dropouts include a significant number of children with special needs (CWSN).They have to be facilitated compulsory primary education. It is a social as well as individual need.

Earlier there was provision of special schools for CWSN. But now the scenario has changed completely. According to Peters (2004) children in special schools were seen as geographically and socially segregated from their peers, and the initial movement to locationally integrate these students in mainstream schools (integration) shifted to one where the whole school was encouraged to become more adaptable and inclusive in its day-to-day educational practices for all students (inclusive education). Pedagogy in particular was highlighted as the key to meeting all students' educational needs by making the curriculum flexible, and so more accessible. By recognising that teaching methods which can make curriculum accessible to children with disabilities can also make learning accessible to all students (Ainscow, 1991; 2005), a teacher or school principal is well on the way to improve the overall quality of their school. In this way, inclusive education is not a disability-only issue, but an educational quality issue.

A centralized system of educational management does not respond to the educational needs of the people at the local level. The strategies of educational management followed over the years may fail to attract children to schools. Therefore, decentralization is advocated to make the delivery of educational programmes more effective. The capability expansion approach also argues that development of human capabilities requires decentralized administration to enjoy the confidence and support of the great majority of the people (Griffin and Knight, 1990). Keeping in view importance of decentralized management of education, national flagship program of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) committed to provide education to all through district based, decentralized special planning and implementation.

The 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments in 1993 have enabled decentralized governance through the creation of a third tier of micro- legislators or elected bodies (Gram Panchayat) at village level. Village education committees are an important part of Panchayati Raj Institutions to take care of educational issues for rural population. But still rural educational status of Uttar Pradesh (U.P.) particularly Varanasi district is suffering from several problems like gender disparities, high drop outs, low enrolment, poor quality education, miserable school buildings and facilities etc. After a glimpse of whole issue the following question emerged: What type of programmes are run by Village Education Committees (VECs) for increasing the enrolment & retention of Children with Special Needs (CWSN)? Hence, to find answer of this question the present study was undertaken.

Operational Definition of Technical Terms Used

Village Education Committee (VEC): VEC is a committee of head of Gram Panchayat, three parents of children enrolled in primary school which includes one woman of the village (nominated by Block Education Officer) and Senior Headmaster of Basic School.

Inclusion: It refers to educating Children with Special Needs (CWSN) with normal children in general school.

Children with Special Needs (CWSN) are those who differ from normal children in their physical, mental and social needs and require some extra care and resources for development and adjustment to life.This will include the following categories of children:

    (i)   Visually impaired (VI)

(ii)   Hearing impaired (HI)

(iii)   Orthopaedically handicapped (OH)

(iv)   Mentally retarded (MR)

Varanasi: It is a district in Eastern Uttar Pradesh in India.

Objective of the study

The main objective of the study was, "To study the programmes run by Village Education Committees (VECs) in increasing the enrolment and retention of Children with Special Needs (CWSN)".

Method of the Study

The details of the population, sample and the tool have been given below:

Method- Descriptive survey method was used in this study.

Population- All Village Education Committee (VEC) members of Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh were constitute the population of this study.

Sample - It was consisted of VECs in 3 purposively selected villages from each block of Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh.

Selection of Respondents: The sample of respondents was drawn from VEC members. The list of primary schools (Villages) was obtained from the officials of Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh. All 120 VEC members were responded on Awareness Measurement Scale.

Tool: The researcher used self-developed 'Questionnaire' to study the programmes run by Village Education Committees (VECs) in increasing the enrolment and retention of Children with Special Needs (CWSN). The questionnaire consists of questions related to different assigned roles of VECs in inclusion of children with special needs in education. It has following two parts:

Part I: Primary Information: Its first section is concerned with information related to Block/Gram Sabha. Questions regarding Name of Block, Nyaya Panchayat, Gram Panchayat, Gram, distance of village from Block, Tehsil and District head quarter have been asked. In Second Section information regarding Name, status in the VEC, gender, age, educational qualification and experience have been asked.

Part II: This part deals with the awareness of VEC members (Question Number 1 to 7), enrolment and retention of children with special needs (Question Number 8 to 15), facilities for children with special needs (Question Number 16 to 36) and constraints faced by VEC members in inclusion of children with special needs (Open question). This part consists of 36 closed ended questions and one open ended question.

Data Analysis

The data obtained on Questionnaire was analysed by using frequencies and percentages.

The programmes run by village education committees in increasing the enrolment & retention of children with special needs

The objective of this study was, 'to study the programmes run by Village Education Committees (VECs) in increasing the enrolment & retention of children with special needs (CWSN)'. The data in this respect were reported with frequency (f) and percent (%) and the results are given in Tables 1to 8.

Table 1: Disability wise identification of CWSN

Item No.	Item Area	Response Type	Frequency (%)
		Yes	106 (88.33)
1.	Disability wise identification of CWSN	July, House Hold Survey	15 (12.50)
		July-August during child census	15 (12.50)
		July	15 (12.50)
		July to September	15 (12.50)
		1 August to 15 August	10 (8.33)
		During child census	5 (4.17)
		First week of July during child census	5 (4.17)
		June and July	2 (1.67)
		No specific response	24 (23.33)
		No	14 (11.67)

Interpretation

The table 1 indicates the findings related to disability wise identification of CWSN. 88.33% VEC members reported 'Yes'. On further analysis eight types of responses were found -(a) 12.50% said house hold survey is heldin July, (b) Another 12.50% said in July-August during child census, (c) 12.50% reported identification of CWSN is held disability wise in July, (d) 12.50% said identification of CWSN disability wise in July to September, (e) 8.33% said identification of CWSN disability wise from 1 August to 15 August, (f) 4.17% said during child census, (g) 4.17% said first week of July during child census and(h) 1.67% reported identification of CWSN disability wise in June and July. 23.33% VEC members gave no specific response. Only 11.67% VEC members reported 'No'.

