

EDUCATION



Assessment of the perception of primary school teachers about the primary education inspectors performance in public primary school of Federal Capital Territory, Abuja

Charity Egondur Duru-Uremadu

Full Length Research

Assessment of the perception of primary school teachers about the primary education inspectors performance in public primary school of Federal Capital Territory, Abuja

Charity Egondur Duru-Uremadu

Lecturer, Department of Educational Management, COED, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Umuahia, Abia State. Email: rityeureumadu@yahoo.com; sebauremadu@yahoo.com. Tel: +2348033528446

Accepted 22nd February, 2017

The study investigated the level of performance of public primary education inspectors in the FCT Abuja with a view to determine their actual level of operations and the proffer solution. In particular, the work ascertained the perception of primary school teachers about inspectors' performance in urban and suburban schools. To determine the above, research questions and hypotheses were formulated to enable the study be statistically tested. ANOVA test method was used to carry out tests and analysis, on 0.05 level of significance. The results revealed that there is no significance difference in the ratings of the functions of the primary education inspectors by the teachers on the working experience. It was also discovered that inspectors perform their duties mostly in urban locations with less attention paid to sub-urban areas. Based on these findings it was recommended, among others that: (1) inspection exercise in primary schools should always be executed with greater attention paid to schools that are not easily accessible to the inspectors where their services are mostly needed; (2) inspectors should make concerted efforts to carry out extensive teaching demonstrations in FCT schools to enable teachers improve on their teaching skills and (3) government should give the inspectors all the needed backings, tools and training they deserve during the performance of their duties. If these recommendations are carried out to the letter it is believed that the quality and performance of the inspectors and the primary school teachers alike would soon improve leading to overall performance of the Nigerian primary education system.

Key words: Primary education inspections, primary education inspectors, performance; perception of primary school teachers, school effectiveness, ANOVA-tests, Federal Capital Territory.

INTRODUCTION

Today in Nigeria among public primary schools there are teachers, students and administrators who are involved in the day-to-day learning activities. There is therefore a pressing need to determine what to teach, how to teach it and whom to teach it bearing in mind that modern and constructive inspection of schools is expected to be positive, dynamic and democratically executed (Duru-

Uremadu, 2005). Moreover, the individuals to be taught are also believed to be full of unique talents and capabilities (Eya et al., 2001).

The success of any education system is dependent on inspection and primary education is the bedrock of other forms of education and the formulation for national development, sound economic growth and social

reconstruction and integration. The aim of inspection is therefore to provide good quality education in schools and according to Aderounmu (1985), good quality education is more generally determined by the number of success in examination. By implication inspectors are called upon to maintain or raise the quality of education in the primary schools.

Besides, inspection is to ensure that resources budgeted for education are judiciously utilized and that instructions are given in line with the broad aims and objectives of education. As a liaison officer between teachers and government, the inspector ensures that new knowledge, skills, government policies and stipulations, modern instructional materials introduced as teaching aids in the school instructional process to enhance educational growth and development of both pupils and teachers, are properly selected.

Therefore the functions of inspectors of education at primary education level include quality control of instructions and helping teachers to perform their duties effectively and efficiently. According to Ogunsaju (1988), the inspector summarily coordinates the activities of other stakeholders in this task of quality control of instructions just as the entrepreneur superintends the activities of their factors of production in the world of economics. The inspector serves as a link between the Ministry of Education and schools. It is based on the reports of the inspector that government takes actions (Ogunsaju, 1988). The inspector visits schools to carefully assess what is on ground and report back to the government. He ensures that policies are carried out in line with laid down procedures and that financial allocations to the education sector are judiciously utilized. The inspector ensures that there is proper record keeping by teachers in our primary education system.

It is expected that a result-oriented and virile inspection policy would be of greater value to public primary education system. The Nigerian society cannot afford to waste its scarce resources on primary education venture without the corresponding dividends to justify it. Hence, it is from this background that the present study is set to analyse the performance of these inspectors vis-à-vis their stated functions at the primary education level in the Federal Capital Territory of Nigeria, Abuja because this is the seat of power and it is expected to be a model as well as a pinnacle of excellence since charity, they say, begins at home. It is imperative therefore for the study to ascertain if there are problems militating against the performance of these inspectors, how these problems could be tackled so as to put them back on track.

Statement of the Problem

Over the years, governments in Nigeria at state and local

levels have been committing more resources to primary education as has been evidenced by its ability to cope with the increased complexity of the primary school system, increase in pupils enrolment, proliferation of schools, recruitment of teachers and staff development. Nonetheless there exists public opinion regarding fallen standard of education evidenced in the falling quality of school leavers and low productivity of teachers persists (Duru-Uremadu, 2005, 2016). Again, the report of the study conducted by World Bank in 1994 showed that the primary education sector in Nigeria was performing below expectation and was at variance with policy provisions (Adamu, 1998).

But there are inspectors in charge of these schools, well-skilled personnel, to monitor and control standard, which the public is saying, is not improving. One past study sought to establish if the rating of the performance of primary education inspectors in FCT Abuja vary on the basis of school location and found that the ratings of their performance was significantly above average of 2.50. It also established that there was significant difference in the ratings of the functions of primary school inspectors by teachers on the basis of school location (Duru-Uremadu, 2016). The present study will seek to determine whether the ratings of the performance of public primary school inspectors vary on the basis of gender as well as on the basis of experience categories among teachers. By the time the study is concluded we shall be in a position to confirm or rebut if teachers rating of inspectors at FCT, Abuja, vary on the basis of gender and or the basis of the length of teaching experience.

Purpose of the Study

The present study targets at achieving the following objectives stated below:

1. To reveal whether the rating of the performance of public primary school inspectors vary on the basis of gender.
2. To find out if the rating of the performance of primary education inspectors vary on the basis of experience categories of teachers.

Research Questions

Based on the objectives the present study aimed to achieve, it will address the following research questions:

1. Does teachers' rating of the performance of inspectors vary on the basis of gender?
2. Does teachers' rating of the performance of inspectors vary on the basis of length of teaching experience?

Hypotheses

In a bid to execute an independent and reliable study the

following hypotheses are postulated and tested to guide findings of research:

HO₁: There is no significant difference in the ratings of the performance of public primary school inspectors by teachers on the basis of gender.

HO₂: There is no significant difference in the ratings of the performance of inspectors in public primary schools on the basis of length of teaching experience.

Section 1 of the paper has introduced the study, stated the research problem, established objectives the study intends to achieve and postulated hypotheses to be tested in the course of the study. Section 2 will review related past literature on which the work is premised. While section 3 will concentrate on research methodology. In section 4 data will be presented, analysed and results discussed. Finally, summary of findings of research, conclusions and recommendations will be made in section 5 of the paper.

Review of Related Literature Conceptual Framework

Inspection is carried out with an eye on improving teachers' performance. Once inspection date is announced, the teachers of the particular school work relentlessly (tirelessly) with a view to raise their performance rating. Hence effective inspection of schools at targeted of bringing out the best in the teachers of primary schools so as to attain optimal performance level in these regions where these inspected schools are located.

Inspection is an occasional (routine) thing while supervision is constant and regular monitoring of teachers' activities to make them perform their work better with a view to raising the standard of education in a particular region, state or federal area.

Ogunu (2001), defined inspection as that specific process whereby a school is examined and evaluated as a place of learning in such a way that advice may be given for its improvement and that advice embodied in a report. In the above sense Ogunu tried to distinguish inspection from supervision which according to him, is a constant and continuous process of more personal guidance based on frequent visits when attention is directed to one or more aspects of the school and its organization. Traditional inspection was coercive, fault-finding, capricious and vindictive because government was grant-aiding schools. Thus inspectors only look out at for the schools qualified to benefit from such gestures.

