

AN ANALYSIS OF SUPERVISORS' VIEWS ABOUT SUPERVISION DURING PRACTICE TEACHING PROGRAMME (PTP) OF B.Ed. STUDENTS

(Waseem Ahmad, Junior Research Fellow, Faculty of Education (K), B.H.U., Varanasi-10, U.P., India,
E-mail: waseemahmad578@gmail.com)

Abstract

The purpose of present study is to find out supervisors' views about supervision during Practice Teaching Programme (PTP) of Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) students. The sample of the study comprised of 90 supervisors of Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) situated in Varanasi city. The quantitative data were collected through the supervisors' views sheet regarding the supervision. It consisted of closed ended questions. The findings were obtained in percentage. According to the results of the study, 80% supervisors viewed that they checked the lesson plans of all subject groups thoroughly. 58% supervisors viewed that they were satisfied with overall process of supervision of practice teaching, whereas 41.98% remained dissatisfied. 58% supervisors viewed that they were satisfied with simply putting signature on prepared lesson plans after merely a glance view during supervision of practice teaching, whereas 41.38% remained dissatisfied. The majority of the supervisors (about 72%) wrote comments for improvement of lesson plans with the help of subject teaching method expert of a pupil-teacher during Practice Teaching Programme (PTP). Only 19.30 pupil teachers are supervised per day by the supervisors in Banaras Hindu University (BHU) during PTP, but this number is largest among all the institutions under sample of the study.

Keywords: Supervisors' views, Supervision, Practice teaching, B.Ed. Students

Rationale of the Study

In 21st century, the biggest challenge in developing countries is requirement of good quality teachers in large numbers to meet the requirements of the growing educational sector due to population explosion. The quality of teachers depends upon the soundness of the teachers' training programmes. Many teacher training institutions have been opened in the developing countries around the world in the recent past owing to their significant role in the national development in these countries. There is no teacher education programme that can be said to be completed without an effective student practice teaching programme. Practice teaching is considered an important part of the whole process of teacher preparation during Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) course in teachers' training programmes.

In Indian context, many Teacher Training Institutions (TEIs) offering Teacher Education Programme (TEP) require their B.Ed. students to take part in teaching experiences in a school where they can interact with actual learners so that they can develop required skills for their classroom teaching later after completion of Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) program. This is the session that is usually known as 'practice teaching' or most popularly 'practicum' (Husen and Postlethwaite, 1985; Derrick and Dicks, 2005; Farrell, 2008). In other words it is also called 'induction' (Collinson et al., 2009) or internship, student teaching, field experiences, cooperative education, sandwich programme, clerkship, clinical practicum and the like depending and varying upon profession (Husen and Postlethwaite, 1985; Taneja, 2000). Generally, the duration of practice teaching programme is about 4 to 5 weeks during B.Ed. Course. University Education Commission (1948-49) recommended duration of at least 12 weeks of supervised school practice in one year course while

Education Commission (1964-66) suggested continuous teaching for a specific period of at least eight weeks under actual school condition by working as a teacher in a selected school. Each student-teacher has to teach at least two classes a day with all the preparation (till the completion of 40 lessons in which 20 in each subject) and he/she is expected to practice the skills learned in the classroom. The provision for the number of lessons varies from state to state or institute to institute all over India. As reported by Dubey (1981) the number of practice lessons in Maharashtra varied between thirty and forty, except Bombay University where it was twenty, and in Madhya Pradesh student teachers taught 30-35 lessons even if there was provision for forty lessons. In RIE'S of NCERT where two years B.Ed. programme has been introduced student teachers are to practice 80 lessons in teaching subjects, 40 being in each subject (RIE Bhubaneswar, 1999). The total number of lessons range is from 40-60 as reported by Singh (1982). The supervisors are assigned to supervise their performance and provide them feedback and sharpen their teaching skills. The final evaluation is carried out by an external examiner at the end of the practice teaching. According to Oslaitan and Agusiobo (1981), Kurian (1988), Bozko (1989) student teachers are observed, supervised and evaluated by teachers in the schools where they are placed and by the college or university supervisors. This gives each student a profile of achievements in various aspects of his/her practice.

However, in spite of its popularity and contributions, teaching practice as evidenced from the literature is problematic. Major complaints are focused on its method of supervision and its effectiveness (Stones and Morris, 1972; Bowman, 1979; Stones, 1987). William's (1963) observation (as cited Boydell, 1986) that teaching practice is, "still a major, highly valued component of teacher education continues to be valid, it is also true as opined by Wade (1975) that teaching practice" so traditionally accepted yet suffers so much from lack of a theoretical basis with which to support future developments or indeed justify present ones.