Table 2: Organization of Medical Camp for identification and assessment of CWSN

Item No.	Item Area	Response Type	Frequency (%)
		Yes	95 (79.17)
2.	Organization of Medical Camp for identification and assessment of CWSN	At BRC	41 (34.17)
		July , Kasturba Vidyalaya Shivpur	9 (7.50)
		September, In School	6 (5)
		In School and Kasturba Vidyalaya Shivpur	6 (5)
		August-September at BRC	5 (4.17)
		At Block Level, Shivpur	2 (1.67)
		August, BRC Kachnar	2 (1.67)
		Once in a year	2 (1.67)
		In every four months	2 (1.67)
		Block and District Headquarter	2 (1.67)
		August, BRC	2 (1.67)
		No specific response	16 (13.33)
		No	25 (20.83)

Interpretation:

The table 2 reports the findings related to organization of Medical Camp for identification and assessment of CWSN by VECs. 79.17% VEC members reported 'Yes'. On further analysis eleven types of responses were found -(a) 34.17% said medical camps are organized for identification and assessment of CWSN at BRC, (b) 7.50% said in July at Kasturba Vidyalaya Shivpur, (c) 5% said medical camps are organized for identification and assessment of CWSN in September at school, (d) 5% said in school and Kasturba Vidyalaya Shivpur, (e) 4.17% said in August-September at BRC, (f) 1.67% said at Block level, Shivpur, (g) 1.67% said medical camps are organized for identification and assessment of CWSN in August at BRC Kachnar, (h) 1.67% said once in a year, (i) 1.67% said in every four months, (j) 1.67% said at Block and District Headquarter and (k) 1.67% reported medical camps are organized for identification and assessment of CWSN in August at BRC. 13.33% VEC members gave no specific response. 20.83% VEC members reported 'No'.

Table 3: Organization of discussion on house hold survey by VEC for enrolment of CWSN

Item No.	Item Area	Response Type	Frequency (%)
		Yes	104 (86.67)
3.	Organization of discussion on house hold survey by VEC for enrolment of CWSN	July-August	20 (16.67)
		First week of July, House Hold Survey	15 (12.50)
		July, On the basis of child census, enrolment and presence	15 (12.50)
		1 July to 31 July	10 (8.33)
		July, Information to BRC about CWSN	4 (3.33)
		Meeting in school	4 (3.33)
		July, Rally	2 (1.67)
		Door to door survey	2 (1.67)
		July, Prabhat Pheri by Primary Schools	2 (1.67)
		June and July, Comprehensive strategy for welfare of CWSN	2 (1.67)
		No specific response	28 (23.33)
		No	16 (13.33)

Interpretation

The table 3 indicates the findings related to organization of discussion on house hold survey by VEC for enrolment of CWSN. 86.67% VEC members reported 'Yes'. On further analysis ten types of responses were found -(a)16.67% said in July-August, (b) 12.50% said in first week of July during house hold survey, (c)12.50% said in July on the basis of child census, enrolment and presence, (d) 8.33% said 1 July to 31 July, (e) 3.33% said in July information is given to BRC about CWSN, (f) 3.33% said meeting in school, (g) 1.67% said in July during rally, (h) 1.67% said during door to door survey, (i) 1.67% said in July during Prabhat Pheri by primary schools and (j) 1.67% said in June and July a comprehensive strategy is adapted for welfare of CWSN. 23.33% VEC members gave no specific response. 13.33% VEC members reported 'No'.

Table 4: Efforts of VECs for enrolment of CWSN through 'School Chalo Abhiyan'

Item No.	Item Area	Response Type	Frequency (%)
4.	Efforts of VECs for enrolment of CWSN through 'School Chalo Abhiyan'	Yes	108 (90)
		No	12 (10)

Interpretation:

The table 4 indicates the findings related to efforts of VECs for enrolment of CWSN through 'School Chalo Abhiyan'. 90% VEC members reported 'Yes'. 12% VEC members reported 'No'.

Table 5: The determination in VEC meeting for 100% enrolment of CWSN between ages of 6 to 14 years.

Item No.	Item Area	Response Type	Frequency (%)
5.	The determination in VEC meeting for 100% enrolment of CWSN between ages of 6 to 14 years	Yes	106 (88.33)
		No	14 (11.67)

Interpretation:

The table 5 indicates the findings related to determination in VEC meeting for 100% enrolment of CWSN between ages of 6 to 14 years. 88.33% VEC members reported 'Yes'. 11.67% VEC members reported 'No'.

Table 6: Efforts by VECs to ensure regular presence of CWSN in school

Item No.	Item Area	Response Type	Frequency (%)
		Yes	108 (90)
6.	Efforts by VECs to ensure regular presence of CWSN in school	Parents of CWSN are motivated to send their children to school	20 (16.67)
		Motivating children to go school through parent teacher meeting	15 (12.50)
		Parent teacher meeting	14 (11.67)
		By MTA and PTA meeting	6 (5)
		Knowledge about CWSN by contact with parents	6 (5)
		VEC members go home of CWSN, Meena Manch for Girls	5 (4.17)
		Parents are advised to send their CWSN school	2 (1.67)

Education, Health and Economic aid to CWSN at Panchayat Level by government	2 (1.67)
At Panchayat Level enquiry of CWSN's condition and education by VEC members	2 (1.67)
Motivating the parents of CWSN	2 (1.67)
No specific response	34 (28.33)
No	12 (10)

Interpretation

The table 6 indicates the findings related to efforts of VECs in ensuring regular presence of CWSN in school. 90% VEC members reported 'Yes'. On further analysis ten types of responses were found -(a)16.67% saidparents of CWSN are motivated to send their children in school, (b) 12.50% said by motivating children to go school through parent teacher meeting, (c)11.67% said by parent teacher meeting, (d) 5% said by Mother Teacher Association and Parent Teacher Association meeting, (e) 5% said knowledge about CWSN by contact with parents, (f) 4.17% said VEC members go home of CWSN and Meena Manch is organized for girls, (g) 1.67% said parents are advised to send their CWSN in school, (h) 1.67% said education, health and economic aid to CWSN at panchayat level by government, (i) 1.67% said at panchayat level enquiry of CWSN's condition and education by VEC members and (j) 1.67% said by motivating the parents of CWSN. 28.33% VEC members gave no specific response. 10% VEC members reported 'No'.

