THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Conflicting Views among Supervisors during Off –Campus Teaching Practice Supervision at the University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Francis Agbalenyo
Teacher, Wesley Girls High School, Cape Coast, Ghana
Ernest Ampomah Arkoh
Lecturer, Community University College, Takoradi, Ghana
Joseph Mfum Appiah
Head, Department of Education Studies Enchi College of College of Education, Ghana

Abstract:
This research examined conflicting views among supervisors during the Off-Campus teaching practice supervision at the University of Cape Coast. Sequential explanatory mixed method design was employed for the study and the multi-stage sampling technique and the proportionate stratified sampling technique was used to select respondents for the study. Questionnaires, focus group discussion guide, interview and document analysis guide were used to gather both qualitative and quantitative data for the study. The results were presented using tables, percentages, frequencies as well means and standard deviations. The areas of conflicting views among supervisors revealed by the study are; lesson note format, statement of lesson objectives, the way of displaying teaching and learning resources, chalk board summary, the classroom position of the teacher and finally the closure of the lesson. It was further revealed that the years of experience, the content knowledge of the supervisor and the supervisors' own perception of teaching are some of the factors influencing supervisors' remarks. Based on the findings, it was recommended that the Teaching Practice Unit should come out with one accepted way of dealing with the areas where there are conflicting views and such method should be emphasized during micro teaching.

Keywords: Teaching, teaching practice, supervision, off- campus, conflicting, views

1. Introduction

Education is considered as the nation's important tool for achieving more progress and development in the changeable world (Diala, Ibrahim, Yousef & Ferial, 2014). This implies that any nation that wants to develop in this continuously changing world must invest in education. Jahin and Alexander (2006) assert that qualified and competent teachers have critical roles to play in determining their country's development and prosperity through quality education. This assertion has been supported by Bisher (2005) who argues that teachers are indispensable despite new developments in education such as modern teaching aids to facilitate the teaching and learning process. This means that to have quality education calls for well trained teachers.

The main rationale behind the establishment of the University of Cape Coast was to see to teacher education in Ghana. Teacher education is a programme that is related to the development of teacher proficiency and competence that would enable and empower the teacher to meet the requirements of the teacher profession. University of Cape Coast was therefore responsible for training highly skilled professional teachers for Ghana's second cycle institutions and the Ministry of Education with the primary purpose of meeting the manpower needs of Ghana's accelerated education programme at the time. However, with the attainment of her autonomy in 1972, she expanded and diversified her academic programmes to include studies in Humanities, Pure and Applied Science with a recent addition of Medicine and Law (University of Cape Coast Prospectus, 2014/2015).

One of the main machinery for training of teachers in the University of Cape Coast is through Teaching Practice Programme. Teaching Practice Programme is a kind of practice teaching which gives an opportunity to the student-teachers to put into practice the theories and skills of teaching that he or she has learnt in the classroom. According to Olaitan and Agusiobo (1992), teaching practice is the first opportunity for the student-teacher to participate in activities involving teaching in actual situations. Teaching practice is also recognized as an experience of guided teaching in which the student-teacher assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group of students or pupils over a specific period of time, for example, six weeks in the case of the University of Cape Coast which was later extended to one semester. The extension was deemed necessary in the sense that it seems to give student-teachers adequate time to acquire the necessary field experience to improve upon their teaching skills as well as an understanding of the kind of environment they would be working in after training. Furthermore, teaching practice programme enables student-

teachers to develop several competences which include; interpersonal, pedagogical, intercultural and psychological competences. The teaching practice at the University of Cape Coast is of two kinds: The On-Campus teaching practice and the Off-Campus teaching practice. The on-campus teaching practice, also known as the microteaching, is the situation whereby practice teaching takes place on the campus of the college or university. In this case, the student-teacher teaches his or her own colleagues in groups for a specific teaching period. The University of Cape Coast's on-campus teaching sessions are designed to:

- Strengthen student teachers approach to teaching;
- Identify student-teachers' personal strengths and areas for improvement;
- Enhance student-teachers' understanding of the variety of effective teaching styles; and
- Improve upon student-teachers' ability to provide and receive effective feedback.

However, the Off-Campus teaching practice is quite different from the On-Campus teaching practice. In the Off-Campus teaching practice, student-teachers are sent to first or second cycle institutions where they are supposed to teach various classes. In that case, student-teachers introduce, develop and conclude a lesson in one or two class periods. Again, during the Off- Campus teaching practice, student-teachers assume a more real role as teachers by engaging in all the activities a permanent practicing teacher will engage in. when this happens, it would arouse the student-teachers' interest in the teaching profession and motivate them for the work ahead (Ngidi & Sibaya, 2003).

1.1. Problem Statement

At the University of Cape Coast, a number of studies have discovered that conflicting views do exist among supervisors on the same issue during off-campus teaching practice supervision. For example, a study conducted by Oppong (2013) to examine the perspectives of History student-teachers on the remarks given by supervisors during teaching practice supervision at the University of Cape Coast revealed that there have been conflicting remarks from supervisors on lesson taught. Similarly, Tettey (2014) in his study to explore the perspectives of trainee-teachers on issues pertaining to lesson planning during off-campus teaching practice at the University of Cape Coast also discovered that conflicting views do exist among supervisors. In addition, Agbalenyo, Kporsu, Amoo-lamptey and Dorkenoo (2013) undertook a study to explore the challenges of B. Ed (Management) student-teachers during off-campus teaching practice at the University of Cape Coast. They reported in their recommendation that supervisors should be objective and consistent in their views/remarks. This suggests that the views of supervisors are not consistent. In other words, the views do contradict with each other.

It can be seen from the studies of Oppong (2013), Tettey (2014) and Agbalenyo, Kporsu, Amoo-lamptey and Dorkenoo (2013) that conflicting views do exist among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision. Though these findings are relevant, the researchers failed to provide literature on the areas where supervisors view do not agree among themselves on the same issue. The question "on what areas do supervisors not agree on each other?" is still left unanswered. It therefore seems very little or no attention has been given to further examine this critical issue.Though in the circles of organizational behaviour, leadership and administration, research works have shown that conflicting views are inevitable, it is also true according the views of Yetunde (1998) that when there is very little or no consensus about what constitutes effective teaching during teaching practice supervision; student-teachers may end up more confused at the end of their teaching practice. In this regard, a critical investigation of the issue is therefore very vital and crucial in an era where there are increasing numbers of people entering the teaching profession. It is also necessary to undertake this study to unveil the areas of conflicting views as well as factors influencing the views of supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision at the University of Cape Coast and suggest possible meanings of minimizing the conflicting views.

1.2. Research Questions

The study sought answers to the following research questions and hypotheses:

- What are the areas of conflicting views among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision at the University of Cape Coast?
- What are the factors influencing the views of supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision at the University of Cape Coast?
- Hypotheses 1: H_0: There is no statistical significant difference in the influences of supervisors' remarks on student-teachers teaching in terms of gender
- Hypotheses 2: H_0: There is no significant difference in the influence of supervisors' remarks on student-teachers teaching in terms of their programme of study.

