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Abstract

The study was carried out to investigate evaluation methods of teaching practice of formal and non-formal teacher education institutions. Major objective was to compare the evaluation methods of teaching practice implemented in formal and non-formal teacher education institutions in Pakistan. Four hundred prospective teachers were selected randomly in which 200 prospective teachers were from formal universities and 200 were selected from non-formal institutions. The data were collected by administering the validated questionnaires. Data were analyzed by using two-way chi square techniques to compare the responses of formal and non-formal prospective teachers. Prospective teachers of both formal and non-formal system have the opinion that duration of teaching practice was not enough for their training. Prospective teachers of both systems showed their agreement that they were judged on the basis of; through well introduction of the topic, well presentation and well explanation of the content. Prospective teachers of formal and non-formal universities projected that the evaluation of prospective teachers during teaching practice was satisfactory. Majority of prospective teachers of formal universities intended that supervisor involved the cooperating teacher in their evaluation while prospective teachers of non-formal universities rejected the involvement of cooperating teachers in evaluation.
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Introduction

Teacher education plays an imperative role in raising the standard of education. It is a fact that teacher’s skills have a profound impact on achievement of students (Moore, 2005). According to Akbar (2001), the fundamental purpose of pre-service education is to train prospective teachers to convene challenges that they have to look in future in the schools. The pre-service training program comprises three components:

- Academic Preparation
- Pedagogical Skills
- Teaching practice

Academic preparation includes the training of prospective teachers in the subject areas to be qualified at school level. Though the teachers are assigned those subjects for teaching at secondary level which they have studied at Bachelors level but it is assumed that they are still lacking in certain subject areas and should be enriched. This component of teacher education program is named as academic preparation. Pedagogical Skills have three kinds of courses: (a) foundation courses; these courses give understanding of philosophical, sociological and psychological background of education, (b) pedagogy courses; which give understanding of science and art of teaching through principles of organization of content, effective questioning skills, presentation of effective learning experiences to the prospective teachers, and (c) professional courses, they endow with understanding of curriculum development, organization of co-curricular activities, techniques of measurement and evaluation, and classroom management techniques. This element of teacher education program is called as pedagogical skills. Teaching practice is a graduate/post graduate level course in teacher education institutions both in non-formal and formal institutions. It is planned in such a way that prospective teachers may be able to teach in real classrooms according to earlier theories and practices of teaching.

Richard & Crookes (1988) stated that in professional teaching programs, teaching practice is mandatory for all the prospective teachers. Teaching practice ensures physical and mental training of prospective teachers. In this way they may be able to learn basic principles and teaching techniques required for the profession of teaching. As it is an essential part of teacher education, a plenty of time and consideration is required to pay out. This is because the skill gained from the field experiences is very decisive and valuable regarding the profession. That’s why majority of teacher education institutions devise their teaching practice in a way to give the prospective teachers maximum experience to the actual teaching world as possible.
Murtaza (2005) argued that the evaluation of teaching practice is a very problematic subject. Prospective teachers have unavoidably been graded according to the criteria detained by supervisor or particular institutions and the criteria have not always been made clear. There is still a growing debate about the most successful way of evaluation of prospective teachers in teaching practice. Educator tends to have different ideas as to what constitutes a successful lesson. The evaluation methods used in teaching practice is largely inexplicit in nature, hence the problem of objectively arise when awarding marks or grades. Supervisors are usually given evaluation schedules which consist of some criteria against which prospective teacher’s performances are to be judged, often along a give point scale: that is, 5 to 0 or A to F, ranging from excellent to unsatisfactory. Although supervisors have different ideas of what they want to see in a good lesson, they seem to agree on the board areas to consider. These areas are:

1. The personal traits of the prospective teachers,
2. The preparation of a lesson plan,
3. The teaching method and use of instructional materials,
4. Classroom management,
5. Evaluation techniques

Thus, the study is undertaken to find out the evaluation methods of teaching practice in formal as well as in non-formal teacher education institutions of Pakistan. This study has provided a comparison between the evaluation methods of teaching practice of both systems and also the weaknesses and strengths of different evaluation methods used by these both systems of education. The practices relating to the organization, administration and supervision of students' teaching practice in teacher training institutions in Punjab were investigated.

