

JOURNAL OF CHILDHOOD AND PRIMARY EDUCATION

Vol. 7 No. 1
July 2010

ISSN 1117 - 1863

Publication of the Primary and Tertiary Teacher
Education Association of Nigeria (PATTEAN)

MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN PRIMARY SCHOOL AND ITS INFLUENCE ON TEACHERS' EFFECTIVENESS

Theresa Maurice Udofia

Department of Science Education
University of Uyo

Abstract

The study examined the influence of monitoring and evaluation of primary schools on teacher's effectiveness. The study adopted a survey design. The population was all the primary school teachers and pupils in Akwa Ibom State estimated at 14,686 and 46,164 respectively. Purposive sampling technique was used to select 130 class teachers and 750 pupils in six government owned primary schools in Uyo LGA. The reliability of the Primary School Monitoring and Evaluation Questionnaire (PSMQ) and Teachers' Effectiveness Questionnaire (TEQ) were determined using split- half method and reliability indices were 0.78 and 0.75 respectively. One hypothesis was tested at 0.05 alpha level. The data were analyzed using mean and t-test statistical techniques and the findings revealed a poor monitoring and evaluation process of primary school teachers. The findings also showed that there exists significant influence between monitoring and evaluation process on teachers' effectiveness. Recommendations were made among which is the urgent need to make monitoring and evaluation more proactive and very regular.

Introduction

Education plays a crucial role in the development of any country. In the past ten years, Nigeria education system has undergone series of reforms to meet up with the demands of the changing society. This has specifically led to the restructuring of primary school curriculum and establishment of National Teachers Institute (NTI) to improve on teachers' quality among other things. In addition, the Education Road Map is another reform with a focus on access and equity, standard, quality assurance, training, funding, technical and vocational education. These are laudable initiatives that can bring development and ensure qualitative education if effectively implemented.

However, this is far from expectation as the gap between policies and practices have made the initiatives meaningless with many questions raised (Wasagu, 2007). Similarly, Edho (2009) asserted that lack of effective supervision and monitoring of schools is a major setback in education sector. Corroborating this idea, Okebukula (2008) outlined constraints against achieving quality in Nigerian education system to include poor monitoring and evaluation, inadequate findings, poor motivation, poor teaching quality and quantity, poor infrastructure and poor curriculum delivery. The intent of teaching /learning is to effect positively on the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains of the pupils and one way of achieving this is through effective teaching by the teacher.

Awotua-Efebo (1999) defined effectiveness as doing the right thing in the teaching process so that the goals and objectives of the lesson can be achieved. In other words, meaningful teaching /learning depends on the effectiveness of the teacher and this has to do with creativity, effective communication, productive skill, effective classroom management, use of innovative teaching strategies, good teacher-student relationship and appropriate utilization of instructional materials. These could be achieved through adequate funding, effective monitoring and evaluation and improved infrastructure.

UBE (2003) defines monitoring as a means of checking the extent to which planned contents, input, process and products in a programme is implemented. It is a periodic end intervention for exercise which involves checking, watching and observation for the purpose of determining achievement, constraints and challenges for future direction and intervention for purpose of assessing quality. Also, evaluation is a process of gathering and analyzing available educational data that can be used in making decisions on the level of performances, (UBE, 2003).

Obinaju, (2001) perceived educational supervision/evaluation as those particular activities and aspects which maintain and promote the effectiveness of teaching and learning in school. A study on challenges affecting implementation of Universal Basic Education attributed constraints to effective supervision/monitoring to lack of means of transportation of personnel, lack of office accommodation, lack of qualified personnel and time factor, (Edho, 2009)

At the state level, monitoring and evaluation of primary school teachers rest squarely on the state Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB) with Local Education Authority (LEA) as supporting unit at the local level for quality control. According to Shuaibu (2001) the whole system of education have been rarely evaluated in the sense of assessing performance and contribution of all components of instructional system, students, teachers, materials inputs and administrator.

To this end, Taiwo (2008) maintained that monitoring of schools should be regular with follow up inspection and vigorous internal supervision of activities. Furthermore, supervisors should visit school regularly not as security agent to find fault and intimate teachers and head-teachers but to observe teachers on duty and share observations (Etuk, 2008)

From the forgoing, if the nation is to meet up with her vision 20- 2020 which is barely ten years away, education reforms must be coupled with a comprehensive regular monitoring and evaluation at all levels. Hence, this study was carried out to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation on teachers' effectiveness in the primary school. For the purpose of guiding the study, the following objectives were raised;

1. To determine the extent of monitoring and evaluation process in the primary school
2. To determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation on teacher's effectiveness.

Two research questions were also stated as follows in order to achieve the objectives

1. To what extent is monitoring and evaluation process effective in the primary school system?
2. What is the influence of monitoring and evaluation process on teachers' effectiveness in primary schools?

The following hypothesis was also tested at 0.5 level of significance.

Monitoring and evaluation process in primary schools does not significantly influence teachers' effectiveness.

Method and Procedure:

Research Design: The study adopted a survey design.