2. Methodology

2.1. Mixed Method Approach

This study employed the mixed method design. Mixed method design is the methodology for conducting research that involves collecting, analyzing, and integrating quantitative and qualitative research in a single study (Creswell & Clark, 2003). The rationale behind the choice of this research design is that, a combination of both qualitative and quantitative researches provides a better understanding of conflicting views among supervisors during off campus teaching practice supervision than using only one research approach. The type of mixed method design used in this study was the Explanatory Sequential Design (QUAN qual). Explanatory Sequential design consists of two distinct phases: quantitative

followed by qualitative, wherea researcher first collects and analyses the quantitative data, follow by collection and analysis of qualitative data in that sequence (Creswell & Clark, 2003). The qualitative data collected in the second phase helps explain the quantitative results obtained in the first phase. That is to say that, the second, qualitative, phase builds on the first, quantitative, phase, and the two phases are connected in the intermediate stage in the study.

2.2. Population

The multi-stage technique was used. At stage one; the College of Education Studies was purposively selected. The reason being that it is the only college that sees to the training of teachers and for that matter under take teaching practice supervision. The second stage sampling was done at the departmental level. Under the college of education studies, there are five main departments. The names of the departments under the college of education studies are; Department of Arts and Social Sciences (DASSE), Department of Vocational and Technical Education (VOTEC), Department of Science and Mathematics (DSME), Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (HPER), Department of Educational Foundation and Department of Basic Education. The simple random technique was used to select only one department for the study. The reason for selecting one department was that the researcher wanted to focus on only one department in order to have an in-depth study of the research topic since all the student-teachers in the other departments had similar characteristics. In doing the selection, the names of all departments under the college of education studies were written on a piece of paper and placed in a hat and one was picked at random. The department that was picked among the lot was the Department of Arts and Social Sciences (DASSE). This department comprises of a number of programmes ranging from of B.Ed. (Management), B.Ed. (Accounting), B.Ed. (Arts), B.Ed. (Social sciences) and B.Ed. (Social Studies). The total population for the student-teachers at DASSE was 569 and their assigned supervisors.

The determination of the sample size was done using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table for the determination of sample size. A sample size of 250 which was a fair representation of the entire population of 569 of student-teachers from the department of arts and social sciences was selected for the study.This sample size (250) is above the minimum size (230) suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970).A proportionate stratified sampling technique was used to select a portion from each programme (stratum). This was done to ensure that there was a fair representation of student-teachers from each programme. The lottery method was employed for the selection of the student-teachers in each stratum. In doing so, student-teachers from each programme were assigned codes and those codes were written on a piece of paper and placed in a hat. Due to the large number of documents available (student-teachers' assessment Form-B and lesson note books), it was prudent to select sample for the study. Lyubou (2012) has recommended a percentage range between 14%-30% to be used in sampling documents for a study when there are high volumes of documents. In that regard, 15% was applied on a total of 250 assessments Form-Bs collected from student-teachers to obtain a sample size of 34 documents for this study. The simple random technique was therefore used to select the 34 student-teachers' assessment Form-B to generate additional data to add on to the quantitative data.

Programme	Population	Sample Size
B.Ed.(Management)	176	77
B.Ed. (Social Sciences)	152	67
B.Ed. (Accounting)	97	42
B.Ed.(Arts)	88	39
B.Ed. (Social Studies)	56	25
Total	569	250

Table 1: Distribution of Student-Teachers According to Their Programme of Study

2.2.1. Questionnaire

The use of the questionnaire stemmed from the fact that it is the best method by which reliable information can be obtained in a research of this kind; where the variable under investigation requires statement of fact and high level of confidentiality (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Considering the kind of information required from the respondents of this study, the questionnaire was more likely to elicit truthful responses from student-teachers and supervisors as it guarantees high level of confidentiality. Questionnaires are widely used and useful instrument for collecting survey information, numerical data and often comparatively straight forward to analyze (Wilson & McLean, 1994). The questionnaire was therefore at a better position of collecting easy to analyze numerical data on conflicting views among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision. Wilson and McLean added that, with the use of questionnaire, large samples can be made use of and thus the result can be made more dependable and reliable as in the case of this study where the sample size is large. McMillan and Schumacher (2001) recommend a questionnaire if the researcher knows that the respondents will be able to read, understand and answer the questionnaire. Student-teachers and university supervisors can read, understand and answer the questionnaires on their own. In all, there were two sets of questionnaires. One set for the supervisors and the other set for the student-teachers.

2.3. Focus Group Discussion Guide

Five (5) carefully predetermined questions were structured for focus group discussion in support of the number suggested by Morgan (2002) who is of the view that focus groups are structured around a set of carefully predetermined questions that are usually not more than 10. The questions were meant to generate more data in the form of explanation to the closed-ended items in the questionnaires on the factors influencing the remarks of supervisors, the influence of

conflicting views on student-teachers' teaching and how student-teachers react to the views/remarks of supervisors and finally section E which solicited ways of immunizing the conflicting views among supervisors.

Focus group methodology is useful in exploring and examining what people think, how they think, and why they think the way they do about the issues of importance to them without pressuring them into making decisions or reaching a consensus (Kitzinger, 2005). Focus group is therefore suitable for this study as it helped examined conflicting views among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision. In addition, the focus group discussion in this study was meant to capture experiences, opinions and feelings of respondents which the closed-ended questionnaire could not have obtained (Kitzinger, 2005)

2.4. Document Analysis Guide

In the view of Creswell (1998) and Merriam (2001), document analysis, as a data source, is as good as observation and interview. However, it could be argued that document analysis has an additional potential to reveal information that the interviewee is not ready to share. Moreover, it has the ability to access information that may not be available during observation. In view of this, a Document Analysis was carried out with the aid of document analysis guide. An unstructured document analysis guide was used to gather data through intensive and careful reading of student-teachers' assessment Form-B. The elements of the lesson delivery explored in the document analysis guide included the lesson note format, statement of objective, the position of the teacher in the classroom (whether sitting or standing and whether moving or static at one position), closure of lesson (whether student-teacher summarizes the day lesson all by himself or herself or student-teacher called on a student from the class to summarize the lesson), chalk board summary, the use of teaching and learning materials among others. The essence of the document analysis was to gather additional data to address only research question one which sought to find out the areas of conflicting views among supervisors during on campus teaching practice supervision. Even though the use of document analysis in this context was time-consuming, it enabled the researcher to collect some vital first-hand information in their lesson notebooks and the Form-B.

2.5. Data Collection

This study used the Explanatory Sequential Design which is a two-phase mixed method. As a two-phase mixed method, the design started with the collection and analysis of quantitative data and then followed by subsequent collection and analysis of qualitative in support of the view maintained by Creswell and Clark (2007). An introductory letter was taken from the Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education (DASSE). The relevance of the introductory letter was to seek for approval from the department so as to allow student-teachers to participate in this study.