The major difference between inspection and supervision is that the former is once in a while venture while supervision is a daily affair. As a matter of fact, modern inspection is democratic. Since the take-over of

schools by missions and individual owners in 1970, inspection encourages independent thinking, initiative, creativity and originality (Duru-Uremadu, 2005).

School inspection can be defined as a process of examining, criticizing, appraising teachers and students to see if they conform to set rules and standards (Ibiam, 2015). Inspection and supervision of instruction form the pivot of the teaching and learning process in any educational system. Without proper inspection and supervision, it is difficult to evaluate and assess learning outcome. It is the process of aiding teachers grow professionally through improvement of instruction. The fundamental aim is to help students' learning through equipping the teachers with the current instructional techniques. Bearing this in mind, inspector of schools go about their duties to ensure conformity by schools and teachers. Another aim of inspection is to provide the institutions with written evidence of the constructive advice and recommendations emanating from the inspection exercise. It also aims at acquainting the principal and staff with up-to date information on instructional materials and equipment, which can be used to improve the effectiveness of instruction (Ibiam, 2015).

The Function of Inspectors in Primary Education Management

One of the most crucial functions of inspectors is to ensure that each individual teacher within the school system has been performing the duties for which he was assigned (Ogunsaju, 1988). Another cogent role is to improve the effectiveness of teachers so that they contribute maximally to the attainment of the system goals (Adesina, 1981). For an inspector to achieve the above stated roles, it is necessary that the inspector has a clear understanding of what he wants in the inspection and how he can go about achieving the roles. An unclear role will definitely become hazardous in the process of inspection.

The inspector is to ensure that public money voted for education is spent carefully, wisely and in accordance with the financial regulations. A wise nation recognizes that its real wealth is its children and children have a right to be educated. It believes too that its future success depends on the quality of the education which its children are receiving. Those vast sum of money set aside every year to give a practical expression to these beliefs must not be squandered and unaccounted for or the whole framework of the country will be undermined.

Another important role of inspectors is to ensure that education policies and laws are properly enforced in order to improve the pupils' performances and to develop education of children. One of the main purposes of inspection is to render a teacher disposed to improve,

and to convince him that he can go through self-improvement. Thus inspection offers guidance to the teacher so that he can become competent in self-analysis, self-criticism, self-improving and in turn, enable the teacher to have confidence in himself as a professor in the school system (Kyte, 1980).

It is evident from the above statements that teachers can learn to isolate and analyse their own problems through inspection, this is very necessary in order to find solution to their professional problems for the purpose of improving the total learning teaching situation. It follows therefore that the rapport between inspector and teacher is crucial to the success of any inspection or inspector. Formerly the inspector teacher relationship was often uneasy and unhappy, and many complains, with its implications of prying and bullying.

Helping the teacher personally is termed counselling and a counsellor is a person who places his knowledge and experience at the disposal of others. It is as counsellors that inspector can best help his teachers and can best train them to help their children. If the inspector cares for his teachers it follows that his teachers in turn will care for their children. Many factors which affect a teacher's work are often beyond his control. Shortages of books and materials and ill-equipped classroom, unsympathetic parents or a feeling of strangeness in an alien community, family problems, illness, poor staff relations with his headmaster or colleague.

According to the Ministry of Education, Ibadan (1983) in inspector Handbook, an inspector must take into account of all these aspects of the teacher's work, he cannot counsel properly unless he understands that these factors exist. Because of its fundamental importance a good relationship between the inspector and his teacher is basic.

Inspectors of education who have all responsibility for making sure that effective primary education is improved in a given area, to make it a point of duty to attend all meetings of the local government committee that deal with the issues of education. By so doing, they will not only give general direction but will be able to see that their recommendations receive proper hearing.

In the case of repeated failure to implement the recommendations, the inspector may raise the matter in a separate confidential reports to supervisors and for record purposes inspectors are advised to keep full details including dates of schools they visit, and the nature of the visit (Olele, 1995).

The problems inspectors are facing in primary schools are poor classroom accommodation, poor staffing, inadequate furniture, lack of means of transportation to reach schools that are in the rural areas, poor motivation for both teachers and inspectors, inadequate instructional

materials for pupils and host of others. These problems have generally contributed, not in a small measure to the negative attitude from both inspectors and the teachers towards the teaching and learning process (Olele, 1995).

Accordingly the work of Newman (1986), believed that of all the things that education leaders do to promote the professional growth of teachers, those involved in work with children have by far the greater value. If the inspectors accept the fact that their contact is necessary with head teachers and teachers in spite of the prevailing problems of the nation's primary schools, there would have been a lot of difference (Olele, 1995).

William (1979), categorized inspector behaviour into five classes worth noting in this study:

i. Authority centred inspector: He is an inspector who views absolute principles, expert opinion and common practice as the right answer to problem. He is rigid and uncompromising.

ii. Inner directed inspector: He is the type who interprets policies and procedures to his own values, opinions and judgments to meet educational needs of the community. He feels that he knows better and wider ignoring official channels and procedures

iii. Work-group oriented inspector: This type of inspector makes judgments in the context of specific situations and selects tasks as determined by the situations.

iv. Individual –centred inspection: This type of inspector places emphasis upon fulfilling individual needs and gives priority to decisions that permit individual variations and freedom.

v. Other –directed inspector: He believes that authority for goals and procedures ties is the will of people served. He develops friendly relations with partners of education to know their wishes to see to it that expressed goals and procedures are achieved. Hence, inspectors are expected to promote teaching and learning process in our primary schools.

The inspector's role encompasses these basic components of administrative, curricular and instructional components of administrative, curricular and instructional. The bottom-line is making it possible to help teachers themselves become skilled in the process of fostering children's learning (Robert, 1980). Inspection does not necessarily denote specific occasion when the whole school is examined and evaluated as a place of learning but it refers to the constant and continuous process of guidance based on frequent visits, which focus attention on one or more aspects of the school and its organisation. How well thus purpose is achieved depends upon the skills and efficiency of the inspector in working with the teachers (Ndu, 1992).

Inspector's activities are intended to improve the teacher training and growth on the job. As teachers learn, grow and improve, pupils will also learn and grow. The overall growth of pupils in the final analysis is the ultimate goal of the total educational process.

As such the Economic Sector Work (ESW) 1989, the Poverty Assessment Study (1991) and the Social Sector Review (1994), all cited in Adamu (1998), revealed that the primary education sector in Nigeria was performing below expectation and at variance with the policy provisions. Correspondingly, parents had a very low perception of the primary education services offered their children and wards. People have started asking intriguing questions as to who is responsible for the fallen standard of our education. Who should account for what? Who are the inspectors and what are their duties? Today's primary school system is complex when compared to one room neighbour school. There is population explosion among pupils that attend primary schools in Nigeria coupled with decrease in the number of instructional staff. The pupils and teachers usually bring to school some social cultural and economic background that perplex the unprepared inspector. Besides, the facilities and services for primary education are becoming complex to manage, and the social expectations from the school are equally becoming extremely demanding (Adamu, 1998). These problems and issues call for an organised professional role of the inspector who is equipped with the essential knowledge, principles, theories, skills and strategies associated with inspection to use his expert knowledge and experience to oversee, evaluate and cooperatively improve to conditions and methods of instructional programmes in teaching and learning process.

It is therefore the responsibility of an effective inspector to meet up with his commitment with education objectives ensuring that pupils and teachers are harmoniously working towards a common target. His professional responsibilities must include instructional initiating, organising and directing group actions towards the success of the school. He should familiarize himself with the dispositions and qualifications of his teachers and environmental factors of the school (Duru-Uremadu, 2005).