Population/Sampling Technique: The target population consisted of the entire primary school teachers and pupils in the 47 government owned primary schools in Uyo L.G.A. The estimated population was 14,686 teachers and 46,164 pupils. Purposive sampling technique was used to select 130 primary 4, 5 and 6 classroom teachers and 650 pupils using simple balloting. A total of 780 respondents from 8 schools were used for the study. The researcher deliberately used eight schools which were within Uyo metropolis. The rationale for this was to take care of the problem of distance and transportation which might pose as a constraint to visit schools by SUBEB officials.

Instrumentation:

Two researcher's developed instruments were used for the study. They were Primary School Monitoring Questionnaire (PSMQ) and Teacher's Effectiveness Questionnaire (TED). The questionnaire was made up of two

sections. Section A sought for respondent's personal data. Section B of PSMQ elicited information on monitoring and evaluation process from the teachers while section B of TEQ was developed for pupils to assess their teachers' activities in the classroom. PSMQ was a 12 item Likert type questionnaire while TEQ was a 10 item Likert type questionnaire. The instruments consisted of positive items and the scoring was Strongly Agreed (SA) – 5 point, Agreed – 4 point, Undecided – 3 point, Disagreed – 2 point and Strongly Disagreed – 1 point.

The instruments were subjected to scrutiny of three senior lecturers from the Department of Curriculum Studies of the University of Uyo to establish their face and content validity. The judges were acquainted with the objectives and research questions to help them critically vet the questions in terms of relevance and clarity of purpose. The reliability index for the two instruments PSMQ and TEQ were determined using split-half approach and the results were 0.78 and 0.75 respectively.

Data Collection:

The instrument PSMQ was administered to the teachers of primary 4, 5 and 6 in their different schools by the researcher, assisted by the deputy head teachers. All the pupils selected were put in one class and well arranged to avoid copying. The copies of questionnaire were coded to represent pupils from different classes and five pupils from a class assessed the class teacher. Each question was read and explained to make it clear before responses. Average response from five pupils per class was calculated as a score for each class teacher. The data obtained were analyzed using mean score and t-test statistics. A mean score of 3.0 and above was considered positive and below 3.0 was negative. The mean of each item was recorded and average mean calculated.

Results:

The findings of the study are presented in tables below.

Question 1: To what extent is monitoring and evaluation process effective in the primary school system?

Table 1: Responses of Teachers on Monitoring and Evaluation Process in Primary School.

S/ N	STATEMENT	X	SD	REMARKS
1.	Monitoring team from SUBEB comes at least twice a term.	2.7	0.85	Negative
2.	Date of visit is always known to the teachers in advance.	3.0	1.00	Positive

3.	At least four members always make up a team.	2.5	0.84	Negative
4.	The team always monitors teachers' pedagogic-content knowledge in a teaching/learning process.	3.5	1.00	Positive
5.	Students' notes/assignment books are always checked by the team.	2.0	0.84	Negative
6.	The monitoring team always motivates teachers to improvise/use local resources in teaching.	2.7	0.74	Negative
7.	Monitoring team does not criticize and intimidate teachers	2.6	0.68	Negative
8.	Monitoring team always motivate teachers to high productivity.	2.0	0.99	Negative
9.	Monitoring team always shares observations with teachers to enhance productivity.	2.2	0.99	Negative
10.	Teachers are well informed of innovative teaching strategies during monitoring exercise.	2.6	0.76	Negative
11.	Reports from monitoring team are always unbiased, objective with valid data information.	3.2	0.73	Positive
12.	Generally monitoring team comes very early and checks/evaluates till school is over.	2.2	0.80	Negative
	Grand Mean (X)	2.6	0.85	Negative

Table 1 reveals that only three items 2, 4 and 11 are responded to positively ($X=3.0$ to 3.5) while the remaining nine items were negative ($X<3.0$). The grand mean of 2.60 , SD 0.85 indicates that the monitoring evaluation process of primary school teachers by SUBEB is generally poor.

Question 2: What is the effect of monitoring and evaluation process on teachers' effectiveness in primary schools?

Table 2: Responses of pupils on teachers' effectiveness

S/N	ITEMS	X	SD	REMARKS
1.	My teacher is always regular to school.	3.2	0.91	Agreed
2.	My teacher is always punctual to school.	3.0	1.00	Agreed
3.	My teacher marks pupils' note/assignment every day.	2.5	0.95	Disagreed
4.	My teacher uses appropriate instructional materials like chart, models and concrete objects in teaching.	2.0	0.90	Disagreed
5.	My teacher is creative and improvises instructional materials.	1.5	0.90	Disagreed
6.	My teacher always answers questions during teaching/learning process.	3.0	0.70	Agreed
7.	My teacher is keeps correct records of pupils.	2.6	0.68	Negative
8.	My teacher is friendly with pupils.	3.5	0.81	Agreed
9.	My teacher communicates clearly during teaching/learning process.	3.0	0.99	Agreed
10.	My teacher shows interest in pupils' progress.	2.1	0.70	Disagreed
11.	My teacher gives assignment everyday	2.1	1.00	Disagreed
12.	My teacher always do corrections of assignment on the blackboard.	2.3	0.67	Disagreed
	Grand Mean (X)	2.6	0.88	Disagreed

Table 2 reveals general low teachers effectiveness with grand mean of 2.60, SD=0.88 Seven out of twelve items were negatively responded with ($X < 3.0$) indicating that pupils disagreed with most of the items especially items 4 and 5, which shows that teachers hardly improvise or use appropriate instructional materials.