The questionnaire for student-teachers and that of supervisors were administered on same day. In order to ensure a high return rate, and also to clarify the meaning of some items to both student-teachers and supervisors, the instruments were administered personally with the help of one trained research assistant. The student-teachers selected for this study were asked to wait behind after lectures. They were then briefed about the purpose of the study and an appeal made to them to read all instructions carefully before they respond to the items. Respondents were also given an assurance of anonymity as research ethics demand. The questionnaires given to student-teachers were collected immediately to ensure a high return rate. It took thirty minutes to administer the questionnaires to the student-teachers. However, the questionnaires administered to supervisors took five days before they were collected. This was done to ensure that supervisors get enough time to respond to the items as a result of their busy schedules. Telephone calls were made as a follow-up on the supervisors. In all 424 questionnaires were administered to both student-teachers and supervisors. After collection and analysis of quantitative data in the first phase, a qualitative data was also collected.

The instruments used in collecting the qualitative data were the document analysis guide and focus group discussion guide. First of all, the student-teacher's assessment Form-Bs were collected and photocopied. The photocopy was done so that the original documents could be returned to the student-teachers and also to enable me have ample time to analyse the remarks made by supervisors. Lastly, a focus group was also carried out where more data was generated to explain the quantitative results. A simple random selection method was used to recruit 8 student-teachers for the discussion. In doing so, numbers were assigned to all student-teachers that participated earlier in answering items in the questionnaire. The numbers were randomly drawn without replacement from a hat until the desired number of 8 was achieved. The same process was repeated until three different groups were obtained. Date, time and location as well as the topic to be discussed were all communicated to them. In all, three different groups were engaged in the discussion as opined by Kitzinger (2005), who is of the view that it takes more than one focus group on any one topic to produce valid results – usually three or four. The discussion continued with the same set of questions until I reached a point of saturation where I was not hearing anything new anymore. The time set for the discussion was 60 minutes in support of Kitzinger (2005), who is of the view the ideal amount of time to set aside for a focus group is anywhere from 45 to 90 minutes. He explained further by saying that beyond that time, most groups are not productive and it becomes an imposition on participant time.

2.6. Data Analysis

Background data of respondents was analysed quantitatively using frequencies and percentages to give a clearer picture on the sex distribution, age, experience and gender of student-teachers and supervisors. The rest of the analysis has been explained in line with the instrument used to collect the data.

2.6.1. Questionnaire

Quantitative data was generated on the first two research questions. Thus research question (1, & 2). These research questions were crafted as open-ended items for both student-teachers and supervisors. However, the items for supervisors covered only research question 2 which sought to identify the factors influencing the remarks of supervisors. Each closed-ended item on the questionnaire for both student-teachers and supervisors were structured on a 5-point Likert-scale and responses ranged from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The weight for each item was computed and the score obtained denoted the level of agreement or disagreement.

The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics (means, standard deviation, percentages and frequencies) with the aid of Statistical Package for Service Solution (SPSS) computer application software.

2.7. Document Analysis

The document analysis was carried out on only research question 1. we carefully read through the assessment form-Bs that was collected from the student-teachers with the help of a document analysis guide. Whilst reading, brief notes were made in the margin when interesting item was found. One after the other, I went through the notes made in the margins and listed the different types of information found. The information was categorized into various themes where conflicting views do exist. Then after, the various themes were compared.

Since there were several student-teachers' Form-Bs, the procedures described above were repeated for all the sampled student-teacher's Form-Bs. Once the entire documentary data was categorized into themes, the list was reviewed in order to ensure that the data was categorized in line with the items stated on the guide. All the categories were reviewed to ascertain whether some themes could be merged or if some needed to be sub-categorized. Finally, the overall areas of conflicting views were then estimated and described with frequencies and percentages.

2.8. Focus Group Discussion

Focus group discussion was held to thoroughly gather extra explanatory data to the quantitative data in the questionnaire. In order for all participants' comments to be useful, they were broken down using a systematic and verifiable process. The process began with transcribing all focus group tapes and inserting notes into transcribed material where appropriate. Data was also cleaned up by stripping off nonessential words. Where possible; some comments have been modified to reflect correct grammar. Participant's comments were assigned a code each on a separate line on a page. Each line was labelled with the participant and the group number, for instance, a comment from a student-teacher 6 in group 2 was assigned the number 2.6.

Each line is then entered into an Excel database on a separate Excel spread sheet for each group. Each separate response or idea was entered on a separate line with participant ID attached in order to link up the comment of each student-teacher. When all comments have been entered, I then looked for common themes across the entries for each question. Finally, short paragraph summarizing findings for each theme was written whilst noting similarities and differences across groups.

3. Results and Discussion

Variable	Subscale	No.	%
Gender	Male	26	65.5
	Female	14	35.5
Total		40	100.0

Table 2: Gender of Supervisors

Background information such as gender, subject area of specialization, number of years of supervision, highest teacher degree earned and highest academic qualification of supervisors are presented in Table 2. From Table 2, it was realized that 19 (65.5%) of the supervisors were males whilst the remaining 11(35.5%) were females. This shows that more male supervisors participated in this study than their female counterparts. The reason is that there are more male lecturers and for that matter supervisors than female lecturers at the University of Cape Coast.

Variable	Subscale	No.	%
Subject Area of Specialization	Accounting	6	15.0
	Business Management	10	25.0
	Cost Accounting	5	12.5
	History	5	12.5
	Economics	7	17.5
	French	3	7.5
	History	2	5.0
	Religion	2	5.0
Total		40	100.0

Table 3: Subject Area of Specialization of Supervisors
Source: Fieldwork, 2016

Table 3 provides information on the subject area of specialization of supervisors. From Table 3, it can be grasped that 8 (20%) of total supervisors specialized in accounting, 12 (30%) specialized in Business management, 7 (17.5%) also specialized in Economics, 3 (7.5 %) were in the field of French whilst the remaining   2 (5%) specialized in religion. This shows that majority (30%) of supervisors specialized in Business Management and the least (4%) was in the field of history and religion.

One important observation made from Table 3 was the fact that the supervisors that observed the lessons of student-teachers to some extend have content knowledge in the subjects taught by the student-teachers. This is evident from Table 3 because the subject areas taught by student-teachers are not different from the areas of specialization of the supervisors. It was also indicated that whilst majority of the student-teachers were in the field of Business Management so were the supervisors. That notwithstanding, supervisors also do observe lessons outside their subject areas of specialization. Some student-teachers mentioned that there were instances where their lessons were observed by supervisors who do not specialized in the area that they are teaching.

