CHAPTER IV

STUDY AND CONTENT ANALYSIS OF PRACTICE TEACHING RECORDS

Selection of Institutions and Records:

In Uttar Pradesh there were 43 institutions that prepared candidates for Bachelor's Degree in Education/Teaching. Of these 27 were affiliated to the Agra University. The Gorakhpur University ran a Department of Education, besides affiliating 10 colleges. The Lucknow University had a Department of Education and two of its associated colleges also ran a Department of Education. The Aligarh Muslim University had a Department of Education and the Benares Hindu University ran a Teachers' Training College. The present study included the study of lesson-plan books, criticism books and observation books of student-teachers in the departments of Education in the Lucknow University, the Aligarh University, in the Gorakhpur University with one of its affiliated colleges, in 7 affiliated colleges of the Agra University, as also in the Teachers' Training College of Benaras Hindu University - 12 institutions in all.

In selecting institutions of teacher-education for the study of records, it was thought advisable to select the departments of Education in the three universities - the Aligarh Muslim University, the Gorakhpur University and the Lucknow University, and also Teachers' Training College,
Banaras Hindu University. Only one of the colleges affiliated to the Gorakhpur University could be taken up for study as relevant records were available in the colleges of this university only for a very few days during the intervening period after practical examination and before theory examinations. Out of 27 colleges affiliated to the Agra University care was taken to select institutions from different districts subject to the condition that records were available. The institutions selected were located in different important educational centres in the North, the East, the West and the middle of Uttar Pradesh. They were, therefore, highly representative in character.

The selection of students of an institution for the study of their records was made on 20% basis, selecting so far as possible every fifth student serially. The selection was made in such a way that students offering different subjects for teaching practice might be represented. In cases where the number of students offering a subject was not divisible by 5, the next higher or lower number of students were selected. In cases where separate lesson-plan books were kept for different subjects the number of students in different subjects was selected on the basis of 20% without difficulty. But where only one lesson-plan book was maintained for both the subjects some difficulty was experienced in selecting the correct number of students and of their lesson-plan books.
Difficulty of similar nature was also experienced in selecting criticism books. In some institutions supervision remarks were entered, not in lesson-plan books, but in a separate criticism book. In such cases students selected for the study of lesson-plans and supervision remarks could not always be the same. Still care was taken to select the records of the same students in both the cases.

The selection of observation books maintained by students for recording their own observations about the teaching of their fellow students presented another difficulty. As remarks regarding teaching in different subjects were given in one and the same note-book, the ratio of 20% in different subjects could not be strictly adhered to.

Selection of Lesson-plans:

The number of lessons prescribed by the Agra University for teaching practice was 50 in 2 subjects. The departments of Education in some of the affiliated colleges rigidly stuck to the prescribed number and required the students to deliver 25 lessons in each subject. Others did not insist on 50 lessons, nor on 25 lessons to be taught in each subject separately. Therefore, four lesson-plans were selected for study in case of 22 lessons taught and five lessons were selected for study out of lesson-plans more than 22. Every fifth lesson-plan was studied as far
as possible subject to the condition that it had been discussed at the planning stage, and also that it offered a variety of types of lessons, i.e. prose, poetry, grammar, composition, drama, extensive reading, structural approach, translation (generalisation and practice lessons), writing, dictation, Arithmetic, Algebra, Geometry (theoretical, practical, construction.), Physics and Chemistry (demonstration and numerical), Biology, Civics, History (ancient, modern, wars, administration, dynasty, personalities, culture), Geography (Physical, regional, Economic etc.). In some cases where the number of lessons discussed at the planning stage was less than 4 or 5, undisussed lesson-plans were studied to include variety of topics.

**Selection of Supervision Remarks.**

Here the percentage of 20 could not be rigidly adhered to. Where there were 5 supervision remarks, 2 remarks by the subject specialist, if available, were studied, choosing 3 others by different members of the staff. In most of the institutions supervision work in different practising schools was allotted to different members of the staff. Under these circumstances it sometimes happened that subject specialists were not able to supervise even one lesson.

In D.J. College, Baraut only subject specialists supervised lessons in their particular subject. But the Principal of the practising school was authorised to supervise lessons and record his remarks. In the case of this college remark
given by the Principal was also studied in the case of each student. One remark by the head of the department was also studied, if it was given. In the Lucknow University group - supervision was in practice. Each member of the staff was in charge of one group for discussing its lessons at the planning stage and for supervising its lessons. Here no difficulty was experienced in selecting 20% remarks. In each case remarks on various types of lessons were studied in conformity with the consideration noted above.

Study of Lesson-plans:

The number of institutions in which records were studied was 12 with enrolment varying from 52 to 102 in each of them. The total enrolment in these institutions was 948. Each student offered 2 subjects (3 in the case of Teachers' Training College, B.H.U., Varanasi) for teaching practice.

Subject-wise distribution of students was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
<th>603</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>288</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths.</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Science</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1951
Subject-wise Number of Students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>60</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II

The following table gives subject-wise detail of lesson-plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>60</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject-wise Number of Lesson-plans.
The following table gives class-wise distribution of lesson-plans studied in different subjects.

**Table III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table No. IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table No. IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following Table gives branch-wise distribution of Lessons taught in classes VII, VIII, IX and X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inferences Drawn from the Study of above Tables:

Table No.I: Distribution of Subjects Offered by Students:

A glance at the distribution of subjects offered by students for practice teaching would reveal that Hindi was offered by the largest number i.e., by 603 students out of 1951 i.e., 31%. Next in popularity was Social Studies offered by 368 of 1951 students i.e., 19%. Others in order of preference were English, Maths, Science, Geography, Economics, Home Science and Commerce. The reason for this choice was not far to seek. Hindi was a compulsory subject of study up to the high school stage. So it was offered for teaching practice by students who did not have a strong background in other subjects or who had offered, at Degree examination, subjects such as Sociology, Military Science, Commerce, Home Science etc. for which no provision for teaching existed in practising schools or in departments of Education. A comparative study of subjects offered by students for their degree examination and of subjects, they were allotted in practising schools will prove interesting.  