The study will help decision makers and organizers of teaching practice to overcome the problems during evaluation of teaching practice for the smooth running of teaching practice program.

**Objectives of the Study**

The focus of study was to compare the evaluation methods of teaching practice implemented in formal and non-formal teacher education institutions and to analyze the effectiveness of teaching practice at formal and non-formal teacher education institutions.
Review of Literature

A number of terms such as the teaching practice, practice teaching, field studies, in-field experience, school based experience or internship are used to refer to this activity (Taneja, 2000). Teaching Practice is a practical teaching activity by which the prospective teachers are given a chance in real situation to exhibit and improve the pedagogical skill in a specific time period”. (Salawu & Adeoye, 2002). Teaching Practice is a pre-service professional training for concerned persons, aspiring to become teachers with a realistic visualization for sustainable human development (Onyekan, 2000).

According to Practicum Handbook of Queen’s University 2010 (Ontario College of Teachers) the elements of teaching practice are:

1. Professionalism
   (a) Initiative and Dependability
   (b) Discretion & professional Judgment
   (c) Response to Mentorship

2. Supporting a community of Learners
   (a) Promoting a Safe and Trusting Learning Community
   (b) Promoting Student Independence

3. Planning and Preparing
   (a) Use of Curriculum
   (b) Sequencing of Steps in a lesson
   (c) Differentiation
   (d) Resources

4. Lesson Presentation
   (a) Instructional Strategies
   (b) Lesson Management
   (c) Awareness of Classroom Dynamics
   (d) Appropriate and effective use of Language
   (e) Engaging all learners

5. Assessment
   (a) Assessment for Learning
   (b) Assessment as Learning
   (c) Assessment of Learning
Teaching practice is a compulsory component in all the teacher education programs offered in Pakistan except M.Ed (Master of Education). In Pakistan teaching practice duration is very short; it is approximately 4 to 6 weeks. During teaching practice the main focus for prospective teachers is classroom teaching. They are not involved in other activities performed in schools. Therefore, effective learning could not acquire. Prospective teachers are bound to use easy methods of teaching. They are just being taught how to start the lesson; how to control the class. The administration and cooperating teachers of practicing schools are not aware of the evaluation techniques, which are used during teaching practice. Basically two ways are common in Pakistan. Initially these prospective teachers are considered as inferiors teachers and criticized without any good reason. Secondly some cooperating teachers shift their all work load to them. In some teacher education institutions choice of lessons is reserved to the preference of prospective teachers. To evaluate the teaching practice supervisor observe the prospective teacher during teaching in the classroom. Supervisor evaluates the regularity, lesson planning, teaching methods, use of A.V aids, pitch of voice, dress, start and end of lesson, attention of the students, discipline of class, use of black / white board and questioning skills.

**Evaluation of teaching practice**

Punkin (1998) says that the grades awarded by university or college supervisors on teaching practice are not generally considered to be the absolute grade. The absolute grades are determined by a group of external evaluator called “moderators”. There are a number of reasons for having autonomous evaluator to keep an eye on the awarding of grades to students:

1. Supervisors may tend to be harsh in their marking.
2. Supervisors may not be entirely objective about the work of their students.
3. Some may be over liberal with marks to the students.

It is therefore natural to call in neutral evaluators to make sure a fair allocation of absolute grades.

Akbar (2001) suggested that evaluation mode of teaching practice should be internal and evaluation criteria should be made part of teaching practice manual and it should be provided to prospective teachers. A suggested criterion is given here.
1. Quality and quantity of content (mastery over the content)
2. Voice and oral expressions (volume, tone, choice of words, easily understood, power of expression, pronunciation).
3. Lesson plan and preparation.
4. Teaching aids (wise choice, effective use, use of available resources, black board summary).
5. General appearance (dress, facial expression, body gestures).
6. Class discipline (maintaining of students interest, participation, student response, management, makes learning exciting and lively, behavior with students).
7. Use of teaching methods (wise selection, relevant with content).
8. Ability to motivate class students (motivation for good work-habit, achievement of desirable attitude).
9. Quality of questions (clear, varied and thought provoking questions, encouragement of pupil questions, handling questions).
10. Student response/behavior (like the teachers, respect the teacher, take interest in the lessons).