Finally, in order to harmonise all the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of primary education, given expertise and experiences the inspector must harness and be grounded in the existing theories and models and apply each as the situation evolves.

Perception of Inspection by Teachers

Educational inspection means different things to different societies or the public at different times according to needs, experience and purpose (Denga, 1986). For a

long time now in Nigeria, the traditional definition mostly given to the school inspector was that of a paladin or knight with a mission to enforce discipline on teachers and pupils in the schools under his control. He was regarded as a government representative who visited school in order to assess and report on the state of teaching, the keeping of school records, general cleanliness of the school, staff behaviour and so on.

Investigation into past literature indicate that the inspector was perceived as performing the role of a policeman who was out to find faults and report the wrong-doer to the government so that they would be hammered into proper shape (Denga, 1986). This view persisted for sometimes, and in order to make the inspector happy, the schools do host the inspector in a special way by offering gifts to elicit a favourable report.

For sometimes in the history of Nigeria education system, many teachers and head teachers saw the inspector as a threat to their individuality and progress. On the other hand, teachers who received good reports viewed the inspector as a source of assistance and support.

In order to give support for the activities of the inspector in the 1940s in which people perceived them the way they did, some instances of the 20th century educational inspectors seemingly played the role of judges, directors and dictators because many teachers were not well trained then.

Psychological research and theory, according to Ogunsaju (1988), have indicated that an individual's behaviour is determined largely by the individual's perception of himself and his role. The expectation of others, create in part, this self-image which directs behaviour. Hence, perception involves self-understanding and assessment about the behaviour of others. People behave in different ways because of their background and upbringing. Teachers, like other individuals, may have psychological or personal problems. It is unnecessary for the inspector to query the teacher or stereotype him as change resistant.

Ogunsaju (1988) once concluded, that "teachers in Nigeria today continue to recognise a contradiction and express strong ambivalence about the place and function of inspection service". It is thus the responsibility of the inspectors to dispel the fear already generated in the minds of teachers and make them realise that inspectors are prepared to help teachers improve and adjust to change. That they are encouraged to feel free and be creative in order to advance the frontier of knowledge.

It can therefore be concluded that the response of a subordinate to any inspection act (or to any interaction with the other members of an organisation) will depend upon:

- a. The perception by the subordinate of the inspection act or interaction (i.e. how the subordinate sees and interprets the experience).
- b. The relationship between these perceptions and the expectations, values and interpersonal skills of the subordinate.

Both of these variables are influenced by the subordinate's background, past experience, values and culturally conditioned sets.

Internship report submitted by Uremadu (1999), showed that most teachers still perceived inspectors as intruders, vindictive persons, fault-finders. Many of the inspectors are coarse and colonial in nature, they are always intimidating to gain submission from their subordinates.

The Impact of Inspectors on Primary Education

Previous studies have revealed that inspector has direct impact on primary education performance (Uganga, 1989; Ogunsaju, 1988; Obadan, 1979; Sergiovanni, 1979; Aderounmu, 1985; Robert, 1980; Newman, 1986 and Duru-Uremadu, 2016). Uganga (1989), explained that inspection of schools allowed the inspector to inspect, direct, co-ordinate and control activities that go on and monitor the management and teachers telling them when and where they have gone right or wrong and guiding them against further recurrence of such mistakes.

With the new trends in the Nigerian educational system, it is obvious that effective inspection will be necessary in order to enhance the quality of instructions in primary schools. Already, there has been pressure from various groups concerning what is taught and how it should be taught. Moreover, modern instructional materials are being introduced and used as teaching aids like the workshop for introductory technology in the school instructional process.

According to Ogunsaju (1988); "In order to cope with these demands, it seems that inspection has got an important role to play in deciding the nature and content of the curriculum, in selecting school organisational patterns and learning materials that will enhance educational growth and development of both the pupils and teachers".

In his report, Ajayi et al. (1998), recommended the increasing need for educational accountability and judicious use of available funds and resources. The government as the financier of primary education can only enforce this through effective inspection by inspectors as liaison officers. The government as the major financier of primary education can only enforce this through effective inspection by inspectors as liaison officers between schools and the government.

Sergiovanni (1979), commented that the major effort of any inspection activity is the changing of some aspects of a person's self-concept, way of behaviour and attitude to the school and within the school as an organisation. This change in behaviour will affect the quality of instruction in particular and non-instructional activities, in general.

Hence, findings of Duru-Uremadu (2016)'s research support the position taken in most books on inspection of schools. That the inspector should treat the individual as one whose ideas and wishes are important. The human value expressed in the procedures are basic to the Nigeria nation's conception of democratic living and human dignity. They happen too, to be the means by which effective and efficient performance of an organisation may be achieved.

Obadan (1979)'s study, revealed that the structure of the school imply that the inspectors are "Liaison Officers" between the ministry and the schools. According to him, "the structure shows a two-way channel of communication by which policies and decisions of go down, and information, problems and perhaps suggestions go up". The inspector can influence decision in the Ministry of Education through his reports on the school he inspects.

According to Aderounmu (1985), the federal government has its core of education inspectors in all the states of the federation primarily to monitor performance in primary school. Also NPEC report (1988), structurally arranged the management of primary education from National Primary Education Commission (NPEC), State Primary Education Board (SPEB), Local Education Authority (LEA) and School Committees. Structurally, therefore the control of primary education in all states of the federation is rested in the Ministry of Education. Associated with centralisation of control is that syllabuses are prescribed by the Ministry and Examination Council. Standards laid down are external to schools and are related to the attainment of skills and the acquisition of subject matter; they are such as assumed to be desirable standard which the pupils should reach. If the pupils fail to reach those standards, they are considered failures. The teachers are therefore primarily concerned with the performance of their pupils, with the result that desperate attempts are made to cover syllabus. Under such conditions as observed by Aderounmu (1985), the environment is not conducive to teacher initiative. The system which it must be remembered if administered by a democratically and liberally minded inspection as a dominant feature of organisation strives to encourage the teacher initiative and foster improvement in the standard of working and in the methods of teaching.

Review of Related Literature

Past studies have touched on various issues regarding

inspection at the primary education level (Denga, 1986; Ogun, 2001; Zeph, 2002; Wolusoye, 2003; Nwaogu, 1980 and Duru-Uremadu, 2016). Areas covered by these past works in their various studies include beliefs and attitudes of rural primary school teachers, the role and functions of inspectorate, evaluative study on the performance of primary school inspectors (Adamu, 1998 and Nwankwo, 1981). Other areas are issues in inspection of primary schools, inspection of teachers in primary schools, teacher's views about primary school inspectors in Abuja, some teachers and inspectors on teacher skill development, etc (see Duru-Uremadu, 2005 and Nwaogu, 1980).

Again, investigation through literature of related studies has indicated that the inspector was perceived as performing the role of a police man who was out to find faults and prosecute the wrong-doers (Denga, 1986). Wonye(2002), carried out a study in Obubra Local Government Area of Cross River State on the performance of primary school inspectors, the results showed that inspectors did not demonstrate teaching techniques in the classroom for teachers as a technique of improving the teacher instructional strategies. This discovery confirms the views of Ogunu (2001), that inspectors are expected to be professional leaders. Another study done by Zeph (2002), revealed that teachers whether newly appointed or old and experienced in the field perceived inspections as fault-finding exercise. They are found to panic and disrupt their lesson when they are being observed. The perception of inspection by Nigeria teachers is still that of fault-finding, dictators, threat to individuality, and prejudiced value judgement in inspection of schools. This finding confirms the earlier views of Ogunsaju (1983), that teachers in Nigeria today continue to recognise a contradiction and express strong ambivalence about the place and functions of inspections at primary education level.