Variable	Subscale	No.	%
Years of Supervision	Between 1and 5 years	13	32.5
	Between 6 and 10 years	12	30.0
	Between 11 and 15 years	6	15.0
	Between 16yrs and above	9	22.5
Total		40	100.0

Table 4: Supervisors' Years of Supervision
Source: Fieldwork, 2016

The years of supervision can have both negative and positive impact on supervision. This is because the years of supervision mostly go with one's experiences. In ascertaining the years of supervision of supervisors, Table 4 shows that 13 (32.5%) of the supervisors have been supervising between the ranges of 1 to 5 years, 12 (30%) were between 6 to 10 years, 6 (15%) have also been supervising between 11 to 15 years.   However, 9 (22.5%) have been supervising for over 16 years. It was not surprising to know that majority of those who been supervising above 15years were professors from the University of Cape Coast. Again, it can be said that most supervisors that participated in the 2015/2016 academic year in which the study was carried have appreciable years of supervision. This can be regarded a good practice as these supervisors would stand a better chance, all other things being equal, to provide a useful remark which will assist student-teachers in their lesson delivery and their professional development.

Variable	Subscale	No.	%
Highest Teacher Degree	PGCE/PGDE	2	5.0
	B. Ed	3	7.5
	M. Ed/M. Phil	19	47.5
	Doctor of education	15	12.5
Total		40	100.0

Table 5: Highest Teacher Degree Earned by Supervisors
Source: Fieldwork, 2016

Table 5 presents the highest teacher degree earned by supervisors. From Table 5, it can be noted 19 (47.5%) had M.Phil. /M.Ed. whilst 15 (12.5%) had their doctorate degree in the field of education. It can be said that all supervisors have educational background and that they were be in a good position to assess student-teachers' teaching effectively during the off-campus teaching practice and offer useful remarks that can assist the student-teachers to put their teaching into a better shape.

Variable	Subscale	No.	%
Academic Qualification	Masters' degree	17	42.5
	Doctorate	23	57.5

Table 6: Academic Qualification of Supervisors

In the educational settings, academic qualification forms the backbone of most activities. It has therefore become necessary to obtain the academic qualification of the supervisors that are sent out by the Teaching Practice Unit to oversee the teaching of their student-teachers. From Table 6, it can be argued that majority 23 (57.5%) of the supervisors have their doctorate degree whilst the remaining 17 (42.5%) also have their master's degree. It was also exposed during the interview that most of those with their master's degree have also enrolled on their PhD and will soon become doctors.
Research Question 1: What are the areas of conflicting views among supervisors during Off-campus Teaching Practice Supervision at UCC? Research Question 1 sought to solicit from student-teachers and supervisors those aspects of the lesson delivery where supervisors' views seem to contradict with each other.

Statement	M	SD
All my supervisors agreed on the same Lesson note format	3.44	1.14
All my supervisors agreed on the same way of stating lesson objectives.	3.33	1.00
All my supervisors agreed on the same way of writing references.	3.74	1.06
All my supervisors agreed on the same way of introducing a lesson.	3.68	1.01
All my supervisors agreed on the same way of displaying teaching and learning resources during teaching	3.41	1.05
All my supervisors permitted me to stand only in front of the class throughout the lesson.	2.75	.98
All my supervisors permitted me when I moved to and fro among the students throughout the lesson	3.69	1.10
All my supervisors agreed when I summarized the day's lesson all by myself.	3.28	1.06
All my supervisors agreed when I called upon a student from the class to summarize the day's lesson	3.12	1.18
All my supervisors agreed on the same way of writing chalk board summary during teaching	3.49	1.08
All my supervisors permitted me to evaluate the students' understanding of the lesson orally immediately after teaching	3.61	1.01
All my supervisors permitted me to evaluate the students' understanding of the lesson using homework	3.14	1.15

Table 7: Areas of Conflicting Views among Supervisors during Off-Campus
Teaching Practice Supervision at UCC
Source: Fieldwork, 2016, MM=3.39; N= 250; MSD=1.06; Uncertain (U=1),
Strongly Disagree (SD=2), Disagree (D=3), Agree (A=4), Strongly Agree (SA=5)

Table 7 presents results from the student-teachers point of view on the areas of conflicting views among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision. In respond to the statement "All my supervisors agreed on the same Lesson note format", Table 7 indicates that majority (M = 3.44, SD = 1.14) of the student-teachers disagreed to that statement. This undoubtedly shows that supervisors' views do conflict when it comes to the lesson note format during off-campus teaching practice supervision. It can therefore be concluded that the Lesson note Format is one of the areas of conflicting views among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision at the University of Cape Coast.

The layout, organization or outlining of the essential components in the lesson notebook to ensure effective delivery of what is to be taught is what is referred to as the lesson note format. To explain further, Coletta and Norris-Bauer (2008) distinguished between the two main lesson note formats. These are the prose format and the tabular format. Coletta and Norris-Bauer described the Tabular Format as a shorter book-style lesson plan whilst the Prose Formatis a longer or detailed description of a lesson. Simply put, the tabular format is short and brief whilst the prose format is long and detailed.

It is worth noting that it is the Prose format that student-teachers from the Department of Arts and Social Sciences of the University of Cape Coast were taught to use but then other students from other departments were also taught the tabular format. According to Singh (2008), a lot of student-teachers prefer the prose format as compared to the tabular format. The reason being that it is easy to use since almost everything that must be done in the class is put down systematically in complete sentences and in themes. As a result, this makes teaching very comprehensive and logical.

However, a quick examination of the Teaching Practice Handbook(UCC, 2013) which provides notes and guidelines for student teachers and supervisors on issues pertaining to teaching practice is completely silent on the formats of lesson note preparation that student-teachers are supposed to use. This means that student-teachers to some degree have the freedom to choose any format that is suitable to them. For example, student-teachers from the Department of Mathematics and Science Education normally use the Tabular format whilst those from the Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education mostly use the Prose format.

In attempt to probe further from student-teachers their concern about the two formats in a focus group discussion, it was pin pointed that some supervisors preferred one format to the other and for convenience sake; such supervisors would advise their student-teachers to stick to their preferred format. For example, the comment from one student-teacher that elaborates more on this point states;
"As for me, am used to the prose format but when my supervisor came, he asked me to use the Tabular format. Me too am not very familiar with the tabular format. But I have to give it a try. When the other supervisors also came, they asked me to continue with the Prose format. When that happens, in fact I don't know what to do next".

Again, from Table 7, it can be realized that the lesson note format is not the only area of conflicting views among supervisors. Another area identified was the way of stating lesson objectives (M = 3.33, SD = 1.0). It can also be settled that the way of stating lesson objective in another area of conflicting views among supervisors.

In an effort to understand better what student-teachers have in mind concerning the statement of lesson objectives, respondents were asked during a focus group interview to mention some of the ways of stating lesson objectives as suggested by their supervisors. Comments such as these were frequenting in the discussion. For example, one student-teacher mentioned

"As for me, my supervisor asked me to use the term "at least" in stating my objectives instead of just mentioning the exact number of outcomes expected of the students. For instance, he suggested I use sentences like "by the end of the lesson, the student should be able to mention at least four (4) benefits of delegation rather than saying "by the end of the lesson, the student should be able to mention four (4) benefits of delegation". The reason behind such suggestion according to my supervisor was that, when you use the word "at least", it gives the learner more room to go beyond his/her limit than being too specific thereby restricting the capacity of the learners."