Some studies pertaining to supervision of practice teaching indicate that Pre-student teaching experiences provided to students by teacher training institutions were not sufficient in terms of skills and techniques of teaching required for classroom teaching (Raj, 1984); many teacher educators are not adequately qualified to supervise practice teaching in the subject in which they supervise the lesson as well as supervisors/examiners do not observe the lesson for adequate time (Mohan, 1980); Poor, uneven supervision and lack of preparation for supervisors (Price, 1989; Yarrow, 1992; Au Yeung et al., 1993); The supervisors do not observe the lessons completely and they rarely put detailed observation on lesson plan (Mohanty, 1984). Further he explained that, the practice teaching programmes (PTP) stressed the delivery of lessons only and other activities expected from a pupil teacher were neglected.

The ineffectiveness of teaching practice is not entirely the fault of supervisors. There are constraints of time, additional work load etc (Bowman, 1979; Bhargava, 2009; Mapfumo, Chitsiko and Chireshe, 2012). However, it is necessary to identify these barriers through systematic analysis more especially in this environment so as to prefer suggestions for improvement of teaching practice operations and effectiveness. This is the focus of this study. The earlier research findings indicate that while practice teaching is broadly accepted as a valuable and successful component of teacher education, it has a number of shortcomings. However, none of the studies focused on the supervisors' views towards supervision while performing the act of supervision of lessons in the real classroom situation during practice teaching programme of B.Ed. students. Therefore, the present study attempted to find answers to the following questions:

- i. What are the supervisors' views regarding thorough checking of lesson plans of all subject groups and in their own subject group only, during PTP?

- ii. What is the supervisors' view about simply putting signature on prepared lesson plans in all subjects?
- iii. What is the supervisors' view about supervision of transaction style of pupil teachers in all subject groups and in their own subject groups only?
- iv. What is the average number of pupil-teachers supervised per day by the supervisor?

Definition of Key Terms Used

Supervisor: In the present study, supervisor means the person appointed to supervise the pupil teacher's delivering their lesson plans in practice teaching programme of the B.Ed. students of the Teacher Education Departments under three universities viz. Banaras Hindu University (B.H.U.), Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapith (MGKVP) and Sampurnanad Sanskrit University (SSU) in Varanasi city, during session 2011-12.

Supervisors' views: Supervisors' view here refers to whether they check thoroughly lesson plans of all subjects or in their own subject groups only, or whether they supervise transaction style of pupil teachers of all subject or only their own subject group, or whether they put signature simply/formally on prepared lesson plans or write down comments for improvement of lesson plans with the help of subject teaching method expert during practice teaching programme of the B.Ed. students.

Supervision: Although the entire set of roles of the supervisor in regard to the practice teaching programme is usually termed as "supervision", yet in this study the termed supervision defined as the observation and evaluation of lesson plans in real classroom teaching of pupil teacher's during teaching practice.

Practice Teaching Programme (PTP): Practice teaching is a part of the whole process of teacher's preparation during Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) course/programme in which pupil-teachers go to school and teach their lesson plan in real classroom setting within the duration 4 weeks to 5 weeks.

B.Ed. Student: For the purpose of the present study B.Ed. student means the students who were doing Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) course from the Teacher Education Departments under three universities (B.H.U., MGKVP and SSU) in Varanasi city and have participated in practice teaching programme (PTP) during session 2011-12.

Objectives of the study

1. To study the supervisors' views regarding their own status of supervision during PTP with reference to
 - 1.1 Thorough checking of lesson plans
 - 1.2 Simply putting signature on prepared lesson plans
 - 1.3 Transactional style of pupil teachers
2. To find out the average number of pupil-teachers supervised per day by the Supervisor during practice teaching.

Methodology

Survey research method was used to achieve the objectives of the study. Data was analysed through questionnaire in order to elicit the view of supervisors about supervision of different

dimensions of practice teaching of B.Ed. students focusing on the lesson plan delivering content when pupil teachers teaching in real classroom setting.

Population and Sample

The population of the present study consisted of all the Supervisors appointed for supervision in the practice teaching programme of Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) students in all Teacher Education Departments under umbrella of different universities in Varanasi city during session 2011-12.