Table 7: Efforts by VECs for retention of CWSN in school

Item No.	Item Area	Response Type	Frequency (%)
		Yes	82 (68.33)
7.	Efforts by VECs for retention of CWSN in school	Mid Day Meal	22 (18.33)
		By providing facilities to CWSN in school	15 (12.50)
		Mid Day Meal, Book and dress distribution	15 (12.50)
		By extra teaching work	5 (4.17)
		Mid Day Meal, Motivation	5 (4.17)
		Mid Day Meal, Books and by motivating CWSN	2 (1.67)
		By giving resources	2 (1.67)
		By giving Government Books and scholarship	2 (1.67)
		No specific response	14 (11.67)
		No	38 (31.67)

Interpretation

The table 7 indicates the findings related to efforts of VECs for retention of CWSN in school.

68.33% VEC members reported 'Yes'. On further analysis eight types of responses were found - (a)18.33% said retention of CWSN in school by Mid Day Meal, (b) 12.50% said by providing facilities to CWSN in school, (c)12.50% said by Mid Day Meal, book and dress distribution, (d) 4.17% said retention of CWSN in school by extra teaching work, (e) 4.17% said by Mid Day Meal and Motivation, (f) 1.67% said by Mid Day Meal, books and by motivating CWSN, (g) 1.67% said retention of CWSN in school by giving resources and (h) 1.67% said retention of CWSN in school by giving government books and scholarship. 11.67% VEC members gave no specific response. 31.67% VEC members reported 'No'.

Table 8 : Organization of discussion to promote and new admission of CWSN by VEC

Item No.	Item Area	Response Type	Frequency (%)
8.	Organization of discussion to promote and new admission of CWSN by VEC	Yes	100 (83.33)
		No	20 (16.67)

Interpretation:

The table 8 above indicates the findings related to organization of discussion to promote and new admission of CWSN by VEC.83.33% VEC members reported 'Yes'. 16.67% VEC members reported 'No'.

Discussion

The findings related to study the programmes run by Village Education Committees (VECs) in increasing the enrolment & retention of children with special needs (CWSN) show that VEC members are working properly in identification of CWSN disability wise, identification and assessment of CWSN in medical camp, in discussion on house hold survey for enrolment of CWSN, in enrolment of CWSN through 'School Chalo Abhiyan', efforts for regular presence and retention of CWSN in school and discussion for new admission of CWSN. Finding of this study is corroborated with findings of research conducted by many including Soni (2004) which reported that unfortunately, Village Education Committees have not taken any step towards the education of disabled children in the selected schools. Alur & Timmons (2004) argued that the real challenge facing India is that ninety-eight percent of children and adults with disabilities receive no service at all. Dvivedi and Tripathi (2007) reported that the participation of village education committee, gram pradhan are more inclined towards factors like scholarship etc. than the education of their children.Mala (2004) reported that the number of students enrolled in primary schools of rural area is less than the number of enrolment of students in primary schools of urban area, which means that environment affects directly on the enrolment of students.

Conclusion

The study reflected that for enrolment and retention of CWSN, VEC members in Varanasi district are working properly for disability wise identification of CWSN, identification and assessment of CWSN in medical camps, for discussion on house hold survey for enrolment of CWSN, for enrolment of CWSN through school going campaign i.e. 'School Chalo Abhiyan', efforts for regular presence and retention of CWSN in school and discussion for new admission of CWSN.

References :

1. Ainscow, M. (Ed.). (1991). **Effective School for All**. London: David Fulton Publishers.

2. Ainscow, M. (2005). **From Special Education to Effective Schools for All, Keynote presentation at the Inclusive and Supportive Education Congress 2005,** University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.

3. Alur, M., & Timmons, V. (2004). Transformational Learning: A Description of How Inclusionary Practice was accepted in India**. International Journal of Special Education,** 19(1).

4. Dvivedi, R. & Tripathi, A. (2007). Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan Aur Shiksha Ki Gunvatta, **Paripekshya**, Varsa 14, Ank 2.

5. Govinda, R. & Varghese, N.V. (1993). **Quality of Primary Schooling in India- A Case Study of Madhya Pradesh**. New Delhi: National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA).

6. Mala, D.R. (2004). An Analytical Study of the Problem of Enrolment and Retention in School. Unpublished Report, Government Education College Bilaspur (Institute of Advanced study In Education), Research Abstracts: Chhattisgarh State Project Office, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, Chhattisgarha available at **http://cg.nic.in/schooleducation/ravijgandhi/web/research-abstracts.pdf.**

7. Mehta, A.C. (2006). **ElementaryEducation in India: Progress Towards UEE Analytical Report 2004-05** New Delhi: NIEPA and Department of Elementary Education and Literacy MHRD.

8. **National Curriculum Framework- 2005**, New Delhi: NCERT

9. Peters, S. (2004). **Inclusive Education: An EFA Strategy for All Children**, Washington DC: World Bank

10. **Sahyog: Gram Shiksha Samiti Hetu Nirdeshika** (2006), Lucknow: Rajya Pariyojana Karyalaya, Vidya Bhawan.

11. Soni, R.B.L. (2004). Disabled Students' Perceptions about their Education**. The Primary Teacher**, New Delhi: NCERT.