In probing further, another student-teacher also stressed the use of the word "by" in stating his objectives as advised by his supervisors. The student-teacher said;

> "When one of my supervisors came, he wanted to see the phrase "by the end of the lesson", when stating my objectives in my lesson note book. My supervisor said he want to see something like "by the end of the lesson, the student should be able to define depreciation". As for that supervisor, he didn't care whether you use at least or not. All he wants to see is my lesson objectives starting with "by the end of the lesson" and he is ok with that". For him, his interest was on the word "by".

In a little different direction from the earlier illustrations, it was also evident that some student-teachers were cautioned by their supervisors to refrain from the use of the word "by" in stating lesson objective but should rather use "at". This was obvious from the comments made by another student-teacher. She commented;

> "Hmmm, it's was not easy at all. I had six different supervisions. When the first three two came, there was no issue. However, when the third lady came, ah! She was so curious. She went back to see the previous lessons that I have already taught and started circling the word "by" at the beginning of the lesson objectives. When the class ended, I approached her and she said "it's an 80 minutes' lesson and we want to see our learners acquiring those objectives you have stated at the end of the lesson and not before the lesson or during the lesson. So she wanted me to use for example the phrase "at the end of the lesson, the student should be able to differentiate demand and supply instead of "by the end of the lesson". As for this supervisor, among other things, she emphasized the use of "at".

Still on the lesson note format, it was identified that there are more suggestions coming from supervisors on how to state lesson objectives. Another comment from a student-teacher pointed out that some student-teachers were admonished by their supervisors to lay more emphasis on the "students" of their class when stating objectives. A remark from another student-teacher illustrates;

> "On my very first lesson, one man came to my school. I have not seen him before. He told me he is a supervisor coming from UCC to supervise my lesson. I took him to my class and he collected the lesson note book. I was a bit scared but he asked me to relax and teach well. Whilst I was teaching I saw him writing something in my lesson note book. After the class he said I have done well but I should use "students" as in plural when stating my objectives rather than using the singular "student". He added that it will be better for example to say "by the end of the lesson, the students should be able to identify three benefits of planning." than "by the end of the lesson, student should be able to identify three benefits of planning". When I was doing my on-campus, I was using "student" when stating my objectives and no supervisor ever complained so Am use to it.

A careful consideration of the various suggestions given by supervisors indicates that the choice of words to use when stating the lesson objectives was the main issue of disagreement. Whilst some supervisors stressed on the use of words such as "by", "at", "students", other supervisors also emphasized the use of "at least", "student".

It was noted from the discussion that the way of stating lesson objective was one major area of conflicting views among supervisors. To buttress this point, Tettey (2014) discovered that the most challenging issue for almost all the teacher-trainees (99 to 100%) include the contradictory lesson planning suggestions from internal and external supervisors.

Other areas of conflicting remarks that have been identified from Table 9 by student-teachers include, the way of displaying teaching and learning resources during teaching (M = 3.41, SD = 1.05), the closure of the lesson (M=3.12), the way of writing chalk board summary during teaching (M = 3.43, SD = 1.06), and evaluation of the students' understanding of the lesson (M = 3.14, SD = 1.15).

It can therefore be settled that the areas of conflicting views among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision included

- The lesson note format,
- The way of displaying teaching and learning resources,
- The closure of the lesson,
- The way of writing chalk board summary and lastly
- The way of evaluating the lesson.

However, it was noted that the standard deviations of all these items were more than one representing heterogeneous responses from the student-teachers. This could be as a result of the facts that the student-teachers were from different programmes and courses and that could have reflected in their views.

The identification of these areas of conflicting views among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision apparently confirms the earlier studies by Yetunde (1998), Oppong (2013), and Agbalenyo, Kporsu, Amoo-lamptey and Dorkenoo (2013) whose studies have shown that supervisors remarks do conflict with each other though these studies did not mention the specific areas of conflicting views among supervisors. For instance, the study of Oppong (2013) made mention of some form of inconsistency in the remarks of supervisors who observed student-teachers during

the off-campus teaching practice but did not identify any direct area. This study has therefore filled this gap by unveiling the actual areas where the conflicting views do occur among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision at the university of Cape Coast.

Finally, from Table 9, it was interesting to know that supervisors' remarks do not conflict on all areas of the lesson delivery. When it comes to the way of introducing a lesson (M=3.68, SD=1.01), the student-teacher moving to and fro among the students throughout the lesson when teaching (M=3.69, SD=1.10), evaluation the students' understanding of the lesson orally immediately after teaching (M=3.61, SD=1.01) and the way of writing references (M=3.74, SD=1.06), all supervisors shared a common view on these areas. This demonstrates that conflicting views do not exist among supervisors with regard to;

- The way of writing references,
- Introducing a lesson,
- Evaluation the students' understanding of the lesson orally and finally
- Moving to and fro among the students when teaching.

It worth noting that the discussion on the areas of conflicting views did not end here. Apart from the student-teachers point of view, the researcher also enquired from the supervisors themselves in order to find out if they are aware of some of the areas where their views do contradict. The results are thus presented in Table 10.

AREAS	M	SD
The Lesson note format.	4.02	.95
The way of stating lesson objectives.	3.63	1.10
The way of writing references.	3.10	1.30
The way of introducing a lesson.	3.32	1.32
The way of displaying teaching and learning resources during teaching.	3.50	1.01
The way of writing chalkboard summary	3.15	1.14
The classroom position of the teacher(i.e. whether the teacher should stand at the front only or move to and fro among students during teaching)	3.45	1.08
The student-teacher summarizing the day's lesson all by him/her self	3.57	1.035
The student-teacher calling upon a student from the class to summarize the day's lesson.	3.30	1.07
Evaluation of the students' understanding of the lesson immediately after teaching (orally or through written test).	3.05	1.10
Evaluation of the students' understanding of the lesson later after teaching using homework	3.22	1.33

Table 8: Areas of Conflicting Views among Supervisors during Off-Campus Teaching Practice Supervision (From Supervisors' Point Of View)
Source: Fieldwork, 2016, MM=3.39; N= 250; MSD=1.13; Uncertain (U=1), Strongly Agree (SA=2), Disagree (D=3), Agree (A=4), Strongly Disagree (SD=5)

Table 10 provides information on some aspects of the lesson delivery. It was evident from Table 10 that four most outstanding areas of conflicting views have been identified by the supervisors themselves. The means of these items ranges from 3.5 to 4.02 showing their level of agreement to these items. These areas are the; Lesson note format, way of stating lesson objectives, way of displaying teaching and learning resources during teaching and lastly the closure of the lesson where the student-teacher summarizes the day's lesson all by him/herself.