1. Sociology, Philosophy, Education, Culture, Statistics and Military Science were not taught in schools and Persian, Punjabi, Music and even Science were not taught in some schools. Besides provision did not exist in some departments of Education.

---

1. Table on page 163 Chapter V b.
for teaching methods of several subjects. Lessons offered in Social Studies were independent and detached lessons in Civics and History and a few lessons in Geography as well (5 out of 355). Thus these lessons were not lessons in Social Studies in the real sense of the term, which implies that topics from daily life of students should be taken and studied in their historical/geographical/political and economic aspects.

Maths and Science came next. Both the subjects were offered by Science graduates but Maths and sometimes Arithmetic was offered for teaching also by other students who studied the same upto high school stage as a compulsory subject.

Economics was taught to high school classes only. Student-teachers are allowed to teach upto Class IX only, which did not have even one full section of students of Economics. Thus the number of students who could be accommodated in this subject was quite low. This was perhaps why there was no provision for instruction in the methods of teaching Economics in five out of twelve teacher-education institutions and the number of such students was only six each in two of the remaining four institutions.

Commerce and Home Science are highly specialised subjects. The former was offered in only one department of Education. Though Home Science was offered in four institutions, the records of students in the subject were available for study in only three of them.
TABLE - II: Subject-wise Number of Lesson-plans

From the study of the number of lessons taught by students in different subjects it was evident that the average number of lessons taught per subject was 23 i.e. 46 lessons taught in 2 subjects. The number of lessons prescribed for practice teaching was 50 on an average.

The number of lessons discussed at the planning stage was 2695 out of 9065 lessons delivered i.e., 29.8%. The percentage for different institutions varied from 50% to 11.1%. In one institution in particular total number of lessons discussed at the planning stage in different subjects was only 78 and that of lessons studied was 153, almost half of the number of lessons studied. Thus only undiscussed lesson-plans were studied and suggestions by supervisors for guidance were not available. To take a concrete example, in Economics only one out of 10 lessons and in English only 3 out of 16 lessons were discussed at the planning stage. This was very serious specially in the case of lessons in English in which language errors abound and teachers can hardly speak correct English.

TABLE - III: Class-wise Distribution of Lesson-plans Studied

Out of 1793 lessons 380 were delivered in Class VI; 7 in Class VII; 508, in Class VIII; and 388 in Class IX.

From the study of the number of lessons taught in different classes it was evident that majority of lessons deli-
covered in class IX were lessons in Civics and Economics (114 and 67 = 181) a little less than half of the total number of lessons delivered in class IX, i.e., 46%. In English only 19 of 232 lessons and in Hindi 58 of 586 lessons were delivered in class IX.

**TABLE - IV: Branch-wise distribution of Lesson-Plans studied:**

Table No. IV threw light on yet another point i.e., the number of lessons delivered in different branches of a subject. In Hindi 190 out of 559 lessons i.e., 34% were delivered in prose alone, while the number of prose lessons in English was 126 out of 258 i.e., 48.8%. As regards poetry lessons there was a great difference between the percentage of lessons in the two subjects, i.e., 28% and 11.5%. The low percentage of lessons in English poetry might be due to the doubtful success of such lessons in classes VI and VII where only reading and recitation with limited understanding are possible. Only 3 lessons were delivered in Sanskrit as part of Hindi. In one institution where majority of students came from Urdu-speaking population dictation was also taught in Hindi. Five dictation lessons were delivered in this school in Hindi.

English composition was neglected most, there being only 4.5% composition lessons (12 out of 258). In Maths, lessons were fairly distributed over Arithmetic, Algebra and Geometry. In Science lessons in Physics were 99 out of 175 i.e., 58%. Social Studies included unrelated
lessons in Civics and History. In Geography 37.6% and 47% lessons were given in physical and regional Geography, respectively.

From the study of the distribution of lessons over different branches of all the subjects it was clear that students, as far as possible, took up lessons, easy and of a routine nature, involving relatively less study and planning.

The number of tests given in different subjects was only 28 i.e., 1.6% in all. This number was grossly inadequate and showed the indifference of the staff and students towards the important skill involved in preparation of new-type tests by teachers-in-training and in assessment of achievement of students by them. This reflected upon the inadequacy of preparation of student-teachers for one of the important duties of the teacher.

Study of Lesson-plans:

The lesson-plans in different subjects were generally prepared on the out-of-date pattern of Herbartian formal steps. There was little evidence of variation from this pattern in the lesson-plans studied.

The following steps were common to plans in all the subjects:

(i) **Aim:** General and specific.

(ii) Previous knowledge.

(iii) **Introduction:** By means of questions based on previous knowledge and on previous days’ lesson, on study of pictures, maps, quotations, anecdotes etc.
(iv) Statement of aim.
(v) Presentation.
(vi) Recapitulation including class-work and supervision.
(vii) Home work.

The suggestions given by the training college staff for the improvement of lesson-plans were consequently studied under almost all the above heads.

Suggestions Regarding:

(1) Aim.
(2) Previous knowledge.
(3) Introduction.
(4) Statement of aim.
(5) Presentation—including different steps for different types of lessons.
(6) Recapitulation including class-work and supervision.
(7) Home work.
(8) Any other.

The study of the corrections of the lesson-plans, and constructive suggestions given, furnished evidence of the quality of guidance given.