A study report on teachers' assessment of primary education inspectors confirmed that inspectors do not visit most schools in rural areas. This also has led to a high rate of absenteeism among teachers and pupils which adversely affect the academic performance of pupils.

Another study conducted in Imo State indicated that most inspection activities were concentrated in the urban areas to the detriment of rural primary schools (Zeph, 2002). The findings also showed that most inspectors did not participate in demonstration teaching as a technique for instructional improvement. In a related study by Wodumere (2003), on supervision of teachers in primary schools that carried out a survey of Port Harcourt Local Government Area of Rivers State, it was proved that inspectors ensured that money allocated to primary

schools was judiciously utilised but added that inspection was not always done with the intention of improving teachers teaching methods but on the basis of finding faults and giving prejudiced value judgement about the schools. This view is in support of earlier view by Aderounmu (1985), that inspectors were labelled fault-finders, critics and authoritarians by teachers rather than agents of change, because change and progress do not come from the tidiness of uniformity of schools but in the creative interplay of diversity. The study also observed that there was no time for inspectors to visit, observe and participate in exemplary models.

The report of a study carried out in Kwara State in Wolusoye (2003), showed that school inspection is still largely colonial in approach in Kwara State. This is so because the impact of inspection is not being well felt by the teachers. The teachers must first benefit from any inspection before the pupils could show this in their performance. The frequency of inspection is not such that allows for teachers to benefit much from it.

One area of controversy is schools should be given notice of their inspection or not. The practice in Kwara State from Wolusoye (2003)'s study is to give notice of inspection. The notice might be as short as three months and as long as a whole session. Copies of programme of inspection are sent to all schools, inspectorate division in the state as well as other related functionaries. A comprehensive list of the advantages and disadvantages of giving notice of visitation can be found in Nwaogu (1980). The ultimate goal of classroom unit is to improve the efficiency of the teacher being visited. Thus, when there is a notice to visit the teacher tends to put up his best, cover any areas of work and in this way improves his efficiency. If the efficiency of inspection is greatly increased, it would be found that the preparation that usually follows an inspection notice would be of significant value to the school system.

In another related studies in Kano and Kaduna States by Yelshim (2001), the inspectorate is set outside the Ministry of Education in an autonomous body of its own. The centres have the primary objective of making the best of the teachers in the secondary and primary schools. It is among its major activities to arrange for seminars, workshops and conferences where renowned scholars and inspectors are invited for the benefit of the teachers. The settings has a number of advantages such as greater opportunities for funding, more time for planning and visiting of schools on a more regular basis. It addressed itself more directly to teachers' classroom problems.

According to Ndu (1997), inspector is a moving teacher college in that his work is an extension of that done by the teacher training colleges. He counsels untrained

teachers about better teaching profession. He offers possible constructive and concrete advice to teachers so that the quality of teaching/learning can be improved. He organises short courses or workshops designed to meet areas of deficiency which have been detected by the inspector during his visitation. The objective of short courses/workshops should be for the school improvement and act as catalyst for innovation and curricular development. The inspector of education must critically evaluate and review new publications and textbooks sent to schools. He must run induction courses for newly recruited teachers and schools administrators.

According to Adamu (1998), "the prosperity and quality of life of every nation in this millennium will be determined by today's children and their ability to solve the problems that face them in their families, their communities and their nation. Only education can unlock this ability hence inspection of primary education is the single most important contribution a nation can make to a better future". He further postulated that "the pressures of modern Nigeria, the political volatility, technological, social and religious tensions of our society affects all citizens, and can be withstood only if the whole population has received and retained the benefit of good primary education.

In agreement with the truisms above, Nwankwo (1981), opined that the success and failure of an enterprise depended, among other factors, partly upon the inspection of such enterprise be it school or an organisation. Thus, the success of any primary education in meeting its goals and aspirations on the professional responsibilities and leadership role of the inspector. Inspection generally is to education what the central nervous system is to the body and the entrepreneur to the other factors of production in the world of business. It directs activities, controls, regulates and monitors the functioning of the different units of the system. The practice of inspection is as old as 1877 when the colonial administration provided assistance to the missionaries to foster the growth of Nigerian education system (Ozigi and Canham, 1979).

According to Edem (2003), it is becoming increasingly clear that experience alone does not constitute a valid basis for inspection of primary education. And the importance of inspection is receiving far greater attention because of inadequacies and laxities in our today's education systems.

The Economic Sector Work (1989), the Poverty Assessment Study (1991) and the Social Sector Review (1994), all cited in Adamu (1998), revealed that the primary education sector in Nigeria was performing below expectation and at variance with the policy provisions. Correspondingly, parents had a very low perception of

the primary education services offered their children and wards. In recent times, people have started asking intriguing questions as to who is responsible for the falling standard of our education. Who should account for what? Who are the inspectors and what are their duties? Today's primary school system is complex when compared to one room neighbourhood school. There is population explosion among pupils that attend primary schools in Nigeria coupled with decrease in the number of instructional staff. The pupils and teachers usually bring to school some social cultural and economic background that perplex the unprepared inspector. Also, the facilities and services for primary education are becoming complex to manage, and the social expectations from the schools are equally becoming demanding (Adamu, 1998). These problems and issues call for an organised professional role of the inspector who is equipped with the essential knowledge, principles, theories, skills and strategies associated with inspection to use his expert knowledge and experience to oversee, evaluate and cooperatively improve the conditions and methods of instructional programmes in the teaching and learning process.

It is therefore the responsibility of an effective inspector to meet up with his commitment with education objectives ensuring that pupils and teachers are harmoniously working towards a common target. His professional responsibilities must include instructional initiating, organising and directing group actions towards the success of the school. He should familiarise himself with the dispositions and qualifications of his teachers and environmental factors of the schools.

Finally, in order to harmonise all the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of primary education, given expertise and experiences, the inspector must harness and be grounded in the existing theories and models and apply each as the situation evolves.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A descriptive survey research design was employed for the study because the study collected information on issues pertaining to attitudes and opinions about primary education inspectors in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. The present study design adopted a qualitative approach to data collection. Qualitative research is not concerned with representativeness or making inferences about the larger population (Ikerionwu et al., 2011 and Duru-Uremadu, 2016). Rather, it seeks to gain rich, comprehensive data from a small number of participants (Ikerionwuet a., 2011).

Population of the Study

The population of the present study consisted of all the

Table 1: Number of schools in the Area councils and the population

Name of Area Council	No. of Schools	No. of schools sampled	Total no. of teachers in each Area Council	Total no. of NCE teachers in each Area Council (%)	Sample size (%)
Abaji	34	8	435	173 (39.9%)	56 (32.3%)
AMAC	60	9	1390	897 (64.55%)	200(22.3%)
Bwari	35	8	400	245 (61.3%)	65 (26.5%)
Gwagwalada	44	8	561	232 (41.4%)	65 (28.0%)
Kuje	67	9	461	196 (47.8%)	60 (30.6%)
Kwali	46	8	297	142 (47.8%)	54 (38%)
Total	287	50	3544	1885 (53%)	500 (27%)

Source: Author's Compilation from FCT Primary Education Board (2004).

teachers in the public primary schools of the Federal Capital Territory of Nigeria, Abuja. There are three thousand and five hundred and forty-five (3545) teachers in all the public primary schools in the Territory (Duru-Uremadu, 2016).

Sample Size and Sampling Procedures

The study has a sample size of 500 NCE teachers out of one thousand eight hundred and eight-five (1885) NCE teachers in FCT, Abuja. This proportion represents 27 percent which is large enough for our generalisation. NCE teachers are chosen because NCE is the minimum teaching requirement in public primary schools system in Nigeria. Anything more than that is considered above the normal qualification for primary school teaching. Besides, NCE teachers are in the majority. Proportional sampling method is used to pick the sample size because of the uneven distribution of NCE teachers among the schools.