These areas identified by the supervisors are in direct confirmation of those areas identified by the student-teachers. This implies that both student-teachers and supervisors are very much aware of these aspects of the lesson delivery as an area of conflicting views among supervisors. When some supervisors were interviewed with regard to the display of teaching and learning resources during teaching, it was then unveiled that some supervisors wanted their student-teachers to display their teaching and learning resources either on the table or on the whiteboard before the actual teaching commerce. This to some supervisors will draw the attention of the learners to class and this will make them concentrate on the lesson. In further backing of this finding was the comments made by a supervisor;

> "......I just don't see why a teacher should keep the TLM/R when you are coming to use it. As for me, I always want them to display them immediately they enter the class. This at list will attract the attentions of some student whose mind may not be in the class."

However, some supervisors were also of the view that whenever a student-teacher want to use teaching and learning resources, such resources should be hidden until the actual stage of the lesson where the resources will be used before it is displayed.

> "Ah! Why do you have to put something on the board when you are not using it immediately? There is time for everything they say and there is time in the lesson when you have to use the TLM/Rs. If the teacher is starting the lesson with it, then I don't have any problem but if it is not time and you displayed it, then a have a problem with you. Ask some of the teachers whether

their students concentrate on the lesson when they see those charts and pictures displayed
when the teacher is not talking about it. The right thing must be done at the right time"

From this comment, it is clear that some supervisors saw it wrong to display teaching and learning resources (TLR/M) when the teacher is not making an immediate use of it. The reason has been that, when this happens, the attention of the learners is often shifted from the actual teaching onto the diagram or picture that may be displayed. The result of such practice again is that learners may not acquire the explanations leading to that diagram thereby not grasping the understanding of the full lesson.

It was again recognized from Table 10 that most supervisors are not aware of the fact that their views do conflict when it comes the way of writing chalk board summary. This shows their disagreement to the statement on the chalk board summary. However, student-teachers have identified chalk board summary as an area of conflicting views.

Again, majority of the supervisors were also not cognizant that classroom position of the teacher (i.e. whether the teacher should stand at the front only or move to and fro among students during teaching) is another area of conflicting views as pin pointed by the student-teachers.

It can therefore be believed that student-teachers stand a better position to provide more information on the areas of conflicting views among supervisors than the supervisors themselves. It was so because, majority of the lessons are observed individually by supervisors. It is only few instances where two or more supervisors observe the same lesson at the same time. The student-teachers are the recipient of both positive and negative remarks of supervisors. On that note, they are able to remember what the supervisors said about their lesson delivery and can recall aspects where supervisors' views agreed and disagreed as well. But that notwithstanding, it is worth affirming at this point that both supervisors and student-teachers have pointed out the way of writing references and the way of introducing a lesson to be an area where there are no conflicting views among supervisors.

3.1. Factors Influencing the Remarks of Supervisors of During Off-Campus Teaching Practice Supervision at UCC

Research Question 2: What are the factors influencing the remarks of supervisors of during off-campus Teaching Practice Supervision at UCC? Research Question 2 sought to solicit from respondents some of the factors that could possibly influence the remarks of supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision. In order to understand the issue better, both student-teachers and supervisors were engaged to provide information on such factors. In an attempt to collect data from the respondents, a five point Likert scale designed questionnaire was administered to student-teachers and supervisors.

Statement	M	SD
Lack of supervisors' knowledge of the specific teaching skills required in my subject area could have influenced their remarks on my lesson	3.95	1.07
The content knowledge of the supervisors could have influenced their comments on my lesson.	4.05	.95
The pedagogical knowledge of the supervisors could have influenced their remarks on my lesson.	3.99	.94
Supervisors own perception or philosophy of teaching could have influenced their remarks on my lesson	4.12	.84
The way I dressed could have influenced the remarks made by my supervisors.	3.80	1.11

Table 9: Perceived Factors Influencing the Remarks of Supervisors During
Off Campus Teaching Practice Supervision
Source: Fieldwork, 2016, MM=3.31; N= 250; MSD=.98; Uncertain (U=1),
Strongly Agree (SA=2), Disagree (D=3), Agree (A=4), Strongly Disagree (SD=5)

As seen in Table 11, it was obvious that majority of the student-teachers agreed to all the five perceived factors that could have influenced the views or remarks of supervisors. The means for these items ranges from 3.80 to 4.12. This implies that from the student-teachers' point of view, what supervisors commented on their lesson delivery was influenced by the following factors; lack of supervisors' knowledge of the specific teaching skills required in teaching their subject area of specialization, the content knowledge of the supervisors as well as the pedagogical knowledge of the supervisors. Furthermore, supervisors own perception or philosophy of teaching and even the manner in which the student-teachers dressed were the possible factors influencing the remarks of supervisors.

These findings confirm one of the variables identified by Oppong (2013) to be a factor influencing the remarks of supervisors. Oppong discovered that most of the remarks made by supervisors during off-campus teaching practice were influenced by their background knowledge. By background knowledge, Oppong mean the subject area of specialization of the supervisors. Oppong added that lack of supervisors' knowledge of the specific teaching skills required in a particular subject area has a potential influence on the remarks made by that particular supervisor as compared to someone having the actual knowledge in that subject area. This finding is further buttressed by a student-teacher's comment which states;
 "I was teaching accounting one early morning when one supervisor came to supervise my lesson. I was teaching how
to post entries from the day books in the individual ledgers. So I realized the supervisors was seating quietly at the back watching me. He was neither talking nor writing. At a point I felt he did not understand what I was doing. Later when the class ends, I found out from one colleague and I was told he is coming from the history department. Am sure

he is not familiar with the principles that one needs to adhere to when teaching some topics in accounting and therefore lacks knowledge about the specific techniques involved in teaching my subject."

In further agreement of the findings of this study on the factors influencing the remarks of supervisors were the studies of Omosewo (2000), Jekayinfa, Yahaya, Yussuf, Ayidagba, Oniye, Oniyangi and Ibraheem (2012), Violet (2015) and Jekayinfa et al. (2012). These researchers have also identified background of supervisors, academic qualifications, age, administrative experience, teachers' attitude and the size of the class to the top most factors influencing the remarks of supervisor during teaching practice supervision.

However, the student-teachers were not able to tell whether academic qualification, administrative experience, age, their own attitudes and even the size of the class could also influence the remarks made by supervisors. The reason for such contrast may be due to the fact that the student-teachers were not in a better position to know the actual age of the supervisors, the academic qualification of the supervisors, the job status and that of the administrative experience of the supervisors. Again, the student-teachers were not familiar with most supervisors as many reported that that was the first time they met those supervisors. This was in line with the remarks made a student-teacher,

"Am lucky I had a number of supervisions. Out of the seven supervisions that I have had, I knew only one of the supervisors whom I have met on campus".

Does it mean that at the University of Cape Coast, academic qualification, administrative experience and age do not influence supervisors' remarks in any way? A deeper analysis of the data collected from supervisors themselves on the factors influencing their views during supervision of student-teachers gives a clearly picture of such factors as displayed in Table 12.

