yrs.

SECTION B

Statements in this section relate to nature of supervision in public basic schools in

Cape Coast Municipality.

The scale notation is: A = Always, U = Usual, S = Sometimes

 R = rarely,   N = Never

	Nature of supervision	A	S	N
8	It is regular and punctual			
9	Close supervision exercise in school			
10	Teacher are informed new policies on education			
11	Strengths and weakness identified			

SECTION   C

        In this section you are to give your views on frequency scope of

supervision in your school. The scale notations are:

V^O = very often   O = often N= never

15) What is the frequency and scope of supervision in your school .

A	Check the use of instructional time	VO	O	N
B	Teachers are supervised during lesson delivery			
C	Observations are discussed after supervision			
D	Vet lesson notes according to scheme of work every four weeks			
E	Complete situational report every four weeks			
F	Build teacher capacity through INSET			

SECTION   D

In this section please give your view; A= Agree, D= Disagree, S. D. =

16) In your own opinion what factors influence supervision.

		A	D
A	Provision of logistics		
B	Provision of motivation		
C	Regular visits by higher officials		

SECTION   E

In this section you are to give your view on; what is the influence of supervision

on teacher performance.

The scale notation is: A = Agree,   D = Disagree,

Your supervision improve teacher performance in:

		A	D
17	Regular preparation of lesson notes		
18	Use of instructional time effectively		
I9	Increase in output of work		
20	Marking of exercises		
21	Punctuality and regularity		

Appendix B

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

This questionnaire is designed to help the researcher solicit your views on the nature of supervision in basic schools, the frequency and scope of supervision and the influence of supervision in public schools in Cape Coast Municipality. Indicate the extent to which supervision influence on teacher performance. The data provided by you will be treated as confidential.

SECTION   A

1) Name of District

2) Name of School

3) Name of Circuit

4) Type of school   Public

5) What is the highest academic qualification

   [a] SSCE [b] GCE O' Level [c] GCE 'A' Level [d] Diploma [e] Degree

6] What is the highest professional qualification

   [a] Cert A' 4yrs. [b] Cert A'3yrs. [c] Diploma, [d] Degree

7] Years of teaching experience [a] 0-4 yrs [b] 5-10yrs [c] 11-15 yrs

   [d] over 15 yrs

SECTION   B

Please provide the data required in this questionnaire as accurately as possible.

Statement in this section relates to nature of supervision in basic schools in Cape

Coast Municipality. The scale notation is A = Agree,

D = Disagree

		A	D
8	Regularly exercised in school		
9	Done during instructional hours		
10	Check on maximise use of time		
11	Result in increase output of work		

SECTION C

In this section you are to give your views on frequency and scope of supervision

in your school.

The scale notation is; VO = Very Often , O = often, N = Never

		VO	O	N
12	Supervised on maximum use of instructional hours			
13	Supervised regularly during lesson delivery			
14	Checked on output of work			
15	Checked on prepared and vetted lesson notes			

SECTION   D

A statement in this section is soliciting your views on factors that influence supervision. The scale notation is as follows;   A = Agree, D = Disagree.

In your opinion what factors that influence supervision.

		A	D
16.	Provision of logistics		
17	Provision of motivation		
18.	Regular visits by higher officials		

SECTION   E

The following statements relate to; what is the influence of supervision on teacher performance. The scale notation is H = High, L = Low.

Supervision of circuit supervisors and head teachers improve performance in;

		A	D
19	Regular preparation of lesson notes		
20	Use of instructional time effectively		
21	Increase in output of work		
22	Marking of exercise		
23	Punctuality and regularity		

Appendix C

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CIRCUIT SUPERVISORS

This questionnaire is designed to help the researcher to solicit your views on the nature of supervision in public basic schools, the frequency and scope of supervision, factors that influence supervision. Indicate the extent to which supervision influence teacher performance in public basic schools in Cape Coast Municipality.

The data provided will be treated with utmost of confidentiality.

1) SECTION A

2) Name of District

3) Name of School

4) Name of Circuit

5) Type of school under your jurisdiction: Public

6) What is your highest academic qualification [a] SSSCE [b] GCE O' Level [c]

    GCE A' Level   [d] Diploma [e] Degree

6) What is your highest professional qualification? [a] Cert A' 4yr.

    [b] Cert A' 3yr.   [c] Diploma [d] Degree

7) Years of supervisory experience; [a] 0-4yrs. [b] 5-10 yrs. [c] 11-15 yrs

     [d] over 15 yrs.

SECTION B

Please provide the data required in this questionnaire as accurately as possible. Statements in this section relate to nature of supervision in basic schools in Cape Coast Municipality. The scale notation is; A = Always, S= Sometimes, R= Rarely, N= Never

		A	S	N
8	Made visit to schools in the mornings			
9	It is regular			
10	Written supervisory report given after supervision			
11	Regular visit to classroom to demonstrate teaching learning techniques			

SECTION C

In   this section you are to give your view on frequency scope of supervision

school. The scale notation is as follows: V^O = very often, N = never

 You effectively supervise the school in your area of jurisdiction to;

		V^O	O	N
12	Check on maximum use of instructional time			
13	Supervise teachers during instructional hours			
14	Discuss observation with teachers you supervise			
15	Check vetted lesson notes			
16	Check pupils on output of work			
17	Check situational report filled by head teachers on teachers			
18	Build teacher capacity through inset three times within a term			

 SECTION   D

Statements in this section solicit your view on factors that influence supervision.

 The scale notation is: A = Agree, D = Disagree

What factors influence supervision;

		A	D
19	Provision of logistic		
20	Provision of motivation		
21	regular visits to check the right thing being done		

SECTION   E

In this section you are to give your views on; what is the influence of supervision

on teacher performance.

The scale notation is: A = Agree,   D = Disagree

Your supervision improves teacher performance in;

		A	D
22	Preparation vetting of lesson notes		
23	Punctuality and regularity		
24	Maximum use of instructional hours effectively		
25	Increase in output of work		

Appendix D

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PREFECTS ON TEACHER PERFORMANCE

IN CAPE COAST METROPOLIS

		A	S	R	TIME 7:00	AFTER 7:00	8:00	AFTER 8:00
1	Time for school							
2	Coming to school everyday							
3	Teaching every subject on the timetable for the day							
4	Staying in school till the end of the day							
5	Giving exercises on every subject taught for the day							
6	Marking of exercises done pupils within the day							

This interview guide is to solicit information from prefects on teacher punctuality, regularity, use of instructional hours, output of work and marking of exercises. The scale notation is; A = Agree, S = Sometimes, R = Rarely

APPENDIX E

SELECTED SCHOOLS

GIRLS   BOYS

Philip Quaque J.S.S   Philip Quaque JSS

St. Monica's J.S.S   Catholic Jubilee JSS

Wesley Girls JSS

MIXED SCHOOL

Antem M/A JSS   Christ Church Anglican JSS

Ebubonko M/A JSS   Abura Ahmadiyya JSS

Pedu M/A JSS   Aboom Zion JSS

Ayifua St. Mary's JSS   St. Lawrence Catholic JSS

Efutu Anglican JSS   St Cyprian Anglican School

St. Joseph JSS   O L A Presby School

Kakomdo M/A JSS   Bakatsir Primary. J. S. S.

St. Nicholas Anglican JSS   Church of Christ

Mensah Sarbah JSS   Kwaprow M/A J.S.S.

Apewosika M/A JSS   Abura English /Arabic