

Chapter 5

Major Findings and Discussion

Chapter 5

Major Findings and Discussion

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a comprehensive overview of the research followed by major findings and a discussion of the research in detail. The researcher conducted a study of B.Ed. school internship programme in Gujarat. The objectives of the study were: 1. To study the current practices of the school internship programme. 2. To study the roles of Supervisors, School Principals, Mentors, and student-teachers during the School Internship Programme. 3. To study the Experiences of school principals, mentors, and student-teachers during the school internship. 4. To study the Expectations of Supervisors, School Principals, Mentors Student-teachers, regarding the School Internship Programme. To study the problems faced by Supervisors, School Principals, Mentors, and Student-teachers during the school internship programme. 6. To suggest measures for improvement of the School Internship Programme. A descriptive survey method was employed. Multistage sampling was used for the present study. All the student-teachers, 10 conveners of school internship, and 40 supervisors from the five grant-in-aid TEIs and five private TEIs affiliated with the state universities were selected as sample of the study. 20 school principals and 40 mentors of the internship schools in which student-teachers went for the internship also consisted of the sample. The researcher prepared research tools such as an information schedule, questionnaire, and semi-structured interview for the data collection. All the research tools were validated by the experts. The researcher collected the data personally and quantitative data was analyzed by frequency and percentage and content analysis was done by using QDA Miner Lite for the study. The major findings and discussion of the research are as follows.

5.1 Major Findings

5.1.1 Current Practices of School Internship

□ Structure of the School Internship Programme

1. The majority of teacher education institutions emphasized microteaching, bridge lessons, and stray lessons during the pre-school internship in 1st semester. Four teacher

education institutions conducted block teaching in 2nd semester, while other teacher education institutions conducted it across the different semesters.

2. The majority of teacher education institutions conducted School Internship during the 3rd semester, while some teacher education institutions conducted school internship during the 3rd and 4th semesters.
3. The majority of teacher education institutions conducted annual test lessons in the 4th semester while two teacher education institutions conducted it in the 3rd semester.
4. The majority of teacher education institutions conducted viva in 3rd semester, except the two teacher education institutions.

□ **Microteaching**

1. All the teacher education institutions conducted microteaching in 1st semester for duration varied from one week to one month.
2. All TEIs emphasized on teaching skills such as introduction, questioning, reinforcement, illustrating with examples, blackboard work, and stimulus variation. Two institutions also focused on the skill of probing and audio-visual aids during the microteaching.
3. In all the teacher education institutions, supervisors and fellow students observed and provided feedback to the student-teachers and only supervisors assessed the student-teachers during the microteaching.

□ **Bridge Lessons**

1. The majority of six teacher education institutions (TEIs) organized bridge lessons after completion of microteaching during the 1st semester of the B.Ed. Programme.
2. The duration of bridge lessons ranged from one day to one week, teaching duration varied from 12 minutes to 35 minutes, and number of lessons varied from 2 to 4. Student-teachers integrated all the teaching skills and prepared the lesson plans.
3. The supervisors and fellow students observed and provided feedback to the student-teachers in all six teacher education institutions and supervisors assessed the student-teachers.

□ **Stray Lessons**

1. Six teacher education institutions focused on stray lessons after the completion of microteaching and bridge lessons in the 1st and 2nd semesters of the B.Ed. Programme.

2. Student-teachers were required to integrate all the teaching skills; the duration of teaching was 35 minutes, and the number of lessons varied from 5-10.
3. In all six teacher education institutions, supervisors allotted the schools to the student-teachers for stray lessons, provided feedback, and assessed the student-teachers.

□ **Block Teaching**

1. All the teacher education institutions organized block teaching in different semesters of B.Ed. programme in schools and schools were allotted by supervisors.
2. The duration of block teaching varied between 7 to 12 days across institutions, the duration of teaching was 35 minutes, and the number of lessons prepared by student-teachers varied from 8 to 10.
3. In all the teacher education institutions, supervisors visited schools daily, observed classes of student-teachers, provided feedback, and assessed the student-teachers.