12. Tyagi, R.S. (1999). **Role of Village Education Committee. In Educational Administration in Bihar.** New Delhi: NIEPA

SUPERVISION OF PRACTICE TEACHING OF B.ED. STUDENTS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

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

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of research literature on the supervision of practice teaching of B.Ed. Students. This paper is outcome of 78 research literatures on practice teaching in which 11 Ph.D thesis, 12 Dissertation, 36 Empirical research, 14 Theoretical articles as well as 05 commission & committee report. The practice teaching appears as practicum, student teaching, field experiences, cooperative education, sandwich programme, internship, clerkship, clinical practicum, and the like depending and varying upon profession. The paper first introduces practice teaching as an important aspect of teacher education. Then it focuses on review of supervision during practicum in aspects of process of supervision or mode of feedback. Findings indicate that while practice teaching is widely accepted as a valuable and successful component of teacher education, it has a number of shortcomings. However, none of the studies focused on the weightage /attention given by supervisors on practicing skills while performing the act of supervision of lessons in the real classroom situation. The paper than concludes with highlighting certain gaps in research on the practicum that future researchers in the field might want to address.

Keywords: Supervision, Practice Teaching, B.Ed. Students, and Teacher Education.

Introduction

There is no teacher education programme that can be completed without an effective practice teaching programme. Although, there is a school of thought, which says that "teachers are born, not trained", the overwhelming view today is that there is a need for professionally trained teachers to teach in our schools. Many institutions offering teacher education programme require their students to take part in a teaching experiences in a school or a college where they can interact with actual learners. This is the session that is usually referred to as practice teaching or practicum (Husen and Postlethwaite, 1985; Derrick and Dicks, 2005). In some literature it is 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, practice teaching represents the bridge between the academic preparation of teachers and the entry into teaching as a profession. It provides the best situations for assessing the mastery of the knowledge and skills required of an effective teacher. Emphasizing the importance of practice teaching many researcher have been reported as: developing a conception of the subject matter and how to teach it (Grossman and Stodolsky, 1994); learning to manage students behaviour (Bullough, 1989); learning to teach bored students (Kennedy, 1998); learning to work with colleagues (Smylie, 1994; Spindler and Biott, 2000); and an induction into the profession, both to improve teachers' skills and to extend the body of knowledge on effective teaching practices (Collinson et al., 2009). Nanda (1970) has also defined practice teaching as 'a directed learning experience' in which students are engaged actively to learn the techniques of teaching and also to

acquire the necessary skills. A broad theoretical perspective of practice teaching has been offered by Morvant et al. (1995). According to him teaching practice teaching serves as a function within the Teacher Education Programmes (TEPs) that may hinder or support the achievement of its goal. They suggested that when teaching practice is designed, attention should be given to the manner in which it is structured with particular attention given to the way it is scheduled and organised. A poorly designed teaching practice might lead to frustration and stress.

Earlier researches clearly reflect that practice teaching is an integral part of teacher preparatory programme in Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs). It can provide feedback to the TEIs regarding the progress of their students and provide a basis as to whether they should be qualified to teach or not. It also enables the TEIs to identify aspects of their programme to improve further.

Analysis of literature on practice teaching in teacher education

Research on the practicum has gradually shifted in focus since the 1960s (Ong'ondo and Jwan, 2009). This shift has generally followed a similar trend to research in the field of teacher education. Practice teaching is considered to be the most significant part of a programme of teacher education (Clarke and Collins, 2007; Farrell, 2008). 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, but still the present situation in practice teaching programme is highly disappointed. Some of the studies, both in India and abroad that are reviewed below:-

Comments of commission and committees:

Regarding the present situation in practice teaching programmes, the Education Commission (1964-66) expressed its dissatisfaction in the following words:

At present, student- teachers are commonly required to give a specified number of isolated lessons, many of which are often unsupervised or ill supervised. The practice of continuous block teaching, the duration of which varies from two to six weeks, is adopted only in a few institutions and its organization still leaves much to be desired.....Moreover, this programme is very inadequate compared even to the present needs of school" (p-74)

At another place the commission observes that

The quality of training institutions remains with a few exceptions either mediocre or poor, competent staff are not attracted, vitality and realism are lacking in the curriculum and the programme of which continues to largely traditional, and set patterns and rigid techniques are followed in practice teaching with a disregarded to for present day needs and objectives. (pp. 67-68).

On the basis of the situation referred above the Education Commission makes a strong plea for improvement of practice teaching, and making it a comprehensive programme of teacher education. One year before the Education Commission, in 1963, the all India seminar on elementary teacher-training programme in its report gave a detailed and much more valuable suggestion (as cited in Sukhia, 1973). It suggested that:

"there should be at least 18 weeks of teaching practice with 216 working hours of actual practice per trainee and the same amount of observation and assistance to the class in-charge during the two years of training of which a minimum of 6 weeks should be devoted to block teaching. Even in case of free lessons when block teaching is not possible, care should be taken that lesson are not planned divorced from life situation

in the school and community…"

Every training institution should have one or more experimental practicing school attached to it… facilities of holding the practice in other schools in the neighborhood of the training institution should be provided along with transport facilities.

"The teaching practice supervisors must be trained graduates"….excepting craft trained teachers….."

The duration of supervision play an important role in making the feedback more authentic. For full period observation a supervisor can observe only four to five lessons a day. It is not possible to cover every lesson by the supervisor. Regarding duration of supervision the University Education Commission (1948-49) suggested that whatever is observed may be observed in detail. Further, regarding the existing course and teaching the University Education Commission (1948-49) criticised in following words

The existing course is too little time is given to school practice, too little weight is given to practice in assessing the student's performance, and conditions of school practice are often unsatisfactory, some time quite grossly unsatisfactory. In some places a student is required to give only five lessons during the whole of his course (p-213).