**Methodology**

Prospective teachers of formal and non-formal universities were the population of the study. The sample was drawn through convenient random sampling. From the population 10% was selected as a sample. Four hundred prospective teachers were selected through convenient sampling in which two hundred were from formal institutions and two hundred were from non formal teacher education institution. The sample of the study comprised following two categories:-

1. **Formal teacher education institutions:**
   - University of the Punjab
     1. Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab (Main Campus) Lahore
     2. Federal College of Education, H-9, Islamabad
   - University of Education
     1. University of Education (Lahore, Multan and Attock Campus)
   - III- Fatima Jinnah Women University
     1. Fatima Jinnah Women University (Main campus) Rawalpindi
     2. Elementary College of Education Islamabad
2. Non Formal teacher education institutions

AIOU (Allama Iqbal Open University) Islamabad in Pakistan is a non-formal institution providing the education to masses through correspondence material, distance education system and through open learning system. Following regional centers of non-formal teacher education institution (Allama Iqbal Open University) were selected as sample of the study.

i) Allama Iqbal Open University – Lahore Region
ii) Allama Iqbal Open University – Rawalpindi Region
iii) Allama Iqbal Open University – Multan Region
iv) Allama Iqbal Open University – Attock Region

Data Analysis

Two way chi square ($\chi^2$) technique was used for comparison of the responses of prospective teachers of formal teacher education institutions and non formal teacher education institutions.

Results

Table 1

Prospective teachers are judged by stating lesson’s objectives before starting teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df=4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 1 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 4.20 which is less than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward disagreement. Thus, the statement “Prospective teachers are judged by stating lesson’s objectives before starting teaching” is rejected. This shows that students of both formal and non-formal are not in favour of above statement.
Table 2
Prospective teachers are judged by how well they ask questions to test previous knowledge of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant  df=4  Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 2 shows the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 54.90 which is greater than table value at 0.05 level. Both the respondents have difference in their opinion. Therefore, students of formal university disagreed while students of non-formal university agreed with the statement “Prospective teachers are judged by how well they ask questions to test previous knowledge of students”.

Table 3
Prospective teachers are judged by how well they communicate in class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant  df=4  Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 3 shows the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 16.8 which is greater than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward agreement. Thus, the statement “Prospective teachers are judged by how well they communicate in class” is accepted. This shows that students of both formal and non-formal are in favour of above statement.
Table 4
Prospective teachers are judged by effective non-verbal communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant df=4 Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 4 shows the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 22.60 which is greater than table value at 0.05 level. Both the respondents have difference in their opinion. Therefore, students of formal university agreed while students of non-formal university disagreed with the statement “Prospective teachers are judged by effective non-verbal communication”.

Table 5
Prospective teachers are judged by having sound command over subject matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Significant df=4 Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 5 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 6.40 which is less than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward disagreement. The statement “Prospective teachers are judged by having sound command over subject matter” is rejected. This shows that students of both formal and non-formal are not in favour of above statement.

Table 6
Prospective teachers are judged by mastery over teaching methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant df=4 Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49
Table 6 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 26.90 which is greater than table value at 0.05 level. Both the respondents have difference in their opinion. Therefore, students of formal university agreed while students of non-formal university disagreed with the statement “Prospective teachers are judged by mastery over teaching methods”.

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df=4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 6.6 which is less than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward agreement. There is no difference between the opinions of both the respondents. This shows that both the students formal and non-formal are agreed that prospective teachers are judged by how well presenting the content.