From each of the fifty (50) schools, a sample of 54 NCE teachers from Kwali Area Council, 56 from Abaji, 65 from Gwagwalada was drawn (table 1). This sample size was based on the staff strength of NCE teachers of the randomly selected schools. Three inspectors were chosen from each of the six area councils except Gwagwalada and Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC) which has four inspectors each.

The sample for this study was selected from all NCE teachers of sub-urban and urban schools of the fifty (50) selected schools in the Federal Capital Territory. The study was designed to cover five hundred (500) NCE teachers in the six area councils of the Territory. This is for effective coverage, proper geographical representation and uniform generalisation.

In order to select the sample that is representative of the population stratified sampling technique is adopted, because it identified and addresses heterogeneity in the population. The population contains definite subsets which are distinctly different. Accordingly, Denga (1986), asserted that since a heterogeneous population of subgroups might respond differently, a sampling procedure that adequately represents the entire

population is adopted, the ideal of sampling being to select a portion from the main population to represent the whole population.

The fifty (50) randomly selected schools were stratified into twenty-five sub-urban and twenty-five urban schools, female and male NCE teachers.

Therefore the sample included two hundred and fifty (250) male teachers and two hundred and fifty (250) female teachers from both the rural and urban schools.

Instrumentation and Procedure for Data Collection

Data for this study was obtained mostly through the use of questionnaires, others include records from the officials of the Federal Capital Territory, Primary Education Board (PEB), records of past researchers and the course, personal observation of inspection by the researcher while she was an attaché with Government Local Educational Authority (LEA) in 1999 and as a primary school teacher since 2000 to 2015.

The questionnaire for teachers which contains twenty nine items, was designed to seek information about the performance of inspectors at primary education level in the Federal Capital Territory. The questionnaire consists of three sections each. Section A seeks to obtain personal information from the respondent; Section B of the research instrument seeks to obtain information from the respondents about their perceptions, and views of inspection and inspectors. Section C part of the instrument was a Likert type rating instrument. This was modified by making use of the four-point scale instead of five-point Likert type of rating scale. This four-point scale seeks responses about attitudes, beliefs or judgements by respondents about inspectors and their functions. Here a respondent is expected to respond to questionnaire in a four point scale of:

Strongly Agree	4
Agree	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1

All questions on this part varied depending on the nature

Table 2: Description of Respondents

Variable	Frequency	%	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Sex:				
Male	206	56.5	51.5	51.5
Female	194	48.5	48.5	100.0
Marital status:				
Single	56	14.0	14.0	14.0
Married	344	86.0	86.0	100.0
Teaching experience:				
Up to 5 years	25	6.3	6.3	6.3
6 – 10 years	293	73.3	73.3	79.5
11 – 15 years	42	10.5	10.5	90.0
16 or more years	40	10.0	10.5	100.0
School location:				
Urban	294	73.5	73.5	73.5
Sub-urban	106	26.5	26.5	100.0

Source: Author's compilation (2016)

and duties of the respondents.

Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

A pilot study (pre-test) was carried out in ten primary schools (which are not in the sample size) to authenticate the reliability of the instrument. The scores for individual respondents from the questionnaires in each group were summed up and the mean and standard deviation obtained.

The Pearson's Product Correlation Coefficient was used. The result obtained was 0.69 indicating that there is strong positive correlation. To ensure the content validity of the instrument, it was subjected to two experts in primary education inspection and other colleagues in the area of education administration and planning, research and statistics who certified the instrument to be authentic.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data collected from correspondents are organised and fed into the computer and processed using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Because of the nature of the study, a decision rule was drawn that 2.49 and below are Below Average; 2.50 – 3.49 is Average and anything from 3.50 to 4.0 is Above Average.

The scores representing the ratings of individual respondents from the questionnaire in each group are summed and the mean and standard deviation obtained. To arrive at a reliable and valid statistical results and interpretation of the hypotheses formulated, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for testing hypotheses one and two of the study. The critical level of significance for acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis is 0.05.

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The responses of teachers from the selected schools in the

Federal Capital Territory are analysed and interpreted with a view to ascertain the perception of public primary school teachers about inspectors' performance in primary schools of the FCT, Abuja.

Data collected from correspondents was organised and coded into computer sheets. It was then fed into the computer and processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). As a result, mean scores (\bar{X}), standard deviation of items and research questions, the testing and interpretation of the hypotheses were determined.

Decision Rule

As such, the decision rule for this study is that a mean rating of 2.49 and below is below average performance; 2.50 – 3.49 is average and a mean rating of 3.50 – 4.0 is above average.

Demographic Description of Respondents

The respondents were asked to supply certain personal characteristics in the questionnaire. The responses are contained in table 2.

Table 2 has the following interpretations. The sex composition of the teachers revealed that 51.5 percent are male, while 48.5 percent are female. Fifty – six (56) of them that represented

14 percent are single while three hundred and forty-four (344) which is 86 percent are married. All in all are NCE teachers by qualification. As to teaching experience, 6.3 percent of them have served up to 5 years, 10.5 percent have taught for 11 – 15 years whereas 10 percent have served for 16 years or more. In the area of school location, two hundred and ninety-four (294), are from urban schools while one hundred and six (106) which represented 26.5 percent, are from sub-urban schools.

Table 3: Ratings of male and female teachers

S/N	Items	Male				Female			
		N	X mean	SD	Decision	N	X mean	SD	Decision
1	The inspector sees each teachers in the schools during the year	206	2.95	.31	Average	194	2.95	.26	Average
2	The inspector supports the goals of the school (learning and teaching)	206	3.92	.37	Above average	194	3.96	.19	Above average
3	The inspector discusses his reports with teachers prior to turning them into office.	206	3.04	.24	Average	194	3.03	.19	Average
4	The inspector makes suggestions to the teachers on how to improve their instruction	206	3.00	6.97E02	Average	194	3.01	7.18E02	Average
5	The inspector demonstrates teaching techniques at the school for the teachers	206	2.58	.72	Average	194	2.58	.72	Average
6	The inspector organises workshops for the teachers	206	2.58	.72	Average	194	2.58	.72	Average
7	The inspector is sufficiently knowledgeable about current practices in teaching	206	3.00	.17	Average	194	3.01	7.18E02	Average
8	The inspector is friendly and helpful to teachers and school management	206	3.95	.31	Above average	194	3.95	.32	Above average
9	The inspector brings teaching aids to the school.	206	2.01	.28	Below average	194	2.01	7.18E02	Below average
10	Inspector makes suggestions on how to improve the school	206	2.99	9.83E02	Average	194	2.99	.12	Average
11	Inspectors visit schools regularly	206	2.46	.82	Below average	194	2.46	.80	Below average
12	Their reports after inspection are objective	206	2.40	.57	Below average	194	2.47	.62	Below average
13	Their reports after inspection are objective	206	2.04	.23	Below average	194	2.01	.14	Below average
14	The inspector informs teachers about new practices and policies from government	206	2.98	.23	Average	194	2.99	.10	Average
15	Schools in both urban and suburban areas receive equal and similar inspection exercises	206	2.45	.84	Below average	194	2.36	.85	Below average
16	Causal and detailed inspections are carried out regularly	206	2.48	.82	Below average	194	2.47	.86	Below average
	Overall		2.77	1.43	Average		2.77	1.68	Average

Source: Compiled by the Author (2016)

Responses to Research Questions

In this subsection answers to questions contained in the questionnaire are presented below:

Research question one

Does teachers' rating of the performance of primary education inspectors vary on the basis of gender?