NPE (1986) also emphasized on the importance to overhaul teacher education in the country. With the ongoing technological advancements and changing society it was felt essential to improve the quality of teacher education. The role of teachers and expectations from them has also changed substantially and to meet the changing expectations of teacher's role National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education was framed in 1988. To fulfill the changing needs of the learners and improve the quality of education, the National Curriculum Framework (1988) suggested the following three major components of teacher education for each stage: (a) Foundation Course, (b) Relevant specialization and (c) Field work or Practicum. The framework emphasized the importance of Practicum to familiarize pupils-teachers or perspective teacher with various practical aspects of classroom teaching so that student teachers can better prepare themselves to take their future teacher role effectively.

Difficulties faced by student teachers during practicum:

A study of the difficulties of student teachers and beginning teachers in the secondary school was done by Henry (1951) in Appachian State (U.S.A.). Finally there were 55 difficulties reported in which approximately 59.2% of the participants ranked the following 10 difficulties, related to teaching, in the descending order: (1) problem of class control and discipline, (2) Motivating pupil interest and response, (3) handling routine phases of class room management, (4) Adjusting to difficulties in school equipment, physical conditions and materials, (5) Handling broader aspects of teaching technique, (6) Lack of command over matter and instructional material, (7) Lack of effective teaching voice, (8) Presenting the lesson and guiding pupil discussion, (9) Adopting to the needs, interest and abilities of pupils, and (10) difficulties involved in planning and organizing, learning activities. Similarly, a recent study investigated the challenges faced by student teachers during teaching practice exercise by Okobia, Augustine and Osagie (2013) in Nigeria. They were 15 challenges reported in their study, in which some of these as: inadequate teaching practice orientation; poor interpersonal relationship between faculty supervisor and student teachers; too much workload or responsibility; poor learning environment and overcrowded classrooms; managing students with different skills; time for the teaching practice exercise is short; and practice teaching is a period of stress for student teacher. In Mifsud's (1996) cited in Letho (2001) opinion, it

is not sufficient to leave to students and beginning teachers, because there are always complex problems which require experienced supervisors in order to establish the link between theory and practice. Further he believes that student teacher need time also to reflect on their image of teaching in order to challenge their misconception about a teaching career and therefore develop their expertise in that line. According to Oslaitan and Agusiobo (1981), giving student teachers more field experience that is supervised affords them the same.

In most teacher education programmes, student teachers are supervised by teacher educators from their institutions. The process usually involves the supervisors observing the student teachers' teaching in classrooms, and then talking about the lessons during what is commonly called post-observation conferences (Brandt, 2006; Intrator, 2006). A critical study has been done by Arora (1973) on discussion lesson as a technique of improving practice teaching. In that study he found that 45% pupil teachers showed increase in marks at the second discussion lessons and 47% showed a decrease while 8% remained stationary. For better arrangements of practice teaching programme he said that difficulty of availability of cooperation from the schools and the difficulty of taking the help from inspectorate of education should be solved. Similarly, several researcher reported that student teachers prefer to be actively involved in the post-observation discussions (Tang and Chow, 2007; White, 2007).

Process of supervision/mode of feedback:

Research on supervision by university based teacher supervisor, like other aspects of practice teaching has also covered a range of issues. One of these has been the process of supervision (Ong'ondo and Jwan, 2009). For example, Proctor (1993) investigated how supervisors supervise students during practice teaching. Proctor established that supervisor focused on aspects of teaching such as confidence, mastery of content and classroom management but different supervisors put emphasis on different aspects with potential confusion to the student teachers. Based on this study, Proctor (1993) suggested more studies on the conduct of practice teaching citing "the need for better understanding of the way tutors operate when they are supervising". Similarly, Gal (2006) reported a study done in Israel on the role of practicum supervisors in enhancing behaviour management skills among their student teachers. Among her findings was that student teachers had difficulties managing behavioural problems in their classrooms, yet supervision did not deal with this adequately.

Related to the process of supervision of practice teaching, there has also been research on the student teachers' preferences regarding mode of feedback (Rastogi, 1996). This study has revealed that average number of lessons supervised by the principal was six, and by the CIE staff was two while percentage of supervised students were 78 and 26.5 respectively. Average number of remarks per supervised lesson given by the school principal was 3.5, and by the CIE staff 8.5. Further, he point out that four types of remarks were given to the student teachers, viz., neutral, negative, suggestive and appreciative. The last three types of remarks given by the CIF staff did not appreciably differ in respect of male and female student teachers. In the same way Srivastava (1969) reported in his study that the average number of lesson supervised daily by an instructor is 5 to 7 whereas the percentage of total lessons thoroughly supervised comes to 7.5% to 20% during the session. Further, he found that some arrangement of follow-up of supervised lessons are made in a few institutions and nearly 3 to 5 very good and very poor lessons are discussed in each week, when the practice is still in progress, among the student teachers and staff of the training school. Other study on this issue has indicated that the lessons of the students are invariably supervised by the staff members only. The number of student teacher allotted per supervisor is so large that little time is

available for supervision of each lesson. The students would like their lessons to be supervised for at least 10 to 15 minutes and the supervisors generally point out good and bad points in teaching while putting the remarks in the lesson note books of student teachers (Kachhawaha, 1967). In the same way Joseph (1967) analyzing in his study that there was no uniformity in the number of lessons to be given by the trainees and in the type of practical work done in different training colleges. Regarding supervision of practice teaching, majority of staff members did not want to share the responsibility with school teachers, whereas this was not true with the trainees.