Planning of lessons in Hindi is being given below as specimen from the study:

Planning of Lessons in Hindi:

Total number of lessons studied in the subject was 559 of which 8 lessons were on test. Of the remaining 551 lessons 190, 151, 54, 39, 54, 12, 41 and 5 lessons were delivered in prose, poetry, grammar, composition, extensive reading, drama, Sanskrit and dictation, respectively. The steps followed in the planning of these lessons were the usual Herbertain formal steps and in
several cases even these steps were not followed carefully. The subject specialist pointed out to this irregularity in as many as 42 cases but failed to do so in 6 cases, in which these steps were not followed. If we left out for the present the presentation stage, at which steps and devices used for presenting lessons in different branches of the subject are different, aim, previous knowledge, introduction, statement of aim, recapitulation and home-work were common to all the types of lessons in Hindi, except tests. The observations from the study of these steps are given below serially to see how successfully students did justice to them.

Aims: Aims were studied under three sub-heads (a) General aims (b) specific aims, and (c) how far these aims were realised. From the study of various general aims it was clear that the same aims were repeated in subsequent lessons of the same type irrespective of the class to which a lesson was being given, e.g., composition of poems as an aim in poetry lessons in high school classes and also in class VI. Some institutions were very particular about general aims being given in each and every lesson, some others, on the other hand, excluded general aims altogether. Thus lessons with correct specific aims out-numbered lessons with correct general aims.

Only in 392 of 559 lessons general aims were correctly given but specific aims were correctly given in 405 lessons.
The number of lessons in which these aims were fully realised was only 258. This clearly showed that general aims were mechanically repeated in lesson after lesson. In some cases only "as usual" was written in all subsequent lessons irrespective of the types of lesson and classes to which different lessons were given. Specific aims which differ from lesson to lesson were correctly given. But steps taken to realise these aims often reflected lack of sincerity and honesty of effort to do so. In a great many cases no language work was done to give the students command over words and phrases newly learnt. Merely the telling of meaning of difficult words was the usual practice without having recourse to the use of devices. Quotations were given in a very few cases though creation of poetic atmosphere was invariably given as one of the aims of a lesson in poetry.

Previous knowledge assumed was correctly given in 472 of 559 lessons.

Lessons were introduced in mechanical ways. Out of the lessons introduced by means of questions based on previous knowledge as many as 157 lessons were not connected with the day's lesson. 143 lessons were continuation of previous day's lesson but of these lessons 55 lessons were not connected with it. Use of pictures in introduction was made in 2 lessons only. Out of 145 lessons in poetry only 28 were introduced with poems or anecdotes.
Use of a variety of devices motivates the class which is the first step to learning. But it demands ingenuity and effort from the teacher which he did not like to put in. From the study it was clear that the path of routine and least resistance was generally chosen. This is why introduction was motivating only in 220 cases out of 559.

The statement of aim in a large number of cases flowed out of the introduction. But in 82 cases it was only forced and was given by the teacher, even bereft of the context.

Only 356 out of 559 lessons were recapitulated. In several cases questions put to recapitulate the lessons were the same as given at the comprehension stage, repeated verbatim.

Out of 559 lessons in the subject 35 were lessons in composition and 5 in dictation, in both of which, class-work in the shape of writing should form an inseparable part. In the remaining 519 lessons in prose, poetry, grammar etc., some written work should have been done. But class-work was included in 180 lessons only. Supervision of class-work was done in 146 lessons only. Thus there was no effort to supervise students' work and to render individual help to them. This would result, in a majority of cases, in a wide gap between what was taught in the class and what was actually learnt by students.
Home-work was assigned in 272 cases only. In the following lines are given the observations of study of the lesson-plans of prose lessons at the presentation stage.

**Hindi Prose:** One hundred and ninety lessons were given in prose. The steps taken to present these lessons were reading by the teacher, followed by loud reading by the students, and silent reading by students in some cases preceded or followed by central questions, exposition by means of devices, language-work, reading by students and comprehension questions.

Introductory reading by the teacher and reading by students were done in all the cases. But silent reading of the passages in prose was done in 56 lessons only. Even if we make allowance for prose lessons given in Class VI about 100 lessons were given in higher classes. This reflected upon the neglect of silent reading and gave the students no chance to prepare themselves for self-study and to grasp the central idea of a passage for themselves. Central questions were put only in 5 of 56 cases in which silent reading was done.

Pronunciation drill was given in some of the lessons, even when it was not necessary.

Exposition of difficult parts was upto the mark in 74 lessons only. In 37 others it was too poor in the use of devices used for the purpose. The student-teacher in
several cases gave the word meaning himself. No devices were used in a majority of cases. In some of the cases where illustrative sentences were given the language was loose, with the result that they did not help students grasp the meaning of the word. Language work by students in the form of framing sentences to illustrate the meaning of words and phrases newly learnt, giving synonyms, antonyms etc., was done in a very few cases. Thus expression aim was sadly neglected and left unrealised.

Use of material aid was made only in 23 lessons. In others it was not used to explain even abstract ideas and to visualise objects, animals and people in other lands, their dress, their ways, their culture etc. The use of aids was rarely made even in lower classes.

Questions to ascertain comprehension of the lesson were put in 124 lessons only. In some institutions the practice was to drop comprehension questions in lessons in which there was only one unit, using instead, recapsitulatory questions to serve the twin purposes of comprehension and recapitulation. In a majority of cases the latter immediately followed the former and were mere repetition. This was reasonable though the objects of both are different, of the former to ascertain whether the lesson has been comprehended or not and of the latter, to revise the days' lesson. Only 160 lessons were recapitulated.
Suggestions by Subject Specialist for the Improvement of Lesson-plans:

Total number of suggestions given on 1793 lesson-plans studied was 1977, which comes to 1.1 suggestion per lesson. There were 420 occasions where suggestions should have been given but the point seemed to have escaped the attention of the subject-in-charge. He drew the attention of the student-teacher towards defective questions in 191 cases and even improved upon many of them. He corrected the language of the lesson-plans in 162 cases and pointed out that logical steps had not been followed in 110 lesson-plans. Material aid was not upto the mark in 129 lessons. On several other points only one suggestion per lesson was given. A large number of lessons were merely signed in token of permission to teach the lesson. The subject-in-charge passed over the lessons so hurriedly because the institutions were often understaffed. The work-load of the members of the staff was too heavy for them to cope with. Consequently discussion of lesson-plans did not generally get due attention, and was only perfunctory.