Hypothesis Testing:

Hypothesis 1: Monitoring and evaluation process in primary schools does not significantly influence teachers' effectiveness.

Table 3: t-test analysis of effect of monitoring and evaluation process on teachers' effectiveness in primary schools.

Monitoring process	Teachers' effectiveness	N	X	SD	df	t-cal	t-crit
	Effective	57	32.09	5.35	128	3.78	1.64
	Non-effective	73	28.88	4.32			

The result in table 2 shows that the calculate t-value of 3.78 with 128 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance is greater than critical t-value of 1.64. This shows that monitoring and evaluation process significantly influences teachers' effectiveness in primary schools in Uyo metropolis. Hence the null hypothesis that monitoring and evaluation process in primary schools does not significantly influence teachers' effectiveness was rejected.

Discussion of findings:

The finding from Table 1 shows that respondents agreed with only three (3) items which means that 25% responded positively while 75% was negative responded. The gap between positive and negative responses as noticed in the finding is too large and it is a serious threat to effective implementation and attainment of objectives of Basic Education?

In Table 2, a grand mean of ($x = 2.60$, $SD = 0.88$) was obtained. This result reveals that teachers' effectiveness in the classroom was rated low by the pupils. As stated by Awotua- Efebo (1999) that effectiveness is doing the right thing in the teaching process so that the goals and objectives of the lesson can be achieved. This implies that the teachers are not performing well in their primary assignment which is to effectively teach the pupils.

In table3, the calculated t – value of 3.78 with 128 degree of freedom at 0.05 is greater than the t – critical value of 1.64. As stated by Okurodudu (2003) that teachers' ability to present instruction can mar or make the progress of the pupils. This confirms the fact that good students performance depends to a large extent on the effectiveness of the teacher in a teaching/learning process. The result of hypothesis showed significant influence of monitoring and evaluation on teachers' effectiveness. This finding is in line with that of Enwereuzoh (2008) who observed that effective monitoring, supervision and evaluation can sustain good quality of the programme and attainment of educational objectives.

Recommendations:

Based on the above findings, the paper makes the following recommendations;

1. Monitoring and evaluation should be carried out with strong organizational planning, adequate supporting facilities and appropriate monitoring tools.
2. Monitoring and evaluation should be more proactive, regular and goal oriented.
3. The State government should employ, train and retrain personnel to carry out this important exercise.
4. Monitoring and evaluation should be carried out with a view to correct, motivate and inform teachers on new strategies and innovations in the field of teaching.
5. Monitoring and evaluation unit should be separated from Project, Research and Statistics (PRS) to enable it be more articulated and focused.

Conclusion:

Monitoring and evaluation is central to teachers' effectiveness in the classroom. Based on the above findings, teachers' effectiveness is low due to poor monitoring and evaluation exercise by the government. The study concludes that monitoring and evaluation significantly influence teachers' effectiveness and this calls for a comprehensive and regular monitoring and evaluation of teachers in order to achieve the objectives of the present reforms in education especially at the primary level.

References

- Awotua-Efebo, E. B. (1999). *Effective teaching and practice*. Port Harcourt: Paragraphic: Port-Harcourt.
- Edho, O. G. (2009). The challenges affecting the implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) in Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science*, 20(3), 183-187.
- Enwereuzoh, N. M. (2008). Sustainability of quality assurance in UBE in junior secondary school. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 5(4), 260-265.
- Etuk, N. E. (2008). Ensuring the production and retention of quality teachers for Quality Basic Education in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 15(3), 69-81.
- Obinaju, Q. M. (2001). Supervision and evaluation: Strategies for the success of UBE programme. *Journal of Research in Education*, 2(1), 119-129.

- Okebukola, P. A. O. (2008). Education reforms: Imperatives for achieving vision 20-2020, in education reforms for 20-2020. *Proceedings of senate committee on education summit*, 61-65.
- Okorodudu, R. I. (2003). Resource management for effective instruction in Nigeria primary education system. *Journal of WCCI. Nigeria chapter 4*, 145-159.
- Shuaibu, N. J. (2001). Co-operation among educators, educational institutions and stakeholders at home and abroad. In O. Nnoli and I. Sulaiman (Eds.), *Reassessing the future of education in Nigeria*, 167-178, Abuja; Education Tax Fund.
- Taiwo, O. A. (2008). Quality assurance in the upper basic education through effective curriculum implementation. *Nigerian Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 15(3), 23-33.
- UBE (2003). *Universal basic education monitoring manual* – Lagos; Federal Ministry of Education Publication.
- Wasagu, M. A. (2008). Reform agenda of the Nigerian educator sector: Providing solution or evading the real preambles. A memorial lecture presented at STAN 49th Annual Conference, Friday 29th, August, Yenogoa, Bayelsa State.