Another recent study conduct in Nepal by Gautam (2010) on analyses the view of B.Ed. and M.Ed. students regarding the usefulness of practice teaching in teacher training institutes of Nepal reported that internal supervisors were required to observe at least 3 classes during the practice teaching. However there existed a disparity in the responses of supervisors and pupil teachers regarding the frequency of observation, as the supervisors reported that they had observed 3 times while the responses of pupil teachers varied. Out of 35 students teachers only 10 of them (29%) agreed with supervisor's response and 9 students (26%) said that their classes were supervised only once, another 13 (37%) student teachers reported that they were supervised only twice while 9% said that they were not supervised at all during the practice teaching session. The study concluded that the supervision system was very weak and the supervisor failed to give uniform suggestion to the pupil teachers to improve their teaching skills. Sometimes the supervisors walked out of the classroom without giving any comments or feedback. A controversial report on student-teaching found to suffer from poor supervision by Sawchuk (2011) released by the Washington-based National Council on Teacher Quality, the report examines student-teaching practices in 134 education schools, or about one-tenth of such programs nationwide. All but a quarter of the programs reviewed earned a "weak" or "poor" rating. The student-teaching experience offered by many traditional schools of education couples poor supervision with a lack of rigorous selection of effective mentor-teachers. In the same way Mehrotra (1974) has found that the existing practice teaching was ineffective due to the defect in the supervisory system where there was an atmosphere of tension and artificiality during practice and lack of clarity about the supervisory role. He has further found that teacher training institutions had not adopted those practices and methods of instruction which they preached the trainees to adopt in schools. While all India study regarding adoption and discontinuation of innovations in 209 secondary teacher training institutions belonging to various states Singh (1975) has observed that more than two-thirds of the training institutions provided sufficient time for practice teaching and had provision for good practicing schools and more than half of the institutions involved teachers of practicing schools for supervision work.

Assessment focused supervision:

Some studies found out that assessment focused supervision threatens student teachers and creates a situation generally where the student teachers pay more attention to pleasing supervisors than on learning (Brandt, 2006; Farrell, 2007; Walkington, 2005). According to Moanty (1984), the practice teaching programmes stressed only on the delivery of lessons and other activities expected from a pupil-teacher were neglected. While Singh (1971), has suggested way for the evaluation of practice teaching. According to him effective assessment implies that all staff members are aware of the criteria involved and understand their implications in class work. Srivastava (1970) also conducted a study in which a majority (81.7%) of the institutions have some system of internal assessment, but total internal assessment of practice teaching is found only in 8.5% of the institutions and complete external assessment in 18.3%. Most of the institutions which have some system of internal assessment do not give any more than 50% of the total marks of practice teaching to it.

Supported nature of supervisors during supervision of practice teaching:

There has also been research on how supervisors are supported during practice teaching. For example Sukhia (1973) conduct a study in which the supervisors helped the student teacher in preparing the lesson to be taught. They helped student teachers in developing logical sequence of questioning and developing self confidence and use of proper teaching aids. The supervisors also saw that student teachers adopted proper teaching behavior in the classroom and managed the class with proper discipline. They understood their students fairly well and taught them effectively by displaying all the professional teaching skill that might be helpful for the student teachers in actual teaching. A similar study conduct by Malhotra (1989) which showed that practice teaching helped the student teachers in organising the teaching skill according to their suitability but more of lessons should be taught in order to attain competence in teaching. The feedback provided by the rotation and regular supervisors through oral/written remarks helped them in improving their weakness. Another study was conducted in Netherlands which showed that teacher educators lacked professional language to articulate expected practices coherently and consistently to their student teachers (Swennen, et al. 2008). They concluded that teacher educators need to be supported to develop "the ability to link their expertise to their own practices and the practices of their student teachers". Regarding knowing the student teachers' views on the expertise of the teacher educators a study conduct by Smith (2005) in Israel. He reported that supervisor guiding them in their pedagogy during practicum. He also asked the supervisors to evaluate their own expertise in supervising the pupil teachers. The finding indicates that the pupil teachers and supervisors had conflicting views on the conduct of supervision. The researcher concluded that there was need to identify the required expertise for supervision and support supervisors in them.

Role/value of supervision during practice teaching:

There have also been investigations on the value/role of supervision on teacher learning during the practicum (Ong'ondo and Jwan, 2009). Emphasizing the role of supervision during the practicum Ryan, Toohey and Hughes (1996) observed that a range of learning experiences are planned through a learning contract in the field with the collaboration of educational supervisors and practicum in the field offers the best environment for students to develop various skills and also helps students to integrate theory and practice. Stimpson et al. (2000) state that "supervision is an integral part of the teaching practice or teaching practicum undertaken in schools by part-time or full-time students seeking professional initial teaching qualifications". Similarly, Bhatnagar (1980) observed that practice teaching is the most important element in teacher education. A another study conduct by Fayne (2007) on this issue in USA involving 222 student teachers during practice teaching sessions for over five years. His study revealed that student teachers regarded most supervisors as playing very important roles in their learning. The student teachers identified some of these roles as managing the process of practice teaching, serving as people they could trust with confidential information, and giving comments on their teaching that usually contributed to improvement of their performance.

Researchers have noted that practice teaching can have positive and negative consequences on student teachers (Koehler, 1988; Korthagen, et al., 2006; Sabar, 2004). Researcher such as Price (1987) cited in Ryan, Toohey and Hughes (1996) view the practice teaching give an opportunity to apply theoretical knowledge previously gained in campus based activities. On the other hand, Schon (1980) argues that the role of the practice teaching is to raise problems and issues which were used to trigger the investigation of related theory and knowledge. On the positive sides there is evidence that the practice teaching is successful in: improving attitudes towards supervision, self confidence,

job knowledge, job seeking skills and practical reasoning (Gibson, 1985); helping students to integrate well into the work environment (Mann, 1985); developing greater maturity in students, enabling students to make more positive contributions, and demonstrate more positive attitudes in class (Pienaar, 1985); developing job skills and on the job performance, interpersonal and social skills (Au Yeung et al., 1993); enhancing employment prospects of graduate (Au Yeung et al., 1993); and giving students insight into the world of work and career prospects (Au Yeung et al., 1993; Edward, 1985 & Pienaar, 1985). On the basis of earlier research which showed that the practice teaching was the most important element in teacher education. Yarrow (1992) stated on overall value of practice teaching in particular the role of supervision that