The sample of the present study consisted of 90 respondents (B.H.U., 46; MGKVP, 11; and SSU, 33) in total, in which 67 male and 23 female supervisors were selected from Teacher Education Departments of three universities (B.H.U., MGKVP & SSU) in Varanasi city during session 2011-12 and purposive sampling method was used for the selection of the supervisors.

Tools used in the study

According to above mentioned objectives of the study a "Supervisor views Sheet" as a tool developed by researcher to obtain/collect the supervisors' view which is involved in PTP during session 2011-12. There were 10 items in this sheet which were concerned about PTP.

Statistical techniques used in the study

As per objective Percentage statistical techniques were used in the present study.

Analysis and Interpretation

Objective-1: The first objective of the study was to study the supervisors' views regarding their own status of supervision during PTP with reference to thorough checking of lesson plans of all subject groups during PTP. In response to this objective, 80.43% in BHU, 90.90% in MGKVP and 75.76% in SSU the supervisors responded that they checked thorough lesson plans of all subject groups during supervision of practice teaching in practising school. Their responses and percentage are given below in table-1.

Table -1: Thorough checking of lesson plan of all subject groups

Sl. No.	Institutions	No. of Supervisors	Responses and Percentage*	
			Yes	No
1.	BHU	46	37 (80.43)	09 (19.57)
2.	MGKVP	11	10 (90.90)	01 (09.10)
3.	SSU	33	25 (75.76)	08 (24.24)
	Total	90	72 (80.00)	18 (20.00)

*Percentage has been given in Parenthesis

As shown in table-1, overall 80% supervisors are acknowledge that they checked the lesson plan thoroughly of all subject groups during supervision of practice teaching. It clearly shows that the majority of supervisors were in habit of checking the lesson plan thoroughly of all subject groups.

In item No. 2 the supervisors were further asked do they check lesson plan thoroughly in their own subject teaching group only. Their responses and percentage are represented in table-1(a)

Table -1(a): Thorough checking of lesson plan in their own subject teaching group only

Sl. No.	Institutions	No. of Supervisors	Responses and Percentage*	
			Yes	No
1.	BHU	46	14 (30.43)	32 (69.57)
2.	MGKVP	11	04(36.36)	07 (63.64)
3.	SSU	33	10 (30.30)	23 (69.70)
	Total	90	28 (31.11)	62 (68.89)

*Percentage has been given in Parenthesis

From the table No. 1(a), it is seen that only 30.43% in BHU, 36.36% in MGKVP and 30.30% in SSU the supervisors responded that they checked thorough lesson plan only their own subject teaching groups. The above table clearly indicate that more than 68% supervisors did not check thoroughly lesson plan only their own subject teaching groups. It means very few supervisors checked lesson plan thoroughly only their own subject teaching group.

Objective 1.2: The objective 1.2 of present study purported to study the supervisors' views about putting signature on prepared lesson plans in all subjects. The results related to this objective are presented in the following table.

Table -1.2: Simply putting signature on prepared lesson plans in all subjects

Sl. No.	Institutions	No. of Supervisors	Responses and Percentage*	
			Yes	No
1.	BHU	46	15 (32.61)	31 (67.39)
2.	MGKVP	11	05 (45.45)	06 (54.55)
3.	SSU	33	09 (27.27)	24 (72.73)
	Total	90	29 (32.22)	61 (67.78)

*Percentage has been given in Parenthesis.

The above table reveals that 32.61% in BHU, 45.45% in MGKVP and 27.27% in SSU the supervisors responded that they put signature simply/formally on prepared lesson plans of all subjects. From these figures it appears that out of 90 only 29 (32.22%) supervisor said that they put signature simply whereas remains 67.78% supervisors did not put signature simply on prepared lesson plans of all subjects. It means majority of supervisors put signature on prepared lesson plans after checking the lesson plans of a pupil teacher.

The supervisors who responded to the above item in positive were further asked were you satisfied with the glance view of lesson plans signed by you. The responses and percentage are shown here in table - 1.2(a).

Table -1.2(a): Satisfaction of supervisors putting signature on prepared lesson plan at a glance view of lesson plan

Sl. No.	Institutions	No. of Supervisors	Responses and Percentage*	
			Yes	No
1.	BHU	15	09 (60.00)	06 (40.00)
2.	MGKVP	05	03 (60.00)	02 (40.00)
3.	SSU	09	05 (55.56)	04 (44.44)
	Total	29	17 (58.62)	12 (41.38)

*Percentage has been given in Parenthesis.