The respondents here comprised male and female teachers from both urban and suburban schools. Their teaching experience ranges from 5 years to 16 or more years. The male teachers in the study are two hundred

and six (206) while their female counterparts are one hundred and ninety-four (194) in number. Variations in their size is as a result of their distribution in the sample size. Their overall mean scores are the same 2.77 and 2.77. The data are contained in table 3.

From table 3, it is observed that male and female teachers hold the same opinion in items 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11. They all had the same means, that is, 2.95 and 2.95; 2.58 and 2.58; 3.95 and 3.95; 2.01 and 2.01; 2.99 and 2.99; 2.46 and 2.46, respectively. However, there were variations in the remaining items. There was wide

disparity in five (5) of the items and small disparity in the remaining five (5) items. The wide disparity items include item No. 5 which stated "That @The inspector demonstrates teaching techniques at the school for the teachers". The mean scores for both the male and female teachers are 1.99 and 2.02. They rated the inspectors' performance here as below average. Item number 2 "The inspector supports the goals of the school (learning and teaching)" has the mean score of 3.92 for male teachers and 3.96 for female teachers. This means that female teachers rated inspectors' performance here higher than their male counterparts. Items 12 "Their reports after inspections are objective" was rated higher by female teachers than their male counterparts. Each has the mean (X) score of 2.40 for male and 2.47 for female. All the same, they both rated inspectors' performance of this function as below average. Male teachers may be of the opinion that inspectors report about them after inspection is bias. They are more tended to gender sensitivity than being objective. As much as female teachers rated them failure in this aspect, it appeared they were more delighted with inspectors' performance here than the male teachers. In item number 13 which sought to ascertain if "Inspectors only visit schools where there is a problem", male teachers rated them higher than their female counterparts. Each had the mean (X) score of 2.04 and 2.01, respectively even though their ultimate judgement was below average performance in this area of inspectors' functions. There was also wide disparity in Item 15 "Schools in both urban and sub-urban areas receive equal and similar inspection exercise". Male teachers seemed to differ in opinion in favour of inspectors' performance here than their female counterparts. Each of them has the mean (X) score of 2.45 and 2.36, respectively in their rating of inspectors' performance of this vital function. Inspectors are expected to give schools in both locations equal attention but where the weight is lopsided, it is very disturbing. Both male and female teachers rated inspectors' below average performance here which is to say that schools in both urban and sub-urban locations did not receive equal and similar inspection exercise.

In table 3, also, item numbers 3, 4, 7, 14 and 16 were the next in conflict. Both male and female teachers have variations in their rating of inspectors' performance in these functions though with small disparities. All of them had average performance rating except Item No. 16 "Casual and detailed inspection are carried out regularly" which had 2.48 and 2.47 mean scores and therefore were below average.

In conclusion therefore, there are variations in the rating of the performance of the primary education inspectors on the basis of their gender. Though, the

mean scores for both male and female teachers are the same but judging by the ratings on items stipulated in the questionnaire, female teachers rated inspectors' performance higher than their male counterparts. These could easily be seen in item numbers. 2, 3, 4, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 with mean (X) scores of 3.92 and 3.92; 3.04 and 3.03; 3.00 and 3.01, 1.99 and 2.02, 2.40 and 2.47; 2.04 and 2.01; 2.98 and 2.99; 2.45 and 2.36; 2.48 and 2.47 for male and female teachers, respectively.

Research question two

Does teachers rating of the performance of primary education inspectors vary on the basis of length of teaching experience?

The categories of teachers with varied teaching experience are four in this study. They are teachers with up to 5 years' experience in the profession, 25 in number; 6 – 10 years, 293; 11 – 15 years, 42 and 16 or more years, 40 in number. Each of these responded to the questionnaire and rated the inspectors' performance based on their length of experience in the field. Their overall mean (X) scores are 2.76, 2.76, 2.77 and 2.78 for the first, second, third and fourth, categories, respectively. Teachers who have served up to 5 years and their counterparts in 6 – 10 years had the same opinion and rating for the inspector. The third and fourth group held different opinions. Their ratings differed. Those who have served for 16 or more years rated inspectors' performance higher than their counterparts in 11 – 15 years. The data are contained in table 4.

From the table 4, it is observed that all the teachers of the different categories of experience held the same opinion on their rating of inspectors performance on Items Nos. 5, 7 and in item No. 4, where only experience category of up to 5 years differed in opinion. Their means (X) scores were 3.04, 3.00, 3.00 and 3.00, respectively. The other items had wide disparity in their ratings by the teachers of different working experience. In Item No. 1 "The inspector sees each teacher in the school during the year", the mean scores for each of the groups were 2.96, 2.95, 3.00 and 2.88, respectively. Even though inspectors were rated on average performance, there were variations in the ratings especially that of the last group 16 or more years whose means score was 2.88 when compared with their counterparts in the other three groups. Teachers of more working experience rated inspectors' function in No. 1 lower than the other groups. Group 6 – 10 years and 11 – 15 years rated inspectors' performance higher in item No. 3 than the others. Also in item No. 2, groups 11 – 15 years and 16 or more years rated inspectors' performance very low and below average with mean (X) score of 2.40 in contrast to other groups who seemed to hold different views in their ratings

Table 4: Ratings of Experience Categories of Teachers

Items	Up to 5 years				6 to 10 years				11 to 15 years				16 or more years			
	N	Mean	SD	Decision	N	Mean	SD	Decision	N	Mean	SD	Decision	N	Mean	SD	Decision
The inspector sees each teacher in the school during the year	25	2.96	.20	Average	293	2.95	.27	Average	42	3.00	.22	Average	40	2.88	.46	Average
The inspector supports the goals of the school (learning and teaching)	25	3.92	.28	Above Av.	293	3.94	.30	Above Av.	42	3.95	.31	Above Av.	40	3.95	.32	Above Average
The inspector discusses his reports with teachers prior to turning them into office	25	3.00	.41	Average	293	3.03	.20	Average	42	3.07	.26	Average	40	3.00	.00	Average
The inspector makes suggestions to the teachers on how to improve their instruction	25	3.04	.20	Average	293	3.00	5.84E02	Average	42	3.00	.00	Average	40	5.00	.00	Average
The inspector demonstrates teaching techniques at the school for the teachers	25	2.00	.00	Below Av.	293	2.00	.19	Below Av.	42	2.00	.00	Below Av.	40	2.00	.00	Below Average
The inspector organises workshops for the teachers	25	2.40	.82	Below Av.	293	2.59	.72	Average	42	2.60	.70	Average	40	2.65	.66	Average
The inspector is sufficiently knowledgeable about current practices in teaching	25	3.00	.00	Average	293	3.00	.15	Average	42	3.00	.00	Average	40	3.00	.00	Average
The inspector is friendly and helpful to teachers and school management	25	3.92	.28	Above Av.	293	3.97	.22	Above Av.	42	3.81	.71	Above Av.	40	3.98	.16	Above Average
The inspector brings teaching aids to the school	25	2.08	.40	Below Av.	293	2.00	.19	Below Av.	42	1.98	.15	Below Av.	40	2.03	.16	Below Average
Inspector makes suggestions on how to improve the school	25	2.96	.20	Average	293	2.99	.12	Average	42	3.00	.00	Average	40	3.00	.00	Average
Inspectors visit schools regularly	25	2.32	.85	Below Av.	293	2.44	.83	Below Av.	42	2.57	.77	Average	40	2.55	.71	Average
Their reports after inspection are objective	25	2.52	.71	Average	293	2.43	.58	Below Av.	42	2.48	.63	Below Av.	40	2.40	.63	Below Average
Inspectors only visit schools where there is a problem	25	2.04	.20	Below Av.	293	2.02	.19	Below Av.	42	2.02	.15	Below Av.	40	2.05	.22	Below Average
The inspector informs teachers about new practices and policies from government	25	2.92	.28	Average	293	2.99	.17	Average	42	3.00	.00	Average	40	2.93	.27	Average
Schools in both urban and sub-urban areas receives equal and similar inspection exercises	25	2.44	.82	Below Av.	293	2.42	.83	Below Av.	42	2.24	.96	Below Av.	40	2.50	.85	Average
Casual and detailed inspections are carried out regularly	25	2.56	.82	Average	293	2.45	.85	Below Av.	42	2.60	.77	Average	40	2.50	.88	Average
OVERALL		2.76	0.41	Average		2.76	0.73	Average		2.77	0.35	Average		2.78	0.33	Average