□ **Activities performed by student-teachers during the Block Teaching**

1. The majority of the teacher education institutions allotted different activities to student-teachers during block teaching.
2. Four TEIs were assigned to prepare a blueprint, while two of these four TEIs also assigned classroom observation to the student-teachers, while the other four TEIs assigned tasks like organizing assemblies, co-curricular activities, and preparation of bulletin boards. Among these, two TEIs also focused on cultural programme, and two on psychology tests, diagnostic tests, and remedial teaching.

□ **School Internship**

1. Six TEIs conducted school internship in 3rd semester, and four TEIs conducted school internship in 3rd and 4th semester of B.Ed. programme, the duration of internship varied from twelve weeks to sixteen weeks, and the number of lessons prepared by student-teachers varied from 5 to 60.
2. Both supervisors and mentors assessed the student-teachers during the school internship in eight teacher education institutions whereas in the other two teacher education institutions, only supervisors assessed the student-teachers during the internship.
3. In eight TEIs, student-teachers selected the school for school internship, while in two TEIs, the District Education Officer (DEO) allotted the schools to the student-teachers.

□ **Activities performed by Student-teachers during the SIP**

1. All the teacher education institutions assigned diverse tasks to student-teachers during the school internship.
2. The majority of eight teacher education institutions assigned activities such as action research and school teachers' classroom observation to the student-teachers during the school internship.
3. Six teacher education institutions assigned various activities to student-teachers, including preparing teaching-learning materials (TLM), maintaining log books, creating school calendars and reports, preparing blueprints, organizing co-curricular and community-related activities, and conducting case studies.
4. Four teacher education institutions assigned activities such as conducting psychology tests, organizing cultural programme, maintaining reflective diaries, and continuing comprehensive evaluation of students.
5. Two teacher education institutions emphasized organizing assembly programme, conducting interviews with management authorities, performing diagnostic tests and remedial teaching, attending parents' meetings, yoga sessions, and club activities, managing school libraries and laboratories, preparing bulletin boards, and engaging in project work.

□ **Distribution of marks of School Internship**

1. Four TEIs assigned more weightage to the school internship activities than the remaining six institutions.
2. Four TEIs assigned less than 30% weightage for the school internship programme.
3. Six TEIs assigned lower marks to the annual lessons, while the other four TEIs assigned 100 marks to the annual lessons.
4. Six TEIs assigned more weightage to school internship viva than the other four teacher education institutions.

□ **Assigned marks by different personnel to school internship activities**

1. Supervisors had more weightage for assessing the student-teachers in eight TEIs, while in two TEIs, supervisors and mentors had more weightage for assessing the student-teachers.

2. Mentors assessed activities that were carried out by the student-teachers in schools during the internship in six TEIs, while mentors assessed student-teachers' performance in annual test lessons only in four TEIs.

□ **School internship-related orientation to the student-teachers**

1. All the student-teachers received the orientation related to the school internship, such as the duration and objectives of the internship, activities that had to be performed by student-teachers, and submission work.
2. They also oriented about basic information about the school, teaching method, and the number of lesson plans to prepare during the internship.

□ **Selection of schools during the School Internship Programme**

1. 79.49% of student-teachers selected schools themselves for an internship, while 12.30% of student-teachers responded that TEIs were allotted to them, and only 8.20% mentioned that the government allotted the schools to them.

□ **Types of Internship Schools**

1. 57.22% of student-teachers had completed the internship in government schools. 14.45% of student-teachers completed in grant-in-aid schools, while another 14.45% completed in government and private schools. Only 2.55% of student-teachers experienced all three different types of schools

□ **Internship of student-teachers across various school levels**

1. 25.98% of student-teachers taught secondary and higher secondary classes, 22.27% of student-teachers taught upper primary and secondary classes, whereas 29.29% did not get opportunities to teach in secondary and higher secondary classes.
2. 12.5% of student-teachers taught in secondary classes, while 9.96% only taught in higher secondary classes.