Hindi Prose:

Total number of suggestions given on 190 lesson-plans was 482 i.e., 2.5% suggestions per lesson-plan. In one institution the average was 3.4 whereas in another it was only .36 per lesson. The greatest number of suggestions
were given for the improvement of questions. In some cases only the language of the question was improved upon, in others, even new and useful questions were added.

Fifty-two suggestions were given on exposition of difficulties and devices used to do so. The common device used was the illustrative sentence. But they were often faulty and loose in language. In 3 cases no suggestions regarding the use of devices were given even if it was very necessary to do so.

The next point that received the attention of the subject specialist was language of the plan. The trainees made serious mistakes in writing down their lesson-plans even in Hindi—sometimes spelling mistakes and some times mistakes of construction of sentences. In 4 cases such mistakes remained undetected. Next in frequency were suggestions on language work. But there were 51 lessons in which no language work had been planned nor had any remark regarding its omission been given by the subject specialist. This means that 76 lessons were without any language work planned. Consequently students merely noted down word-meanings without trying to convert the newly-learnt words into active vocabulary.

Suggestions regarding improvement of introduction were given in 155 lessons; regarding aims of teaching Hindi prose, in 31 lessons, leaving 30 lessons without any suggestion on the point though the same was necessary.
Suggestions regarding the use of aid were given in 19 lessons only. There were 8 other lessons in which the use of aid was a must but its use was neither planned by the teacher nor had the lapse been pointed to by the subject-specialist. Other points on which suggestions were given were recapitulation (4), class-work (5), supervision (3), home-work (3).

That students did not follow steps of planning logically was pointed out by subject specialist in as many as 17 cases.

Poetry: 156 lesson-plans were studied in Hindi poetry. Lessons were introduced with questions and answers. Only in 18% lessons they were introduced with a poem. Reading of the poems by the teacher was followed by loud reading of the poems by students in all the 156 lessons. But in 6% lessons silent reading of the poems followed by central questions in 2 cases, was also done. This did not help create poetic atmosphere. The poems were suitably exposed in 66% cases and appreciation questions were up to the mark in 48.7% cases. Aids were used in 20% cases, but parallel quotations were given in 4% cases only. Suggestions for the improvement of the plans were given by method master-on aids in 6% cases, on exposition in 22% cases, on quotation in 5.3% cases. Questions were improved upon in 26.3% cases.
Grammar: Thirty-nine lessons were delivered in grammar. In 92.3% of these lessons a good number of examples were given for generalisation but only in 61.5% cases were these examples compared and contrasted. In 75% cases generalisations were given by the teacher himself but the supervisor pointed to this irregularity in 20% cases only. The generalisations were applied in 91.6% cases.

Extensive Reading:

Fifty-four lessons were delivered in extensive reading. They were exposed in 68.4% cases and exposition questions were put in 55.5% cases.

Drama: Only 12 lessons were delivered in Drama. They were treated like ordinary prose lessons involving reading by the teacher in all the cases, but reading by the students in 68% cases only. In not even one case was dramatisation of the lesson done. Thus the very purpose of such lessons was defeated.

Sanskrit: Sanskrit was taught as part of compulsory Hindi and 41 lessons were given in the subject. These lessons were treated as prose lessons in Hindi and most of the teaching in these lessons was done by the teachers themselves.

Dictation: 5 dictation lessons were also given. This was confined to only one department of Education.

English, another language, has almost the same table
to tell, though the number of lessons taught in the subject was comparatively much less, i.e., 258 as against 559 in Hindi. Out of these 126 or 48.9% lessons were in prose. The usual steps followed were reading by the teacher in 100% cases and reading aloud by students in 98.4% cases and exposition, in 66.6% cases. But language work which leads to realisation of aims of teaching language was done in 10, i.e., 7.9% cases only. The method master drew attention of the teacher towards this short-coming in 6, i.e., 4.7% cases only.

Poetry: Number of lessons in poetry was only 30, i.e., 11.6% of total number of lessons delivered in the subject. Steps followed in the case of poetry lessons were the same as those followed in prose lessons, namely reading of the poem by the teacher and by students, exposition, comprehension questions, excluding, of course, language work.

Translation:

In translation 16, i.e., 6.25% of the total number of lessons were given. Half of these lessons were generalisation lessons. But rules were inductively arrived at only in 37.5% cases. The remaining half were practice lessons.

Grammar: Twenty-one lessons, i.e., 8.1% of the total number of lessons were given in grammar. In 15, i.e., 6% of these lessons a good number of examples were given for
generalisation. But comparison and generalisation was
done by boys in only 47% and 43% cases, respectively.
Attention to this lapse was drawn by the supervisor in
only 33% cases. In 2 lessons the teacher began with defi-
nitions thus combining deductive and inductive methods.

**Structural Approach:**

48, i.e., 18.5% lessons were given on structures
given in text books. They were properly drilled in 83.3%
cases.

**Mathematics:**

199 lessons were given in Maths., 11% of total number
studied in all the subjects. Of these 69 lessons were in
Arithmetic, 70 in Algebra and 57 in Geometry, i.e., 35%,
35.5% and 29.5%, respectively.

**Arithmetic:**

Out of 69 lessons in Arithmetic 50 were practice
lessons in which the problems were properly analysed and
solved with the help of students. In 37% of the 19 genera-
lisation lessons a good number of examples were given. They
were compared. But generalisations were drawn by the
students in 10% cases only. The subject specialist pointed
to this irregularity in 50% cases.