From the analysis of the above table, it appears that the percentage of all the three institutions normally varies from 55.56% to 60%. It means more than 58% supervisor viewed they were satisfied with simply putting signature on prepared lesson plan at a glance view of lesson plan during supervision of practice teaching whereas 41.38% remained dissatisfied.

The supervisors who responded to the above item in negative were further asked did you write comments for improvement of lesson plans with help of subject teaching method expert. The responses and percentage are given below in table - 1.2(b).

Table -1.2(b): Written comments for improvement of lesson plans with help of subject teaching method expert

Sl. No.	Institutions	No. of Supervisors	Responses and Percentage*	
			Yes	No
1.	BHU	31	24 (77.42)	07 (22.58)
2.	MGKVP	06	06 (100.00)	00 (0)
3.	SSU	24	14 (58.33)	10 (41.67)
	Total	61	44 (72.13)	17 (27.87)

*Percentage has been given in Parenthesis.

The above table shows that all the supervisors of MGKVP who responded negative on simply putting signature on prepared lesson plan, say that they write comments of student teacher for improvement of lesson plans with the help of subject teaching method expert. While the percentage of BHU and SSU supervisors were 77.42 and 58.33% respectively. It clearly indicates that very few supervisors (about 27%) did not write comments for improvement of lesson plans with the help of subject teaching method expert of a pupil-teacher during practice teaching.

Objective-1.3: The objective 1.3 of this study aimed at studying the supervision of transaction style of pupil teachers of all subject groups. The result related to this objective, responses and percentage are shown here in table - 1.3.

Table -1.3: Supervision of transaction style of pupil-teachers of all subject groups

Sl. No.	Institutions	No. of Supervisors	Responses and Percentage*	
			Yes	No
1.	BHU	46	44 (95.65)	02 (04.35)
2.	MGKVP	11	08 (72.73)	03 (27.27)
3.	SSU	33	29 (87.88)	04 (12.12)
	Total	90	81 (90.00)	09 (10.00)

*Percentage has been given in Parenthesis

The results in above table reveal that more than 95% supervisors of B.H.U. are supervising transaction style of pupil teachers of all subject groups while the percentage of other institutions normally varies from 72.73% to 87.88%. It is clearly indicated that in all the three institutions most of the supervisors observing transaction style of pupil-teachers of all subject groups.

The supervisors who responded to the above item in positive were further asked are you satisfied with the overall process of supervision. The responses and percentage are given below in table - 1.3(a).

Table -1.3(a): Satisfaction of overall process of supervision in teaching practice

Sl. No.	Institutions	No. of Supervisors	Responses and Percentage*	
			Yes	No
1.	BHU	44	23 (52.27)	21 (47.73)
2.	MGKVP	08	06 (75.00)	02 (25.00)
3.	SSU	29	18 (62.07)	11 (37.43)
	Total	81	47 (58.02)	34 (41.98)

*Percentage has been given in Parenthesis

The above table shows that the percentage of all the three institutions normally varies from 52.27% to 75%. It means more than 58% supervisor say they were satisfied with overall process of supervision of practice teaching whereas 41.98% remained dissatisfied.

In response to item No. 8, the objective 1.3 of this study was to study the supervision of transaction style of pupil teachers of only their own subject group. For achieving this objective the related responses and percentage are shown here in table -1.3.1

Table -1.3.1: Supervision of transaction style of pupil-teachers of only their own subject teaching groups

Sl. No.	Institutions	No. of Supervisors	Responses and Percentage*	
			Yes	No
1.	BHU	46	17 (36.96)	29 (63.04)
2.	MGKVP	11	04 (36.36)	07 (63.64)
3.	SSU	33	13 (39.39)	20 (60.61)
	Total	90	34 (37.78)	56 (62.22)

*Percentage has been given in Parenthesis

From the analysis of above table, it is found that 36.96% in BHU, 36.36% in MGKVP and 39.39% in SSU supervisors are supervised transaction style of pupil teachers of only their own subject teaching group. While overall 62% supervisors did not supervise transaction style of pupil teachers of only their own subject teaching group. It means the majority of supervisors were in habit of supervision of transaction style of pupil teacher of all subject groups.

Objective-2: The second objective of study aimed at to find out the average number of pupil-teachers is supervised per day by the supervisor in practice teaching. The obtained related data revealed that in B.H.U. approximately (19.30) average pupil teachers are supervised per day by supervisors. While in MGKVP and SSU on an average 15.45 and 16.90 respectively pupil teachers are supervised per day by the supervisors. The finding is clearly indicated that the large numbers of pupil teachers are supervised per day by the supervisor in B.H.U. in comparison of SSU and MGKVP.