> *Students in pre service course commonly regarded the practicum component as the most important part of their course. They maintain that from the practicum they gain the most useful knowledge to assist them when they begin working in the 'real world'. Employers also regard the practicum highly as they consider carefully a student's performance in this area when recruitment is undertaken. Within the university context, academics vary in their courses, whilst other see the practicum as having far less significance in overall pre service preparation...Research substantiates that the practicum is the single most powerful intervention in professional preparation....Supervision, therefore, becomes the most important process within such intervention.*

However, on the negative side 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; Au Yeung et al., 1993; Yarrow, 1992); The supervisors do not observe the lessons completely and they rarely put detailed observation on lesson plan (Mohanty, 1984). Further he (1984) explained that, the practice teaching programmes stressed the delivery of lessons only and other activities expected from a pupil teacher were neglected. Collinson, et al. (2009) also added, "the improvement of teacher education is not only a matter of additional supervision, better feedback or adequate facilities for practice, there is also the need for better understanding of the complexities of the teaching process."

Synthesis of research finding:

Above review of research literature on supervision of practice teaching indicate that the practicum is considered an important aspect of teacher education that is getting increased attention of researchers in the field. The research so far done reveals that the supervision of practice teaching is a complex stage which is approached very differently in various parts of the world. The key issues that have been raised by the research on the practicum are summarised thus:

i.   Supervisors did not supervise properly; they just sat in the class and disappeared after few minutes without giving any comments or feedback (as confirms the finding of Kachhawaha, 1967; Sukhia, 1973; Mohan, 1980; Mohanty, 1984; Gautam, 2010),

ii. Lack of uniformity among the supervisors was a major issue. They did not give uniform instruction/suggestions to the student teachers which created several problems (this finding thus confirms the finding of Malhotra, 1989; Gautam, 2010),

iii. Student teacher regard supervisors as important in their learning but some supervisor lack the expertise to support student teachers appropriately (as confirms the finding of

Mehrotra, 1974; Ong'ondo and Jwan, 2009),

iv.   Supervisors were not honest in supervision. This shows the lack of sincerity on the part of the teachers (Price, 1989; Yarrow, 1992; Au Yeung et al., 1993),

v.   One supervisor had to observe many student teachers in schools located in different places (Gautam, 2010), and

vi.   Student teachers did not take teaching practice seriously and they took it as a formality (Damodar, 1977).

Concluding remarks:

Generally, studies on supervision reviewed in this paper apparently add valuable insights to the field. A significant issue are arising that supervision is an important aspect of practice teaching. However, persistent problems are identified with practice teaching which is poorly structured and poorly supervised. Hence there is need to be regular and consistent, pay attention to contextual circumstances, more supportive of the student teachers, it ought to involve student teachers actively in reviewing their lessons and give proper feedback viz. Oral/written comments on their lesson plan notebooks as well as there is need for close collaboration between supervisors and student teachers. It is important to point out that our literature search revealed very little research have been done by the researcher since 1980 on the aspects on supervision of practice teaching in India. However, none of the studies focused on the weightage /attention given by supervisors on practicing skills while performing the act of supervision of lessons in the real classroom situation. Hence there is clearly need for more studies on supervision of practice teaching involving teacher education programmes run by universities so as to enable student teachers achieved the desired outcomes from the practice teaching.

References:

1. Arora, I. P. (1973). A critical study of discussion lesson as a technique of improving practice teaching. **Haryana Journal of Education,** VI (1), 32-38.

2. 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.

3. Bhatnagar, T. N. S. (1980). **Studies and literature on student teaching and other practical work in B.Ed. programme in India: A review.** New Delhi: NCERT.

4. Brandt, C. (2006). Allowing for practice: a critical issue in TESOL teacher preparation. **English Language Teacher Journal,** 60(4), 355-364.

5. Bullough, J.R. (1989). **First year teacher: A case study**. New York: Teacher College Press.

6. Clark, A., & Collins, S. (2007). Complexity science and student teacher supervision. **Teaching and Teacher Education.** 23, 160-172.

7. Collinson, V. et al. (2009). Professional development for teachers: A world of change. **European Journal of Teacher Education,** 32(1), 3-19.

8. Derrick, J., & Dicks, J. (2005). **Teaching practice and mentoring: The key to effective literacy, language and numeracy teacher training**. Leicester: NIACE.

9. **Education Commission** (1966). Govt. Of India, New Delhi.

10. Edward, N.S. (1985). Evaluations of industrial training for technician engineers. **Paper Presented in**

Fourth World Conference on Cooperative Education, 2, 92-95. Edinburg: Napier College.

11. Farrell, T.S.C. (2008). Here's the book, go teach the class: ELT practicum support. **RELC Journal,** 39, 226-241.

12. Fayne, H.R. (2007). Supervision from the student teachers' perspective: An institutional case study. **Student Teacher Education.** 3(1), 53-66.

13. Gal, N. (2006). The role of practicum supervisors in behaviour management education. **Teacher Education,** 22, 377-393.

14. Gautam, G. R. (2010). Practice teaching in I.Ed. and B.Ed.: A learning experience or a meaningless ritual?. from **http://neltachoutari.wordpress.com/2010/09/04/practice-teaching-a-reflection/**

15. Gibson, G.R. (1985). Work experience, employment skills, and work attitudes of disadvantage youth in USA. **Paper Presented in Fourth World Conference on Cooperative Education,** 2, 92-95. Edinburg: Napier College.

16. Grossman, P., & Stodolsky, S. (1994). Considerations of content and circumstances of secondary school teaching. In darling-Hammond (Ed.). **Review of Research in Education**. Pp 179-222.

17. Henry, W. W. (1951). **A study of the difficulties of student teachers and beginning teachers in the secondary school. Educational Administration and Supervision,** XXXVI, 98-100.

18. Intrator, S.M. (2006). **Beginning teachers and the emotional drama of the classroom. Journal of Teacher Education,** 57(3), 232-239.