**Algebra:** In Algebra 70 lessons were given. Of these
48 were practice lessons and the remaining 22 were genera-
lisation lessons. In 48 lessons problems were properly
analysed and solved. In 10 of 22 generalisation lessons
a good number of examples were given for generalisation. They were compared and contrasted in 43.5% cases but generalisations were arrived at by students only in 27.2% cases. In none of the other cases did the subject specialist point to the lapse.

**Geometry:** In Geometry 75 lessons were delivered, 1 in generalisation; 22 in practical geometry, 23 in theoretical geometry, 14 in construction geometry, and 3 lessons in practical proof leading to analytical proof. Proper steps were followed in these lessons in a majority of cases.

**Science:** 175 lessons were given in science, 99 in Physics, 30 in Chemistry and 42 in Biology, excluding 4 lessons in test.

**Physics:** Only 50.5% lessons were demonstrated and the teacher put questions to guide students' observation in 37.4% lessons only. Results were tabulated in 48% cases but generalisations were drawn by pupils only in 27.3% cases. The subject specialist pointed to this lapse only in 2.2% cases. He improved upon guiding and eliciting questions in 40% lessons.

**Chemistry:** Out of 30 lessons in Chemistry 76.6% were demonstrated with proper apparatus. But the teacher guided observation by boys with the help of questions in 33.5% cases only. The method-master pointed to this shortcoming in 36.6% lessons. In 10% lessons the teacher narrated facts himself.
Biology: In lessons in Biology (Zoology and Botany), plants, birds and insects were displayed for study. In a few cases even pictures were used instead of actual objects. Thus in 57.1% lessons there were objects for observation, which was guided with the help of questions in 71.4% lessons. Questions were improved upon in 52.4% cases. Observations were noted by students in 64.3% lessons. In one lesson the teacher himself narrated facts instead of guiding students in observing them.

Social Studies:

Three hundred and fifty-five lessons were delivered in Social Studies but they were independent and detached lessons in History (66.5%) and Civics (32.1%) excluding 7 lessons on test. Five lessons in Geography were also taught as part of Social Studies in one institution but in this study they have been treated along with other lessons in Geography.

History: Two hundred and thirty-four lessons in History were almost equitably distributed over Ancient History and Cultural History, Dynasties, Administration, etc. Use of development as well as elicitation questions was made in 72% of these lessons and of narration by the teacher in 71.6% cases. Lessons were illustrated with the help of maps, charts, facts from daily life, and other aids in 60.7% cases. The greatest number of suggestions from the
subject specialist were given for the improvement of questions.

Civics: Out of 114 lessons in Civics 57.9% were developed with the help of questions and answers. Narration was used in 72.8% lessons. As in History the greatest number of suggestions in lesson in Civics were given by subject specialist on questions. Language of the lesson-plans was corrected in 18% lessons.

Geography: One hundred and forty-one lessons were given in Geography - 49 in physical, 59 in regional, 14 in economic Geography, excluding 18 others. Lessons in physical Geography were developed with the help of questions and answers in 69.4% cases. Use of narration was made in 85.9% lessons and they were all illustrated with maps, charts etc. The largest number of suggestions were given by subject specialist on the improvement of questions.

Regional Geography:

Out of 59 lessons in regional Geography 66% were developed with the help of questions and answers. The teacher made use of narration as well as maps in 83% cases. Subject specialist gave suggestions about map-study and questions in 15% cases and made correction in the language of lesson-plans in 20% cases.

Economic Geography:

Out of 18 lessons in economic Geography 44% were developed with the help of questions. Narration was
given in 77% lessons, and in 77% lessons aids, maps, charts etc., were also used. Suggestions for improvement of the lesson-plans were given in 33% cases.

**Economics:**

Sixty-seven lessons were given in Economics. Of these 77.7% lessons were developed with the help of questions and answers and an equal percentage with teachers' narration. Aids were used in 22.4% lessons. Suggestions regarding questions, narration, aids, example and facts from daily life were given by the subject specialist in 65.4%, 11.9% and 13% cases, respectively. Language of lesson-plans was corrected in 23.8% cases.

**Home Science:**

The subject was taught in 3 institutions only and 31 lesson-plans in the subject were studied. Of these 67.7% lessons were developed with the help of questions and answers and in 80.6% of these lessons narration was also used. Aids were used in 41.9% lessons. Suggestions for improvement of the lesson-plans were given by the subject specialist regarding questions, narration, facts and aids in 39%, 9.7%, 9.7% and 3.3% lessons.

**Commerce:**

Commerce was offered by student-teachers in one institution only and 8 lesson-plans were studied in the subject. All the lessons were developed with the help of questions and answers and in 37.5% lessons narration by the teacher
was also used. In 62.5% lessons aids were used. Suggestions regarding questions were given in all the lessons but those regarding aids and facts, in 37.5% lessons only.

Study of the Remarks by Supervisors at the Time of Delivery of Lessons:

Total number of institutions covered in the study was 12, with a total enrolment of 948. Each student offered two subjects for practice teaching. But in Teachers' Training College, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, each student offered three subjects. The number of students under study in this institution was 55. The number of students in the remaining eleven institutions under study was, therefore, 893. Thus the total number of lesson-plan books in all the subjects was 893 x 2 + 55 x 3 = 1786 + 165 = 1951.

The number of students whose records were studied for supervision remarks was 387, as against 396 whose lesson-plans were studied. Subject-wise number of the former is given below:

1. Hindi 109
2. Maths. 43
3. Social Studies 79
4. Home Science 7
5. English 64
6. Science 37
7. Geography 28

Total: 387
The difference in the subject-wise number of students whose lesson-plans and criticism-books were studied was due to the varying practices of maintaining criticism books. In some institutions criticism by supervisors was entered in the lesson-plan book itself; in others, in a separate criticism book. In the former the number of lesson-plan books and criticism-books studied was the same. In the institutions where the latter practice was followed criticism books of the same students, whose lesson-plan books were studied, were not always available. Still every possible effort was made to select the students whose lesson-plan books and criticism-books were both available.