□ **School-related orientation to the student-teachers**

1. 73.05% of student-teachers were oriented about the school, while 26.95% were not oriented during the school internship programme.
2. 63.10% of student-teachers were oriented about the schools by school principals, and 14.70% and 12.57% were oriented by mentors and supervisors, respectively.

3. They were oriented on basic information about schools, rules, and regulations of schools, the nature of school students, and school staff. They also oriented about teaching method of schools and presentation of lesson plans.

□ **Supervisors visit to schools during the school internship**

1. Only 23.24% of student-teachers responded that supervisors visited the school, but 35.29% responded that they came only once throughout the school internship, while 49.58% of student-teachers responded that they visited monthly, and only 9.24% responded that they visited weekly.

□ **Meeting with supervisors during the Internship**

1. 69.75% of student-teachers met with the supervisors during the internship, while 30.25% responded that supervisors came only for attendance.
2. They discussed problems faced by student-teachers during the internship and submission work. They also discussed the school principals' and teachers' support and experiences with students and during the teaching.

□ **Observation of classes of student-teachers**

1. Only 6.64% of student-teachers responded that supervisors observed the classes of student teachers during the school internship, 22.66% of student-teachers responded that school principals observed, and 54.49% of student-teachers responded that mentors observed.

□ **Feedback to the student-teachers**

1. Only 6.64% of student-teachers responded that supervisors provided feedback to them during the school internship, while 37.06% of student-teachers responded that school principals provided feedback, and 70.97% responded that mentors provided feedback.
2. They provided feedback related to the method of teaching, lesson plans, classroom management, skills of teaching, and use of teaching aids during the teaching.
3. All the supervisors provided feedback in both written and oral format. At the same time, 72.09% of student-teachers responded that school principals provided feedback only in oral form, and 27.91% of student-teachers responded that they provided feedback in both forms. 73.02% of student-teachers responded that mentors provided feedback in both forms, and 26.98% responded that mentors provided feedback only in oral form.

□ Examine the Documents

1. 93.17% of student-teachers responded that the journal was examined; however, from those respondents, 53.06% of student-teachers responded that the journal was examined after the completion of the school internship. 4.88% of student-teachers responded that the journal was not examined.
2. 82.22% of student-teachers responded that the observation book examined. From these respondents, 50.35% of student-teachers responded that the observation book was examined after completing the school internship. 9.98% of student-teachers only get signed it, and 8.40% responded that the observation book was not examined.
3. 50.98% of student-teachers responded that the reflective diary was examined. From these respondents, 72.80% of student-teachers responded that a reflective diary was examined after completing the school internship. 14.06% responded that the observation book was not examined and 3.71% of student-teachers only get signed.

5.1.2 Roles of Supervisors during the School Internship

□ School internship-related orientation to the student-teachers

1. All the supervisors responded that they provided orientation related to internship to the student-teachers. They oriented about the duration of the internship, general guidelines, and academic and administrative tasks that student-teachers had to perform in schools.

□ School internship-related orientation to the school principals

1. Only 15% of supervisors responded that they provided orientation related to the overall purpose of the internship and the roles of school principals and mentors, and internship activities that performed by student-teachers to the school principals.

□ Supervisors visit schools during the school internship

1. 72.50% of supervisors visited the internship schools nearer to the teacher education institutions during the school internship programme whereas 27.50% of supervisors did not visit schools.
2. 32.50% of supervisors visited the school once a week, 15% of supervisors visited once within fifteen days, and 20.69% visited once a month.

□ Meeting with School Principals during the school internship

1. 72.50% of supervisors met with the school principal during the internship programme. Among them, 44.83% of supervisors met with the school principal weekly, while

34.48% met once within 15 days and 20.69% of supervisors met with the principal once a month.

2. 40% of the supervisors discussed the preparation of files and the regularity and progress of student-teachers. Meanwhile, 25% of supervisors focused on whether student-teachers carried out their work properly, attended classes, and actively participated in activities. The remaining 7.50% of supervisors discussed student-teacher performance and provided support for their school internship work, including teaching them about the functions of a clerk.