Findings and Discussion

The analysis and interpretation of the data in the above section clearly reveal the major findings of the study are as follows:

- Result shows that 80% supervisors checked lesson plans thoroughly of all subject groups during practice teaching in practising school. This finding confirms the finding of Rosemary, Richard and Ngara (2013), who also reported that thorough checking of documents rendered teaching practice supervision of good quality.
- With reference to objective 1.1 it was found that very few supervisors (out of 90 supervisors only 28 of them) checked lesson plan thoroughly in their own subject teaching group only. The reason may be that lack of preparation for supervision (Price, 1989; Yarrow, 1992; and Au Yeung et. al., 1993) or supervisors may not be trained properly for supervision work (Mohan, 1980).
- With reference to objective 1.2 it was found that out of 90 supervisors only 29 of them (32.22%) supervisor simply putting signature on prepared lesson plans of all subjects. In which 58% supervisor viewed they were satisfied with simply putting signature on prepared lesson plan at a glance view of lesson plan during supervision of practice teaching. There may be several reasons for this. For example as rightly said by Mohanty (1984) supervisors do not observe the lesson plan completely and they rarely put detailed observation on lesson plan. Similarly the observation of Gautam (2010) that supervisor just sat in the class and disappeared after few minutes without giving any comments or feedback. In addition, it was found that 27% supervisors did not write comments for improvement of lesson plans with the help of subject teaching method expert of a pupil-teacher during practice teaching.
- In all three universities it was found that most of the supervisors observing transaction style of pupil-teachers of all subject groups and more than 58% supervisors are satisfied with overall process of supervision.
- Also, an important finding of the study is that large numbers of pupil teachers (average 19.30) are supervised per day by supervisors in B.H.U. while lesser number on an average 15.45 pupil teachers are supervised per day by supervisors in MGKVP. The reason may be that the number of student teachers allotted per supervisor is so large. Gautam (2010) rightly said that due to large number of students in teacher training

course, one supervisor had to observe many student teachers in schools located in different places. Therefore, the supervisor pupil teachers ratio should be 1:5 (According to Srivastava, 1969 it should be 1:10), but in no case it should go beyond 1:10. Otherwise proper guidance and supervision in practice teaching is not possible.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Practice teaching is considered to be the most significant part of a programme of teacher education. The success of such a programme depends very much on how effectively the student teacher has been guided and supervised in executing the essential functions of the teacher i.e. classroom teaching. The present study reveals that the very large average numbers of pupil teachers are supervised per day by supervisor was found. The supervisors do not check lesson plan thoroughly and put signature on prepared lesson plan without given any remarks. A large numbers of supervisors' dissatisfied process of supervision. So a number of recommendations can be drawn from the finding of this study.

1. It is very much needed to train and educate the teacher educators regarding supervision of PTP so that their supervision is more beneficial for a pupil teacher.
2. There is need for schools and colleges co-operating teachers to support the supervisors so that they can check lesson plans thoroughly.
3. At least a subject teaching method expert should be appointed each and every school where practice teaching is going on. So that they can check lesson plan thoroughly their own subject.
4. Supervisors should not just focus on number of observing pupil teachers but should devote ample time in supervising the practice lessons of each pupil teacher in details. This recommendation is also supported by University Education Commission (1948-49) that suggested whatever is observed may be observed in detail.
5. There is need for a policy on how effectively the student teacher has to be guided and supervised without compromising the quality of training.
6. If possible, some financial incentives should be provided to supervisors so that they can take interest in practice teaching. This recommendation on higher allowances is in line with Gove's (2011) drive to offer financial incentives to make teacher training attractive.
7. Orientation of the supervisors should be organised before the practice teaching. On improving supervision procedures, refresher training/seminars/workshops and conferences on practice teaching (PT) should be organized from time to time and supervisors should be encouraged to attend these programmes because its provide new technique for effective supervision of PT.

Thus it is hope of the researcher that if the recommendations mentioned above are critically examined and put into usage, it will go a long way to ensure improved and effective supervision of practice teaching in practising schools.

References

1. Au Yeung, Y. N., Lai, C. C., Ho, W. F., Silvan, A., Gow, L., & Ledesma, J. (1993). Attitude towards industrial training in the B.Eng. course in building services engineering at Hongkong Polytechnique. *Studies in Higher Education*, 18(2), 205-226.