The total number of lessons taught by these 387 students in all the subjects taken together was 8855. Of these 4682, i.e., 51.8% lessons were supervised. But when the percentage of supervised lessons in different institutions was considered separately, wide variation was evident. (Table V in Appendix ) The percentage of supervised lessons ranged from 88% in one institution to as low as 24.4% in another institution. The percentage of lessons supervised in the latter was minimum in Science i.e., 14.1. In Maths. this percentage was 37.9 (maximum for this institution). On the other hand in the former institution the lowest and the highest percentage of supervised lessons were 81.4 in Social Studies and 95
each in Science, Geography and English. In six institutions the percentage of such lessons was below the average of 51.8% and in other six institutions it was above the average. It was highest in the Department of Education, Lucknow University, Lucknow where they had group system. A group of about 7 students was under the charge of one member of the staff who discussed lesson-plans of the students of the group under his charge and also supervised their lessons. The group and the member of the staff were attached to one institution. The supervisor had to supervise one or at the most two lessons in one period. The staff-student ratio was 9:60, approximately 1:7.

We could also arrange different subjects in descending order according to the percentage of supervised lessons in each as below:-

1. Commerce 60%  2. English 57.3%
3. Maths. 56%  4. Social Studies 52.4%
5. Hindi 51.8%  6. Geography 51.6%
7. Home Science 50%  8. Science 49.3%
9. Economics 49%

Commerce and Home Science were offered in one and three institutions respectively. The number of students offering these subjects was negligibly small (10 and 41 respectively). The number of lessons taught by students under study in these subjects was only 40 and 167 respectively.
pectively. Leaving out these subjects the most often supervised lessons were in English, possibly because each supervisor could be expected to supervise lessons in this subject. Hindi occupies position five with 51.8% the same as average percentage of supervised lessons.

In a majority of institutions supervision of lessons being delivered in one school was entrusted to one or more members of the staff of the department of Education, who supervised lessons in different subjects in this institution even if they did not teach methods-of-teaching them all. Some of these members did not teach the methods of teaching any subject. The Head of the Department of Education casually went round from one institution to another evaluating lessons of as many students as he could.

In one institution only subject specialists supervised lessons in their subject being given in different schools. They went round all the institutions to supervise lessons of different students in their subject, with the result that they could supervise only a very few lessons. There was group system of supervision in one of the departments, of Education. Students in a group offered subjects of which their professor-in-charge taught methods. He discussed the lesson-plans of these students before delivery and also supervised their lessons at the time of delivery. There was only one institution in which the
Head of the practising institution was authorised to supervise lessons of student-teachers and to record his criticism in their criticism books.

Remarks by supervisors were put under different heads and sub-heads. Some of these were common to all the subjects while others differed from subject to subject in regard to the devices and steps peculiar to it. Given below is the list of heads and sub-heads under which common remarks were put:

(A) Particulars of the student.

(i) Serial number of the student.

(ii) Number of lessons taught by him.

(iii) Number of his lessons supervised.

(iv) Number of his lessons supervised by subject specialist.

(B) Class-room conditions.

(i) Arrangement of seats etc.

(ii) Postures of students and their equipment.

(iii) Arrangement of apparatus.

(C) Personality of the teacher.

(i) Voice, language, pronunciation.

(ii) Mannerism.

(iii) Confidence, zeal etc.

(iv) Appearance.

(v) Encouraging and sympathetic.

(vi) Ability to motivate.

(vii) Class contact and familiarity.
(D) Preparation of the lesson.
   (i) Command over subject matter.
   (ii) Planning of the lesson.

(E) Introduction.
   (i) Appropriate.
   (ii) Adequate.
   (iii) Motivating.

(F) Statement of Aim.

(G) Questions.
   (i) Suitable in language and of class-standard.
   (ii) Pointed.
   (iii) Properly put, distributed.
   (iv) Repeated in changed language.

(H) Answers.
   (i) Complete, correct.
   (ii) Manner of answering by students.
   (iii) Treatment of answers of students by trainers.

(I) Narration.
   (i) Factually correct.
   (ii) Suitable in language.
   (iii) Manner of presentation.

(J) Illustration.
   (i) Relevant.
   (ii) Within students' experience.

(K) Aids.
   (i) Suitability.
   (ii) Quality.
   (iii) Adequacy in number.
   (iv) Use made, how used.
(L) B.B. Work.

(i) Neatness, letter formation.
(ii) Arrangement.
(iii) Coverage of the lesson.
(iv) Speaking and attending to the class while writing.

(M) Class Management.

(i) Discipline, class-management.
(ii) Class-co-operation and class-response.

(N) Miscellaneous.

(i) Home work.
(ii) Instructions to the class.
(iii) Entries on the black-board.
(iv) Steps of the plan.
(v) Success of the lesson.

The remarks given by supervisors were further classified as appreciative (e.g. the teacher was attending to the postures of students) and critical (e.g. the teacher was not attending to the postures of students). The comments of the former type were shown by tick mark (×) and those of the latter by a tick mark with a dot over it (○). In the total they were shown by numbers in numerator and denominator respectively.