Source: Author's Compilations (2016)

Table 5: ANOVA test of the mean ratings of inspectors' performance on the basis of gender

Sex (Gender)	N	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation					
			Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Decision
Male	206	44.25	2.74					
Female	194	44.26	2.78					
ANOVA test								
		Between Groups	0.41	1	.041	.005	.942	Not sig.
		Within Groups	3037.46	398	7.632			

of inspectors' performance of organising workshops for the teachers. The highest rating came from group 16 years or above, with mean (X) score of 2.65 followed by 11 – 15 years group (2.60) and 6 – 10 years group with mean (X) score of 2.59.

Category 16 years or more rated inspectors function in Item 8 higher than the others. This is followed by category 6 – 11 years, up to 5 years and 11 – 15 years with mean (X) score of 3.98, 3.97, 3.92 and 3.81, respectively. The common views of all teachers in the different groups is that inspectors failed to live up to expectations in Items 9 and 13 where they were rated below average performance. This result has indicated that inspectors did not bring teaching aids to the schools. Groups 16 years or more and 11 – 15 years rated inspectors performance in item Nos. 10 and 11 higher than the other groups. Perhaps they were of the opinion that inspectors were of better performance on these functions than the other groups which were rated of below average performance in item No. 11 by the other groups. Item Nos. 15 and 16 were rated higher by 16 years or more group, up to 5 years and 11 – 15 years, than the others. Item No. 12 was rated higher by the first group than the other groups who rated their performance of below average but with disparity in their mean (X) scores. Group 6 – 10 years and 11 – 15 years rated inspectors' performance in Item No. 14 higher than the other groups.

In essence therefore, there were variations in the rating of the performance of the primary education inspectors on the basis of length of working experience but the disparity was not much between the last two groups.

Hypothesis Testing

Each null hypothesis of the study was tested in turn using the appropriate statistical techniques. The results as presented on each table were interpreted and discussed in details below:

Hypothesis One

Ho: There is no significant difference in the ratings of the performance of primary school inspectors by teachers on the basis of gender.

It has been observed from table 5 that the number (N), mean score and standard deviation for male teachers were 206, 44.25 and 2.74, respectively while for the female teachers, the number (N), mean score and standard deviation were 194, 44.26 and 2.78, respectively.

When the mean scores were subjected to ANOVA test, a calculated "F" of .005 was got which is significant at 0.05 level at a probability level of .942.

Based on these results, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the ratings of the performance of primary education inspectors by teachers on the basis of gender is sustained and the alternative rejected.

Hypothesis Two

Ho₂: There is no significant difference in the ratings of the performance of primary education inspectors by the teachers on the basis of length of teaching experience.

From table 6, the mean score representing the ratings of inspectors' performance were used in testing the hypothesis. Based on the data, ANOVA test was carried out on the mean scores of all groups comparing the difference in performance of the various experience categories of teachers.

It was observed from table 6 that the number (N) mean score, standard deviation for group up to 5 years were 25, 44.03 and 3.13, respectively; group 6 – 10 years, 293, 44.24 and 2.74, respectively; 11 – 15 years; 42, 44.31 and 3.00, respectively and group 16 or more years, 40, 44.40 and 2.47, respectively.

When the mean scores were subjected to ANOVA test, a calculated "F" of 0.78 was got which was significant at 0.05 level at a probability level of .972.

Based on this the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the ratings of the functions of the primary education inspectors by the teachers on the basis of length of working experience is sustained and the alternative rejected.

Discussion of Results

Data analysis from table 6 showed that a calculated "F" of .005 was got which is significant at 0.05 level at a

Table 6: ANOVA test of the mean ratings of inspectors' performance on the basis of working experience

Working Experience	N	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation					
Up to 5 years	25	44.08	3.13					
6 – 10 years	293	44.24	2.74					
11 – 15 years	42	44.31	3.00					
16 or more years	40	44.40	2.47					
ANOVA test			Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Decision
		Between Groups	1.805	3	.602	.078	.972	Not sig.
		Within Groups	3035.69	396	7.666			

probability level of .942. Thus the study accepted the first hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the ratings of the functions of primary education inspectors by teachers on the basis of gender. The null hypothesis is hence sustained and the alternative is rejected. This implies that male and female teachers have the same ratings on the performance of inspectors' functions in the Federal Capital Territory. There is no preferential treatment as regards gender by inspectors while performing their duties. The teachers must first benefit from any inspection before the pupils in their quality of instructions. The irregularity and disparity of inspection in sub-urban schools is not such that allow for teachers to benefit much from. A situation where the use of seminars, workshops and conferences in rectifying teachers instructional problems is rare, school inspection remains largely reportage and traditional. There has not been any concerted effort by the inspectors to carry out extensive teaching demonstration exercises and use of teaching aids in schools to help teacher improve upon their teaching skills. This supports the earlier views of Adamu (1998), Nwakafor (1983), Nwaogu (1980) and Duru-Uremadu (2005).

Because of this, much has not been achieved maximally in the aspect of instructional method in schools where teachers are inspected as compared with teachers who are hardly visited by inspectors. Inspectors are more convened with checking teachers' records and pupils score sheets. All these go a long way to colour teachers sense of judgements which makes them see inspection as amounting to witch-hunting exercise.

The results of the statistical analysis obtained from table 6 in hypothesis two clearly indicated that the findings support the hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the ratings of the functions of the primary education inspectors by the teachers on the basis of length of working experience.

The mean scores revealed 44.08, 44.24, 44.31 and 44.40 for the first, second, third and fourth group of experience categories of teachers, respectively. When these mean scores were subjected to ANOVA test, a calculated "F" value of .078 was got which is significant at

0.08 level at a probability level of .972. Based on this finding the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative rejected. This therefore implies that the experience categories of teachers held similar opinion about the performance of inspectors' functions in the Federal Capital Territory on the basis of their length of teaching experience in the profession. It also goes to support the common adage that experience is the best teacher.

Experience has shown that inspectors are still colonial in approach in discharging some of their functions. They do not bring teaching aids to school for demonstration to teachers. The importance of instructional aids cannot be overemphasised and as vanguards of educational standards when they do not lead by examples then teachers may not know how to use some of modern instructional equipment for the pupils. The study's discovery strongly supports the assertions of some scholars like Ozigi and Canham (1979), Adesina (1981), Ogunsaju (1988), Adamu (1988) and Duru-Uremadu (2005).

The study also discovered that inspectors only visit schools where there is a problem. This might have occurred in some of these schools in sub-urban locations where their teachers complained that they were rarely visited. The results of this study furthermore indicated that the attitude of the teachers is very vital to making school inspection more than reporting which has been what traditional inspection stands for. If most of the teachers, whose work is the purpose of inspection visits, cannot discuss their instructional problems with the school inspectors for reason of irregular visits, then the most important value of school inspection have been lost. This situation becomes more serious if school inspectors only have to assist teachers when there is problems in the school. Inspectors should realise that inexperienced teachers need more help than experienced teachers whether in urban or sub-urban locations. It is through the inspector's professional advice and guidance that the new teacher can learn to gain confidence in himself and as well develop interest in his new profession. In the same vein, teaching is an ongoing business and as such its constant inspection should not be taken for granted.