□ **Meeting with student-teachers during the internship**

1. 72.50% of supervisors responded that they conducted meeting with the student-teachers during the school internship programme. They discussed the submission work, their experiences related to the school and students, and the progress of their work with the student-teachers.

□ **Observation of Student-teachers**

1. 50% of supervisors observed the classes of student-teachers during the school internship, while 50% of supervisors did not observe.
2. 20% of supervisors observed student-teachers' classes for 15 minutes. 17.50% of supervisors observed for 5-7 minutes, and 12.50% observed the entire class.
3. 15% of supervisors observed 2-3 classes, while 35% observed 5-6 classes of student-teachers during the school internship programme.

□ **Feedback to the student-teachers**

1. 50% of supervisors provided feedback to the student-teachers during the school internship, while 50% of supervisors did not provide it. 27.50% of supervisors provide feedback orally, while 22.50% provide it in both written and oral formats.
2. 32.50% of supervisors provided feedback related to teaching methods, teaching skills, and logical sequence of teaching, and 17.50% of supervisors provided on classroom management.

□ **Examine the Documents**

1. 60% of supervisors examined the documents after completion of the school internship, 22.50% of supervisors examined weekly, and 17.50% of supervisors examined within 15 days during the internship.

□ **Assessment of student-teachers**

1. All supervisors responded that they assessed the student-teachers during the internship. They assessed the lesson plans and various activities, such as conducting action research, psychological tests, case studies, and co-curricular activities. They also assessed different reports such as school reports, school records, and administrative work.

5.1.3 Roles of School Principals during the School Internship

□ **Awareness about the school Internship Programme**

1. 90% of school principals received information about the School Internship Programme through letters from the teacher education institution.
2. All school principals were informed about the duration of the school internship programme, the number of student-teachers, and the subjects of student-teachers.
3. Only 10% of school principals received information about the duration of the internship programme, the role of the school, and the activities that student-teachers had to perform in school through meetings organized by the teacher education institutions.

□ **Visit the Teacher Education Institutions**

1. 80% of school principals had not visited teacher education institutions for meetings or orientations related to the school internship programme. Only 10% of school principals visited for meetings related to internship, and 10% of school principals visited as supervisors invited them for functions or personal friendships with supervisors.

□ **School Principals meeting with supervisors**

1. 60% of school principals met with supervisors weekly during the school internship programme. They discussed punctuality and regularity of student-teachers, implementation of lessons and activities, teaching quality, and both positive and negative aspects of student-teachers, while 40% of school principals did not meet with supervisors during the internship programme.

□ **School principals meeting with student-teachers**

1. All school principals conducted meetings with student-teachers during the school internship programme.

2. 40% of school principals held weekly meetings, 25% of school principals conducted monthly, 20% of school principals had meetings every fifteen days, and 15% of school principals conducted daily meetings.
3. School principals discuss the teaching method, lesson plans, classroom management, and participation in school activities.

□ **Orientation related to schools to student-teachers**

1. 65% of school principals provided comprehensive information about their schools to student-teachers, including historical background, establishment date, class and student numbers, facilities, curriculum, co-curricular activities, timetable structure, register maintenance, and administrative details.
2. 25% of school principals provided the details that the teacher education institute had instructed the students to get specific details from their schools.
3. 10% of school principals did not provide information as they believed student-teachers were already familiar with the school.

□ **Student-teachers' attendance sheet**

1. 45% of school principals maintained attendance records for student-teachers during the school internship, while 55% did not maintain attendance registers.

□ **Observation of student-teachers**

1. 55% of school principals observed classes of student-teachers, while 45% did not observe the classes.
2. 25% of school principals observed classes of student-teachers for 10 to 15 minutes, 20% of school principals observed for 2 to 3 minutes, and 10% observed the entire duration of student-teachers' classes.
3. 20% of school principals observed 5-10 classes of student-teachers during the school internship, while another 20% of school principals observed five classes, and 15% of school principals observed 2-3 classes.