Total number of lessons delivered by students under study was 8855. Of these only 4682 lessons (51.3%) were supervised by the members of the staff, and the Principal
of one of the practising schools, authorised to do so. Of the 4628 supervised lessons 2285 i.e., about 49.8% were supervised by subject specialists. The number of lessons on which supervision remarks were studied was 1750. This was approximately 19.8% of the total number of lessons delivered by these students and 37.6% of the total number of lessons supervised. The ratio of 20% between the number of lessons taught and lessons studied for supervision remarks could not be rigidly adhered to, as in some cases not a single lesson was supervised.¹

The total number of remarks given by supervisors on 1750 lessons was 8868. Thus the average number of remarks per lesson, of both the categories, appreciative and critical, was 5.06. On the appreciative side it was 4628 for 1750 lessons i.e., 2.6 per lesson and on the critical side it was 4240 for 1750 lessons i.e. 2.4 per lesson.

Number of suggestions given by the supervisors under different heads are given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of suggestion</th>
<th>Number of appreciative suggestions</th>
<th>Number of critical suggestions</th>
<th>Total number of suggestions</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Class-room condition</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The teacher-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Personality</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Preparation</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Introduction</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Economics in institution No. VI.
From the above table it was clear that the greatest number of suggestions were given on "steps of the plan of lesson", i.e., 2475 out of 8868 or about 28%; 1232 on the appreciative side and 1243 on the critical side. Another point of interest was that student-teachers did not follow the prescribed steps in 50.5% cases and followed the prescribed steps in 49.5% cases.

The next point on which supervisors concentrated most was "the teacher" getting 1926 suggestions i.e., 21.7% of the total number of suggestions - 1050 on the appreciative and 876 on the critical side. Of 1926 suggestions 1702
suggestions were given on "the personality of the teacher," his mannerisms, voice, confidence, sympathy etc. Personal appearance of the teacher figured only in 32 suggestions, hardly 1.6%. Of the total number of 1926 suggestions given under the head "the teacher", confidence and zeal got 436 suggestions, i.e., 22.7%. 224 suggestions were given on "preparation" which included teacher's knowledge of the subject matter and planning of the lesson. The number of suggestions given on the points separately were 47 and 177 respectively. This shows that planning of the lessons got about four times the weight given to knowledge of the subject matter.

Black-board work got the next place with 1101 suggestions, i.e., 12.4%. Of 1101 suggestions 546 were appreciative and 555 were critical. Black-board work included neatness, good handwriting, proper formation of letters, systematic arrangement, coverage of the whole lesson, manner of writing, how much time, and at what stage, was given to students for noting down the contents. It excluded black-board summary which formed part of the "steps of the lesson". The supervisors gave suggestions on this point in about 48% of the lessons under study. In about half of these lessons it was not up to the mark. Only in 15 cases the teacher allowed time to the students to take down the contents of the black-board whereas in 38 cases
the supervisor pointed out that no time was allowed to
the students for this important part of the work. It
appeared that the teacher did not think it worthwhile.

The next point to capture the attention of the super-
visor was "class-management" with an equal number of sugges-
tions, 1101, i.e., 12.4%. But the number of appreciative
remarks was 676 and that of the critical remarks, 425. This
shows that teachers-in-training developed their lessons
with the co-operation of students and managed the class
successfully in 61.4% of cases, and could not do so in
38.6% cases. Co-operation of the class was sought in 342
cases but not in 122 cases. They were able to manage the
class well in 308 cases, but not in 254 cases.

Among the devices used by the teachers in the develop-
ment of the lessons, "questioning" was most common. Que-
questions got suggestions from the supervisors in 698 cases,
i.e., 7.9%. Distribution of questions over the class was
appreciated in 133 cases and criticised in 143 cases.
This meant that in more than half the cases questions
were put to only a few selected students who were possibly
seated in the 1st row or were comparatively more intelli-
gent or forward. Back-benchers, weaker and shy students,
were not encouraged to answer them.

The sixth place in order of importance was given to
"miscellaneous" suggestions which counted 583, i.e., 6.6%.
"Miscellaneous" included instructions regarding work,
entries on the black-board such as subject, class, period etc., and success or failure of the lesson.

Answers given by students to questions put by the teacher came next with 295 comments, 120 on the appreciative side and 175 on the critical side. Total counts on this point were 3.3% of the total number of suggestions. Suggestions on the appreciative side were 40.7% of the suggestions on this point; on the critical side they were 59.3%. This showed that answers given by students were not up to the mark and were not given in a proper manner. The treatment, by the teacher, of answers given by students was on right lines in only 68 cases and not on right lines in 121 cases.

The most neglected aspect of supervision was "illustration". It had only 36 counts, i.e., .4%. This showed that teachers were indifferent to the use of illustration.

Study of Observation Books:

Only some universities required their teacher-trainees to observe lessons of their fellow trainees. The Lucknow University, Lucknow and Teachers' Training College, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi did not have this practice. Even in the remaining three universities, the number of lessons prescribed for observation was different. The Agra University prescribed 40 lessons of fellow students to be observed by student-teachers. But in the departments of Education in various affiliated colleges the practice
was different. Departments of Education in two of the seven colleges affiliated to the Agra University covered in this study, did not require any such observation. Three others required strictly twenty lessons to be observed by them in each of the two subjects offered for practice teaching. One institution prescribed 20 lessons in all, 10 in each subject. The remaining one institution required 10 lessons to be observed in the subject of specialisation and 5 lessons in the other teaching subject.

Besides this difference in the number of lessons one more difficulty was experienced. Only one note book was maintained to record observations of lessons in both the subjects, and in some cases observations of lessons in all the subjects. So the subject-wise number of students, whose observation books were studied was slightly different from the number of students whose lesson-plan books were studied and also from the number of students whose criticism books were studied in the subject. The following table will clearly show this difference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>No. of students whose lesson-plan books were studied</th>
<th>No. of students whose criticism books were studied</th>
<th>No. of students whose observation books were studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was not possible to study 20% of observations because observations of lessons in different subjects were recorded in the same notebook. No lessons were observed by trainees in Home Science in Teachers' Training College, B.H.U., Varanasi. Hence observations in Home Science in this institution were not studied.