Whenever there is some innovation or development of new ideas, the old and inexperienced teachers should be informed through course and demonstration teaching (Duru-Uremadu, (2016).

Summary of Findings, Conclusions, Educational Implications of Findings and Recommendations

Summary of Findings

The study was designed mainly to determine performance of the functions of public primary education inspectors in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. It was undertaken specifically to ascertain the level of performance of inspectors in urban and sub-urban schools and among male and female teachers in addition to experience categories of teachers. It was also intended to gauge their perception of inspectors' performance of the functions in the schools covered by the study. From the tests and analysis of the results the following findings were made:

1. It was established that there is no significant difference in the ratings of the functions of the primary education inspectors by teachers on the basis of gender. The findings were tested through the use of ANOVA tests and this hypothesis was upheld by the results of the present study.
2. The second hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the ratings of the functions of primary education inspectors by the teachers on the basis of the length of working experience was accepted by the results of the study.

CONCLUSIONS

In sum, the analysis of data collected in this study revealed that:

1. There is no significant difference in the ratings of the functions of the primary education inspectors by teachers on the basis of gender.
2. There is no significant difference in the ratings of the functions of the primary education inspectors by the teachers on the basis of the length of working experience.

From the foregoing, it is discovered from the results of the study that inspectors perform above average of 2.50 in the FCT, Abuja. There is no significant difference in the ratings of the functions of the primary education inspectors by teachers on the basis of gender nor on the basis of the length of their working experience. Both male and female teachers and experienced categories of teachers rated inspectors on the same level. There is no disparity, therefore both hypotheses one and two were accepted and retained.

Educational implications of Findings

In consideration of the results of the present study, the following educational implications can be deduced from the findings.

1. The perception of inspectors by teachers in sub-urban location is still seen as a threat to the very existence of teachers in those areas. This brings about discontentment and therefore, a tendency for one to conclude that inspectors are not paying adequate attention to the role of improving teachers' instructional methods which is one of the major functions of inspectors in a school-setting.
2. There has not been any concerted effort by inspectors to carry out extensive teaching demonstration exercise in schools to help teachers improve upon their teaching skills. They do not bring teaching aids in demonstrating teaching techniques at the school for teachers to see.

Recommendation

From the foregoing tests, analysis and interpretation of results and findings of research, the following recommendations are proffered:

1. That inspection exercise in primary schools should always be carried out with greater attention paid to schools that are not easily accessible since it is in these sub-urban areas that are where their services are mostly needed in the hinterland of the FCT.
2. Inspectors should make concerted efforts to carry out extension teaching demonstrations in FCT schools to help teachers improve upon their teaching skills.
3. Inspectors should extend their functions to all primary schools in the FCT, Abuja irrespective of their locations to give teachers equal opportunity to benefit from their services.
4. The responsibility for improving quality instructions rests with school inspectors and therefore the government must do all within its powers to increase their effort to give the inspectors all the needed encouragement, tools and training they deserve during the performance of their duties.

With all these recommendations implemented by the educational authorities in Nigeria, the quality and performance of the Nigerian primary school teacher will be well improved in the years ahead.

REFERENCES

- Adamu, U. A. (1998). "A Report of the Study on Public Experience Review" NPEC/World Bank Abuja (June, 1998), 7 pages.
- Adesina, S. (1981). "The Concepts, Prospects of NCE Programme in Nigeria", ASET 1 (1) 11 – 25.

- Aderounmu, B. C. (1985). *Introduction to Administration of schools in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Evans Brothers Limited.
- Ajayi, A. O. and Adamu, U. A. (1998). "Draft National Report on "Costs, Financing and Management of Primary Education in Nigeria" (NPEC/World Bank), Abuja, (June, 1998), 29 pages.
- Denga, D. I. (1986). *An Introduction to Foundation of Education*. Calabar: Rapid Education Publishers.
- Duru-Uremadu, C. E. (2005). "Teachers' Assessment of the Performance of Primary Education Inspectors in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja". An M. Ed. Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of M.Ed (Educational Administration and Planning) to the Department of Foundations, Arts and Social Science Education, Faculty of Education, University of Abuja, Abuja.
- Duru-Uremadu, C. E. (2016). "Teachers' assessment of the performance of primary education inspectors in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja", *Prime Research Journal on Education*. Vol. 5 (2). Pp 808 – 820, April xx, 2016.
- Edem, D. A. (2003). *Introduction to Educational Administration in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Eya, L. O. (2001). *Fundamental of Educational Administration*. Enugu: Chuka Educational Publishers.
- Ibiam, N. (2015). *Educational Administration: Principles and Practice*. Owerri: Cel-Bez Publishing Co. (Nig.) Limited.
- Kyte, G. C. (1980). *How to Supervise Organisations*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, Inc.
- Ndu, A. N. and Ocho, L. O. (1997). *Dynamics of Educational Administration and Management: The Nigerian Experience perspective*. Awka: Meks Publishers Ltd.
- Nwakafor, J. N. (1983). *Educational and Supervision*. Ibadan: HEB (Nig) Ltd.
- Newman, W. H. (1986). *Administrative Action* (Second Edition). London: Pitman.
- Nwaogu, J. I. (1980). *A Guide to Effective Supervision of Instruction in Nigerian School*. Enugu: Forth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Obadan, M. N. (1979). "Supervision: Its Role in Improving Falling Education Standards in Bendel State, Nigeria" *Education 1* (1) 95 – 11.
- Ogunu, M. A. (2001). *Introduction to Education Management*. Benin: Ambik press.
- Ogunsaju, S. (1988). *Educational Supervision: Perspective and Practices in Nigeria*. Ile-Ife: The University of Ile-Ife.
- Ogunsaju, S. (1983). *Secondary School Plant Planning Strategies for Future Development in Secondary Education in Nigeria*. Ile-Ife: University of Ife Press.
- Olele, C. (1995). "Inspection and Supervision in Education" in Peretomode, V. E. (ed) *Introduction to Administration, Planning and Supervision*. Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd.
- Ozigi, A. C. and Canham, C. E. (1979). *An Introduction to the Foundations of Education*. Ibadan: MacMillan Publishers Ltd.
- Robert, E. A. (1980). *Principles of Democratic Supervision*. New York; AMS Press Inc.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1979). *Supervision: Human Perspective*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Uremadu, C. E. (1999). Internship Report on "Local Education Authority, Gwagwalada", Abuja, July 27, 32 pages. In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Award of M.Ed (Educational Administration and Planning), University of Abuja.
- William, S. P. (1979). *Secondary Education and Community*. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Company, Inc.
- Wodumere, N. (2003). "Supervision of Teachers in Primary Schools: A Survey of Port Harcourt Local Government Area of Rivers State" M.Ed. Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Education, UNIPORT, Port Harcourt.
- Wolusoye, I. C. (2003). "Instructional Supervision in Kwara State" M. Ed. Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Education, University of Ilorin, Kwara State.
- Wonye, O. (2002). "Fundamental Beliefs and Attitudes of Rural Primary School Teachers on Inspection on Obubra LGA of Cross River State" M.Ed. Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of Calabar, Calabar.
- Yelshm, I. (2001). "Evaluation Study on the Performance of Primary School Inspectors" B.Ed. Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Education, Imo State University, Owerri.
- Zeph, M. (2002). "Some Inspectors and Teachers on Teacher Skill Development in Imo State", M.Ed Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Education, Imo State University, Owerri.