Statements	M	SD
My years of experience as a supervisor influenced my comments.	4.02	1.19
My content knowledge of the subject I observed influenced my remarks	4.10	1.17
My inadequate knowledge in the subject I observed influenced my comments.	3.23	1.35
My academic qualification (E.g. Master, Doctor, etc.) influenced the remarks I made.	3.10	1.08
My job status as a supervisor (i.e. been a senior or junior lecturer) influenced my remarks.	3.38	1.29
My own perception or philosophy of teaching influenced my remarks.	4.35	.74

Table 10: Factors Influencing the Remarks of Supervisors during Off-Campus
Teaching Practice Supervision (Supervisors Own Point Of View)
Source: Fieldwork, 2016, MM=3.70; N= 250; MSD=1.14; Uncertain (U=1),
Strongly Agree (SA=2), Disagree (D=3), Agree (A=4), Strongly Disagree (SD=5)

Table 10 displays the factors influencing the remarks of supervisors during supervision. The three most important factors influencing the remarks of supervisors during off campus teaching practice supervision as indicated in Table 10 were the years of experience of the supervisors (M=4.02, SD=1.19) the content knowledge of the subjects observed by the supervisors(M=4.10, SD=1.17) and supervisors' own perception or philosophy of teaching(M=.4.35, SD=.74). The means for these items ranges from 4.02 to 4.35 showing the degree of agreement of the supervisors to these variables.

This shows that the remarks of supervisors are influenced by their years of experience, the content knowledge of the subjects observed and the supervisors' own philosophy of teaching. The findings of this study is in direct support of the findings of some previous researchers such as Omosewo (2000), Jekayinfa, Yahaya, Yussuf, Ayidagba, Oniye, Oniyangi and Ibraheem (2012), Violet (2015) and Jekayinfa et al (2012) who discovered years of experience of the supervisors and the content knowledge of the subjects as factors influencing supervisors' remarks.

An interview with some student-teachers brought to light how they were dissatisfied with some of their supervisors' relative to their limited knowledge of the subject matter they were supposed to give feedback on. The supervisors were negatively criticized by eight student-teachers, who argued that the fact that their supervisors were not specialized in the subjects they were asked to evaluate prevented them from giving student-teachers a very useful advice or feedback on the methods or activities they used which were specific to the particular subject. This finding gives the impression that supervisors who are assigned to observe student-teachers are sometimes not specialists in the discipline that student-teachers teach. This situation can be disturbing in the sense that supervisors will find it difficult to constructively give comments that will help the learning situation of the teacher-trainee within the context of the practicum he/she is undertaking. The reason was that many student-teachers were still learning new techniques of teaching during their practice by way of putting theories into practice.

However, many supervisors disagreed that inadequate knowledge in the subject they observed did not influence their remarks (M=3.23, SD=1.35). In addition, majority of the supervisors disagreed that their academic qualification and their job status influenced their remarks. The means of these items ranges from 3.10 to 3.38 showing their level of disagreement to these variables. This finding is supported by the findings of Violet (2015), Jekayinfa et al. (2012) who have identified job status and academic qualifications to be among the possible factors influencing the remarks of supervisors.

In an interview with some of the supervisors, they explained that their academic qualification and job status had less influence on the remarks they gave during the supervision exercise. For example, one supervisor said "A person being a doctor or senior lecturer does not make him or her better assessor of student-teachers' teaching. In addition, being an assistant lecturer and for that matter holding a masters' degree does not also make much difference in your supervision. What actually makes the difference is your ability to identify the good and bad practices of teaching and make it known to the student-teacher. To me I think this is what actually matters. For example, I know one colleague who holds master's degree but this guy cans observe a lesson and point out so many things as compared to another supervisor whom I know with a doctorate degree but will seat in your class and won't say anything. Hmm, so your academic qualification does not make much difference".

3.2. The Influence of Supervisors' Remarks on Male and Female Student-Teachers Teaching

Hypotheses 2: H_0: There is no statistical significant difference in the influences of supervisors' remarks on student-teachers teaching in terms of gender. This hypothesis was framed to test the differences that exist between the male and female student-teachers in terms of the influences of supervisors' remarks on teaching. In order to identify the differences in male and female student-teachers' reactions, the obtained data were analysed using independent sample t-test. The independent variable was students' gender and the dependent variable was student-teachers' reaction. In order to obtain the dependent variable, items 34 to 40 on the questionnaire for student-teachers' which sought to measure student-teachers' reaction towards the remarks made by their supervisors were transformed to obtain the mean student-teachers reaction variable. The independent sample t-test was used to identify the difference between the dependent variable and independent variable at a significance level of 0.05. Table 10 presents the results obtained for the differences.

Gender	Mean	SD	t	Df	p
Male	3.638	.456	.612	248	.541
Female	3.674	.453			

Table 11: T-Test Results on Differences in the Influence of Supervisors Remarks Between Male and Female Student-Teachers

Results from Table 10 indicate that there is no statistically significant statistically significant difference between the male student-teachers' reaction to (M = 3.638, SD =. 456) and female student-teachers (M = 3.674, SD =. 453); t (248) = .541, p > 0.05, (two tailed). This means that there is no difference in the mean value of the male student-teachers (3.638) and female student-teachers (3.674). It can be concluded that supervisors' remarks had the same level of influence on student-teachers' teaching no matter their gender

3.3. The Influence of Supervisors' Remarks on Student-Teachers Teaching in terms of the Programme of Study

Hypotheses 3: H_0: There is no significant difference in the influence of supervisors' remarks on student-teachers teaching in terms of their programme of study. The essence of this hypothesis was to test the differences that exist between the influences of supervisors remarks with respect to the different programmes of study. In order to identify the differences that exist between the influences of supervisors' remarks with respect to the different programmes of study, the obtained data were analysed using one-way analysis of variance (Anova). The independent variable was programme of study of student-teachers and the dependent variable was supervisors influence on student-teachers teaching. In order to obtain the dependent variable, items 21 to 33 on the questionnaire for student-teachers' which sought to measure the influence of supervisors remarks on student-teachers teaching were transformed to obtain the mean student-teachers influence variable. One-way analysis of variance was used to identify the differences between the dependent variable and independent variable at a significance level of 0.05. The results (Appendix C) show that there is no statistical significant difference as determined by one-way Anova [F (4, 245) = 1.676, p = 0.156]. It can therefore be established that irrespective of the programme of study, supervisors' remarks had the same level of influence on student-teachers' teaching.

4. Conclusions

Based on the major findings of the study, a number of conclusions have been drawn. The issue of conflicting views still unfolds itself among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision at the University of Cape Coast. As discussed earlier, seven different aspects of the lesson have been identified to be an area of contradictory remarks/views among supervisors during off-campus teaching practice supervision as the university of cape coast. This to some extend does not speak well of the University in terms of teaching practice supervision. The reason has been that, UCC is the head of most teacher training institutions in the country. When this issue persists, it is likely that many student-teachers may finish their practice not having a clear standing on what to do when it comes to some of aspect of the lesson.