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df=4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 2.57 which is less than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward agreement. There is no difference between the opinions of both the respondents. This shows that both the students formal and non-formal are agreed that the evaluation of prospective teachers during teaching practice is satisfactory.
Table 9
The prospective teachers are awarded with the grades A, B, C, D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant   df=4  Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 9 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 11.28 which is greater than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward agreement. There is no difference between the opinions of both the respondents. This shows that both the students formal and non-formal are agreed that the prospective teachers are awarded with the grades A, B, C, D.

Table 10
The prospective teachers are awarded with the pass/fail at the end of teaching practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant   df=4  Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 10 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 14.49 which is greater than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward agreement. There is no difference between the opinions of both the respondents. This shows that both the students formal and non-formal are agreed that the prospective teachers are awarded with the pass/fail at the end of teaching practice.

Table 11
Supervisor involves the cooperating teacher in the evaluation of prospective teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Significant   df=4  Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49
Table 11 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 9.02 which is less than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward disagreement. The statement “Supervisor involves the cooperating teacher in the evaluation of prospective teachers” is rejected. This shows that students of both formal and non-formal are not in favour of above statement.

### Table 12

*School administration or head of school is involved in the evaluation of prospective teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant  df=4  Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 12 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 10.1 which is greater than table value at 0.05 level as the trend of respondents is toward disagreement. The statement “School administration or head of school is involved in the evaluation of prospective teachers” is rejected. This shows that students of both formal and non-formal are not in favour of above statement.

### Table 13

*Constant feedback is given to the prospective teachers during observation by supervisor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective teachers of Non-Formal University</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant  df=4  Table value at 0.05 level= 9.49

Table 13 shows that the calculated value of $\chi^2$ is 63.1 which is greater than table value at 0.05 level. Both the respondents have difference in their opinion. Students of formal university agreed while students of non-formal university disagreed with the statement “Constant feedback is given to the prospective teachers during observation by supervisor”.
Conclusion

The study leads to following conclusions:

- Prospective teachers were not judged by stating lesson objectives before starting teaching. Prospective teachers of formal university held that supervisors judged them by how well they ask questions to test previous knowledge of the students in class while prospective teachers of non-formal university opinions contradicted it.
- Students of formal university disagreed while students of non-formal university agreed that prospective teachers are judged by how well they ask questions to test previous knowledge of students.
- Both prospective teachers of formal and non-formal university apprehended that supervisor judged them how well they communicate in the class while effective non-verbal communication and command over subject matter were not judged.
- Prospective teachers of formal university held that supervisors judged them by mastery over teaching methods.
- Prospective teachers of formal and non-formal universities projected that the evaluation of prospective teachers during teacher practice was satisfactory. They were awarded with the grades A, B, C, D and some prospective teachers opined that they are awarded with fail/pass at the end of teaching practice.
- The students of formal and non-formal are not agreed that School administration or head of school is involved in the evaluation of prospective teachers.
- Majority of prospective teachers of formal universities intended that supervisor involved the cooperating teacher in their evaluation while prospective teachers of non-formal universities rejected the involvement of cooperating teachers in evaluation and provision of supervisor guidance.
- Prospective teachers of formal university agreed that constant feedback is given to them during observation by supervisor while prospective teachers of non-formal university didn’t receive constant feedback during observation by the supervisor.
Recommendations

- Replication of this study may give a complete picture of teaching practice in different parts of Pakistan. Thus the study may be conducted in other teacher training institutions of Pakistan on much larger scale with more number of respondents.
- There must be training on evaluation process of teaching practice for supervisors before starting the teaching practice and there is a need to give orientation and teaching workshops to cooperating teachers regarding evaluation of teaching practice.
- As mostly the evaluation of teaching practice is summative, thus it is recommended that formative assessment and evaluation and continuous observations may be introduced as it may serve as a basis for prospective teachers’ growth and development in their professional training.
- Evaluation of teaching practice should be both internal by university supervisor and external by experts in the field of education and cooperating teachers maybe involved in the process of evaluation of prospective teachers.
- There is a need to put in place a continuous system of monitoring and evaluation of teaching practice including observations of prospective teachers for both formal and non-formal teacher education institutions.
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