2. Bhargava, A. (2009). Teaching practice for student teachers of B.Ed. programme: Issues, predicaments and suggestions. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 10 (2), article 3, retrieved from tojde.anadol.edu.tr/tojde34/articles/article_3.html.
3. Bowman, N. (1979). College supervision of student teaching: A time to reconsider. ***Journal of Teacher Education***, XXX (3), 29-30.
4. Boydell, D. (1986). Issues in teaching practice supervision research: A review of the literature. ***Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education***, 2(2), 115-125.
5. Bozko, H. (1989). Expert-novice differences in teaching: A cognitive analysis and implications for teacher education. ***Journal of Teacher Education***, XXX, 36-40.
6. Collinson, V. et al. (2009). Professional development for teachers: A world of change. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. 32(1), 3-19. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02619760802553022>.
7. Derrick, J., & Dicks, J. (2005). **Teaching practice and mentoring: The key to effective literacy, language and numeracy teacher training**. Leicester: NIACE.
8. Dubey, T.B. (1981). **A comparative study of secondary teacher education in Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra**. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Sagar University.
9. Farrell, T.S.C. (2008). Here is the book, go and teach: ELT practicum support. ***RELCJ***, 39, 226-241.
10. Gautam, G. R. (2010). Practice/student teaching in I.Ed. and B.Ed.: A learning experience or a meaningless ritual?. Retrieved from [http://neltachoutari.wordpress.com/2010/09/04/practice-teaching-a-reflecting/retrieved on 6.05.11](http://neltachoutari.wordpress.com/2010/09/04/practice-teaching-a-reflecting/retrieved%20on%206.05.11).
11. Gove, M. (2011). Training our next generation of outstanding teachers: An improvement strategy for discussion. Retrieved from <http://www.media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/w/wri>.
12. Husen, T., & Postlethwaite, T. N. (1985). **The international encyclopaedia of education**. Vol. 8. pp. 4921-4929. Oxford: Pergamon
13. Kurian, G. T. (1988). **World education encyclopedia**, VIII, U.S.A.
14. Mapfumo, J. S., Chitsiko, N., & Chireshe, R. (2012). Teaching practice generated stressors and coping mechanisms among student teachers in Zimbabwe. ***South African Journal of education***, 32, 155-166.
15. Mohan, K. (1980). **Effectiveness of teacher training programme**. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Edu., Awadh University.
16. Mohanty, S. B. (1984). **A study of student teaching programme in college of education with special reference to innovations**. Ph.D. Dissertation in Edu., MSU.
17. Oslaitan, S.O., & Agusiobo, N. O. (1981). **Principles of practice teaching**. New York: Wiley.
18. Price, D. A. (1987). The Practicum and its supervision. In K. J. Eltis (Ed.), **Australian Teacher Education Review**. South Pacific Association for Teacher Education Inc.
19. Raj, T. (1984). **A study of the organization and administration of student teaching programme in the secondary institutions**. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation in Education, Agra University, Agra.
20. **Report of the University Education Commission (1948-49)**. Govt. of India, New Delhi.
21. **Report of the Education Commission (1964-66)**. Government of India, New Delhi: Ministry of Education.
22. **RIE Bhubneshwar. (1999). Two year B.Ed. (Secondary) course (regulations and scheme of studies, 1999)**.

23. Rosemary, N., Richard, N., & Ngara, R. (2013). Teaching practice supervision and assessment as a quality assurance tool in teacher training: Perceptions of prospective teachers at Masvingo teacher training colleges. **European Social Sciences Research Journal**, 1(1), 126-135.
24. Singh, L.C. et al. (1982). **Third national survey of secondary secondary in India**. New Delhi: NCERT.
25. Srivastava, K. P. (1969). **A critical study of the organization and supervision of student teaching programme in Saran district of Bihar**, Unpublished Dissertation in Education, New Delhi: NCERT.
26. Stone, E. (1987). Teaching practice supervision: Bridge between theory and practice. **European Journal of Teacher Education**, 10(1), 67-79.
27. Stones, E., & Morris, S. (1972). **Teaching practice: Problems and perspectives**. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
28. Taneja, R. P. (2000). **Encyclopedia of comparative education**. New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.,
29. **University Education Commission** (1948-49). Govt. of India, New Delhi.
30. Wade, B. (1975). Initial teacher education and school experience. **Educational Review**, Vol. 29, 58-66.
31. Yarrow, A. (Ed.). (1992). **Teaching role of supervision in the practicum: Cross-faculty perspective**. Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.