It was also established from the study that the remarks of supervisors were influenced by a number of factors. The orientations of the supervisors typically influence their remarks. Supervisors who are prefer and for that matter practiced those practice are now supervising student-teachers who have also be taught different practices. This was exposed when it comes to the issues of lesson notes format and the various ways of stating lesson objectives. Fortunately, these factors have more positive influences on the student-teachers teaching than the negative impacts and this makes the teaching practice programme a beneficial one. It was also realized that some these factors can be controlled whilst others cannot be controlled. For example, the experience of supervisors comes naturally as one undertakes more supervision. It was therefore not surprising that the experience of supervisors influences their remark either negatively or positively. For

instance, some of the experienced supervisors mentioned that they could use 5 minutes of the lesson to judge the entire 80 minutes' lesson. As result, those supervisors do not stay in the classroom throughout the entire lesson. To me, this is not a good practice since things can change along the line when a student-teacher who is tensed at the beginning of the lesson is able to minimize the initial tension and gain full control of the class. However, lack of supervisors' knowledge of the specific teaching skills required in a particular subject area as well as their content knowledge can be enhanced.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn from the study, below are some recommendations to some key stakeholders of education.

- First and foremost, the areas of conflicting views should be made known to supervisors by the Peaching Practice Unit. Many supervisors are actually not aware about the areas where their views do contradict. This is true because most lessons are observed by individual supervisors. It is only few occasions that two or more supervisors observed the same lesson at the same time. Therefore, many supervisors do not know what their colleague supervisors are also saying. It is only when they are conscious that such conflicting views can be immunized.

- In relation to the contradictory suggestions on lesson planning, I suggest that the Teaching Practice Unit should organize orientation for supervisors prior to supervision, sample lesson plans should be provided for hands-on activity so as to help streamline and ensure consistency on the requirements of a good lesson plan and lesson delivery. Moreover, only dedicated supervisors who are willing to offer their full time to the exercise should be made to take part in the supervision. If possible, in each subject area, only supervisors who have content knowledge in that area should be made to supervise it.

- In relation to statement of lesson objectives, it is recommended that the Teaching Practice Unit should therefore come out with one accepted way of stating lesson objectives and that method should made known to supervisors and also emphasized by methods lecturers and microteaching supervisors where student-teachers would be encouraged to master them efficiently.

- In addition, topic introduction (previewing of previous knowledge and linkage to new topic), choosing appropriate teaching method, how to display TLMs properly and, how to cite references in the APA style should also emphasized during micro-teaching.

- Supervisors should also be entreated by the university authority to adhere to the guidelines meant to streamline and ensure consistency in the Off-campus teaching practice lesson assessment and supervision as proposed by the Teaching Practice Unit. Mentors should be made to take active part in the supervision. Mentors should be made to take active part in the supervision. The experienced and good-standing mentors should rather take over the assessment of trainee's subject-matter knowledge during the pre-observation, observation itself and the post-observation discussion

- The study further recommends that supervisors must have a sound knowledge of the subject matter they are supervising, and knowledge about subject-specific methodology which will enable them to provide useful remarks. The government through the ministry of education should therefore provide funds that will be geared towards the training of more supervisors in the various subject areas. When this happens, there will be adequate supervisors to observe the specific subject areas.

- Finally, the teaching practice unit should continue to expose supervisors to training on instructional supervision; that the teaching practice unit should sponsor supervisors to attend educational workshops and seminars to gain new knowledge and upgrade themselves for rising opportunities in the field of teaching

6. References

i. Agbalenyo, F., Kporsu, M., Amoo-lamptey, E., & Dorkenoo, C. (2013). Challenges of off-campus teaching programme: The experience of B.Ed. (Management) students of the University of Cape Coast. Unpublished project work, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.
ii. Bishir, Y. (2005). A suggested educational perspective for teacher education and development in the school of education at University of Ebb. Journal of University Researcher, 8, 93-12.
iii. Creswell, J. W. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
iv. Creswell, J. W. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
v. Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2007). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
vi. Diala, H., Ibrahim, A.,Yousef, A. & Ferial, A. (2014).Student-teachers' perspectives of practicum practices and challenges. European Scientific Journal May 2014 edition, 10(13), 1857 – 7881.
vii. Jahin, S. & Alexander, T. (2006). Saudi EFL Student Teachers' Beliefs about Language Learning: The Impact of a Pre-service Teacher Education Programme. Studies inCurriculum and Instruction, 110, 1-30
viii. Kitzinger, J. (2005). The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants. Sociology of Health and Illness, 16(1), 103–121.
ix. Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities: Educational and psychological measurement. New York: Sage Publications Inc.

x.   Lyubou, K. (2012). A guide to sampling in document analysis. Hong Kong: Sheck Wah Tony Printing Press Ltd.
xi.   McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. New York, NY: Longman.
xii.   Merriam, S. B. (2001). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
xiii.   Morgan, D. L. (2002). Focus groups in social research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
xiv.   Mugenda, J. & Mugenda, T. (2003). Research methodology for 20th century researcher. London: New Age International.
xv.   Ngidi, D. P. & Sibaya, P. T. (2003). Student teacher anxieties related to practice teaching. South African Journal of Education, 23(1), 18-22.
xvi.   Olaitan, S. & Agusiobo, G. (1992). Field experience as a vehicle for transformation, ideology, education and reflective practice. Columbia: Merril Books Inc.
xvii.   Omosewo, E. O. (2000). Guide posts in teaching physics at the senior secondary level. In A. I. Idowu, S. O. Daramola, A. S. Olorundare, Obiyemi, O. O., Ijaiya, N. Y. C., & Lafinhan, K. (eds). A guide to teaching practice. Ilorin: Faculty of Education, University of Ilorin.
xviii.   Oppong, A. C. (2013). Supervisors' remarks in Teaching Practice: The perspectives of History Student-Teacher. Journal of Educational Practices, 4(17), 4-8.
xix.   Tettey, A. (2014). Perspectives of trainee-teachers on issues pertaining to lesson planning during off-campus teaching practice at the University of Cape Coast. Unpublished master's thesis; University Cape Coast, Cape Coast.
xx.   University of Cape Coast (2014). Admission Prospectus, 2014-2015. Cape Coast: UCC Printing Press.
xxi.   University of Cape Coast. (2013). Teaching practice handbook. Cape Coast: Author.
xxii.   Violet, M. N. (2015). Factors influencing principals' instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in Makadara sub- county, Nairobi County, Kenya. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
xxiii.   Wilson, N. & McLean, S. (1994). Questionnaire design: A practical introduction. Newtown Abbey, Co. Antrim: University of Ulster Press.
xxiv.   Yetunde I. (1998). Constraints to effective teaching practice supervision: the views of the clientele. Nigeria Journal of Research in Advance Education, 1(1), 1119-5053.