The Table below gives the details about observation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths.</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Science</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>4489</td>
<td>894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations recorded by students in different subjects were studied under the same heads and sub-heads as supervision remarks e.g., (1) class-room conditions, (2) the teacher- his personality and his preparation (3) introduction, (4) statement of aim, (5) questions, (6) answers, (7) exposition and narration, (8) illustration (9) material aid, (10) black-board work, (11) class-co-operation, (12) miscellaneous, and (13) steps of the lesson.

Before studying the relative importance of various heads under which observation remarks were studied one thing had to be borne in mind. All the institutions had laid down some points on which trainees were required to record their observation. But some of the departments were very particular that observation should be made on all these points. They had prescribed a proforma (specimen attached in Appendix) on which observation remarks regarding all the lessons had to be noted. Others left their students free to make observations about what appeared to them most striking in a particular lesson. In the case of the former there was no freedom for the observer who had to conform rigidly to the routine of observation under the given heads.

Total number of observations studied was 894 and total number of suggestions both appreciative and critical was 8705. The average number of suggestions per lessons came to 9.7 - 7 on the appreciative side (6274 for 894 lessons) and 2.7 on the critical side (2432 for 894 lessons). Average
number of supervision remarks per lesson was 5.06 - 2.6 on the appreciative side and 2.4 on the critical side. The difference was due to the fact that students recorded observation on all or a great majority of points given for guidance. This they could easily do in the time at their disposal. But supervisors had to supervise about 4 lessons in one period and so the time for supervision of each lesson was comparatively much less. In the case of supervisors appreciative and critical remarks were nearly equal in number - 4628 and 4240, respectively. But in the case of observation by students there was much difference - 6274 and 2434, respectively. This showed that students were partial towards their fellow trainees in recording their observation remarks, recording more of appreciation than of criticism.

The number of suggestions given under different heads of observation are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>No. of appreciative remarks</th>
<th>No. of critical remarks</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rank in supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Class-room condition.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) His personality.</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) His preparation.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Introduction.</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Statement of aim. | 84                           | 24                      | 108   | 1.2        | XI                  | XII
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Questions</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Answers</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exposition/ Narration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Illustration</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Material aid.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Black-board work</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Class-co-operation</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Steps of the lesson</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 6274 2432 8700

Student-teachers gave first rank to 'the teacher' — his personality and his preparation, with 21.6% of the number of suggestion. Supervisors gave it second rank. The former gave second rank to 'the steps of the lessons' to which supervisors gave first rank. Thus these ranks were inter-changed.

It was clear that observers were more partial to 'the teacher'; ranks III, IV and V were given to 'black-board work', 'class-co-operation' and 'questions' both by observers and supervisors. The greatest variations were found in the cases of 'introduction' and 'illustration' to which observers attached more importance than supervisors.

Under 'personality of the teacher' several qualities were observed. 'Confidence and zeal' got 355, i.e., 18.9% of
the total counts for 'the teacher' - 269 on the appreciative side and 86 on the critical side. Physical appearance of the teacher got 233, i.e., 12.6% of the suggestions - 211 on the appreciative and 22 on the critical side.

One hundred and eighty, i.e., 9.4% suggestions were given on 'preparation of the lesson' which included 'knowledge of the subject matter' and 'planning of the lesson'. Knowledge of the subject got 54, i.e., 3% suggestions - 43 on the appreciative and 11 on the critical side. Planning of the lesson got 126 suggestions - 103 on the appreciative side and 23 on the critical side. This showed that observers regarded knowledge of subject matter much less important than 'planning of the lesson'. Supervisors also thought that 'planning of the lesson' is more important than 'knowledge of the subject matter'.

'Steps of the lesson' stood second with 1713, i.e., 19.7% suggestions. Every lesson got about 2 suggestions on this point.

'Black-board' work came next with 1122, i.e., 12.8% suggestions and about 1.25 suggestions per lesson. There were 841 suggestions on the appreciative side and 281 on the critical side, the latter being one third of the number of suggestions on the appreciative side. All the points included in 'black-board work' under supervision were also included in observation. Only in 83 cases the teacher allowed time to students to take down the contents of the black-board. Thus
students could not get this advantage in quite a good number of lessons.

Fourth in order of rank was 'class management' with 971 i.e., 11.2% suggestions. There were 717 suggestions on the appreciative side and 254 suggestions on the critical side. Class-co-operation was sought in 344 but not in 69 cases. The teacher managed the class successfully in 327 cases but failed to do so in 175 cases.

'Questions' got 911 suggestions, i.e., 10.5% - 699 on the appreciative side and 212 on the critical side. Questions were suitable in 384 cases and unsuitable in 151 cases. The technique of questioning was on right lines in 264 cases and not so in 102 cases.

According to observers, 'exposition and narration' was the least important point, with only 21, i.e., .24% suggestions, 11 on the appreciative side and 10 on the critical side. Supervisors ranked it XI and rank XIII was given to 'illustration'.

From the table showing ranks given to different heads it was found that ranks III, IV, V and VII were given both by the student observers and supervisory staff to 'blackboard work', 'class-co-operation', 'questions', and 'statement of aim'. Ranks I and II were inter-changed between 'steps of the lesson' and 'the teacher'. 'Introduction' was ranked VI by observers and IX by supervisors. 'Illustration'
was ranked X by the former and XIII by the latter. This wide variation was due to the fact that members of the staff had to supervise several lessons in one period and could be present at the introduction stage in one lesson only. They had to miss that stage in the case of other lessons. On the other hand students generally observed only one lesson in a period. So they could observe a lesson at different stages from introduction to recapitulation including preparation of black-board summary, written work and its supervision by student-teachers. Hence they could record their observation on a number of points. Devices and techniques of teaching are used at all the stages of the lesson and hence the members of the staff had an opportunity to record their remarks on these points, no matter, at what stage they happened to supervise the lesson.