19. Joseph, K. J. (1967). Teacher education for secondary schools in Kerla. **In M. B. Buch (Ed.). A survey of research in education**. (1974). New Delhi: NCERT.

20. Kachhawaha, A. S. (1967). A study of the reactions of pupil-teachers towards the working of practice teaching programme in elementary teacher training institutions. **Research Report**. New Delhi: NCERT.

21. Koehler, V (1988). Barriers to effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. **Journal of teacher education**, 39 (2), 28-34.

22. Korthagen, E., Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 22, 1020–1041.

23. Letho, T.S. (2001). An effective student teaching practice teaching programme. **Published Doctoral Thesis**, Canada: Concordia University, Montreal.

24. Malhotra, S. (1989). Reactions of the student teacher to the practice teaching programme of department of education, **Unpublished Dissertation**, Delhi University, Delhi.

25. Mehrotra, R. N. (Oct, 1974). The problems of teacher education in India. **Teacher Education,** 9, 5.

26. Mohan, K. (1980). Effectiveness of teacher training programme. **Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Edu**., Awadh University.

27. 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.

28. Morvant, M., Gersten, R., Gilman, J., Keating, T., & Blake, G. (1995). Attrition/retention of urban special education teachers: Multi-faceted research and strategic action planning. **Final Performance Report**, 138-173.

29. Nanda, A. (1970). Student teaching: How to enrich it. **Teacher Education**, IV (4), 23-37.

30. **National Curriculum for Teacher Education: A Framework** (1988). New Delhi: NCERT.

31. **NPE** (1986). Govt. of India, New Delhi: MHRD.

32. Okobia, E.O., Augustine, O.E., & Osagie, R.O. (2013). An analysis of the perceived challenges faced by student teachers during teaching practice excercise. **Journal of Education and Practice**, 4, 7-11.

33. Ong'ondo, C.O., & Jwan, J.O. (2009). Research on student teacher learning, collaboration and supervision during the Practicum: A literature review. **Educational Research and Review**, 4(11), 515-524.

34. Oslaitan,S. O., & Agusiobo, N. O. (1981). **Principles of practice teaching**. New York: Wiley.

35. 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**.**

36. Proctor, S.M. (1993). Tutors' professional knowledge of supervision and the implication of supervision practice. In J. Calderhead and D. Gates (Eds.). **Conceptualising Reflection in Teacher Development.** London: The Falmer Press.

37. Raj, T. (1984). A study of the organization and administration of student teaching programme in the secondary institutions. **Unpublished Ph.D. in Education**, Agra University, Agra.

38. Rastogi, K.G. (1969). A study of the supervision of practice of teaching of students of B.Ed. course through correspondence. In M. B. Buch (Ed.). **Second Survey of Research in Education**. (1972-78). p. 444. New Delhi: NCERT.

39. Ryan, G., Toohey, S., & Hughes, C. (1996). The purpose, value and structure of the practicum in higher education: A literature review. **Higher Education**, 31, 355-377.

40. Sabar, N. (2004). From heaven to reality through crisis: novice teachers as migrants. **Teaching and Teacher Education**. 20, 145–161.

41. Sawchuk, S. (July, 2011). Student-teaching found to suffer from poor supervision. Education Week. Retrieved from **http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/07/21/37prep.h30.html**

42. Schon, D.A. (1990). **Educating the reflective practitioner towards a new design for teaching and learning in the profrssions**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

43. Singh, L. P. (Aug. 1971). Evaluation of practice teaching. **Educational India**. 38, 2, 51-52.

44. Singh, T. (1975). Adoption and discontinuation of innovations in the preparation of secondary school teachers in India. **Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,** University of Baroda, Baroda.

45. Smith, K. (2005). Teacher educators' expertise: What do novice teachers and teacher educators say. **Teaching and Teacher Education,** 27, 177-192.

46. Smyle, M. (1994). Regarding teachers' work: Connections to the classroom. In Darling-Hammond (Ed.). **Review of Research in Education**, pp-129-178.

47. Spindler, J., & Biott, C. (2000). Target setting in the induction of newly qualified teachers;emerging colleagueship in a context of performance management. **Educational Research**, 42(3), 275-285.

48. Srivastava, K. P. (1969). A critical study of the organization and supervision of student teaching programme in Saran district of Bihar. **Unpublished Dissertation**. New Delhi: NCERT. Page 5

49. Srivastava, R. C. (1970). Evaluation of practice teaching in teacher training institutions. In M. B. Buch (Ed.) **first survey of research in education,** P. 468. New Delhi: NCERT.

50. Sukhia, S. P. (1973). Evaluation of current supervisory Practices. **Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Edu**., Agra: D.E.I. Women's Training College, Dayalbagh.

51. Supervision of the Practicum in Teacher Education. (1985). In Husen, T., & Postlethwaite, T. N. (Eds.). **The International Encyclopedia of Education**, 8, 4921-4929. Oxford: Pergamon.

52. Swennen, A., Lunnenberg, M., & Korthagen, F. (2008) Preach what you teach! Teacher educators and congruent teaching. **Teacher and Teaching: Theory and Practice**, 14(5), 531-542.

53. Tang, S.Y.F., & Chow, A.W.K. (2007). Communicating feedback in teaching practice supervision in   a learning-oriented field experience assessment framework. **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 23, 1066-1085.

54. Taneja, R. P. (2000). **Encyclopedia of Comparative Education**. New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd., Vol, 4.

55. University Education Commission (1948-49). Govt. of India, New Delhi.

56. Walkington, J. (2005). Becoming a teacher: Encouraging development of teacher identy through reflective practice. **Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education**, 33(4), 299-311.

57. White, S. (2007). Investgating effective feedback practice for pre-service teacher education students on practicum. **Teacher Education**, 18(4), 299-311.

58. Yarrow, A. (Ed.). (1992). **Teaching Role of Supervision in the Practicum: Cross-Faculty Perspective**. Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.