□ **Feedback to Student-teachers**

1. 35% of school principals provided feedback to the student-teachers during the school internship, while 20% did not provide any feedback.

2. 25% of school principals gave oral feedback only, and 10% of school principals provided feedback in both written and oral formats. They provide feedback related to classroom management and methods of teaching.

☐ **Examine the student-teachers' documents**

1. 55% of school principals examined documents such as journals, observation books, and reflective diaries of student-teachers during the school internship programme, while 45% did not.
2. 45% of school principals examined documents weekly, while 10% reviewed them after completing the internship.

☐ **Assessment of the student-teachers**

1. 65% of school principals assessed the student-teachers during the school internship programme, whereas 35% of school principals did not assess them.
2. They assessed lesson plans and reports that student-teachers prepared during the internship. They assessed school reports, logbooks, portfolios of students, school records, and the preparation of teaching-learning material.

5.1.4 Roles of Mentors during the School Internship

☐ **Awareness about the school Internship Programme**

1. All mentors received information about the school internship programme verbally from school principals. School Principals conveyed details, including the duration of a school internship programme, the list of student-teachers, and the subjects assigned to them.

☐ **Mentors visit the Teacher Education Institution**

1. None of the mentors attended any orientation programme or meetings related to the school internship programme at teacher education institutions. Only 10% of mentors visited teacher education institutions for training purposes only.

☐ **Mentors meeting with Supervisor**

1. 52.50% of mentors had meetings with supervisors during the school internship, while 47.50% did not.
2. 27.50% of mentors met once within fifteen days, 15% of mentors met once a month, and 10% of mentors met once a week.

3. They discussed student-teachers' regularity, internship quality, overall performance, improvements, and behaviour and encountered challenges during the school internship.

□ **Facilities to the student-teachers**

1. All mentors responded that they provided facilities such as a staff room, teaching aids, an ICT room, a library, and a laboratory. They also provided equipment to the student-teachers.

□ **Orientation related to schools to the student-teachers**

1. 95% of mentors provided orientation related to academic aspects, administrative work, and school facilities with student-teachers, while 5% of mentors provided information based on specific requests from student-teachers.

□ **Observation of student-teachers**

1. All mentors observed student-teacher classes during the school internship programme whereas among these, 10% of mentors responded that they did not observe student-teacher classes when they were occupied with their school work, and 5% were occupied with their school tasks during the observation.
2. 57.50% of mentors observed 15 classes of student-teachers during the school internship, 22.50% of mentors observed 15-20, and 20% of mentors observed classes daily.
3. 57.50% of mentors dedicated the entire class duration (35 minutes) to observation, 22.50% of mentors spent 5-10 minutes, and 20% spent 15-20 minutes.

□ **Feedback to the student-teachers**

1. All mentors provided feedback to student-teachers on teaching methods, blackboard skills, explanation skills, content, classroom and time management, and both positive and negative points.
2. 57.50% of mentors provided daily feedback, 30% provided feedback once a week and 12.50% provided feedback twice a week.
3. 55% of mentors provided feedback in both oral and written forms, while 45% of mentors provided orally.

□ **Examine the Documents**

1. 40% of mentors examined lesson plans, observation books, and reflective diaries of student-teachers, while 60% of mentors only signed these documents.

2. 56.25% of mentors examined weekly, 31.25% examined daily, and 12.50% four times weekly.

□ **Assessment of the student-teachers**

1. 32.50% of mentors assessed student-teachers during the school internship programme using assessment formats provided by teacher education institutions, while 67.50% of mentors did not assess.

5.1.5 Roles of Student-teachers during the School Internship

□ **Observation of school teachers during the school internship**

1. All student-teachers responded that they observed the classes of school teachers. The majority, 57.81%, of student-teachers responded that they observed the ten classes of school teachers, while 36.65% observed the thirty lessons of school teachers.

□ **Analysis of Syllabus and Textbook**

1. 38.48% of student-teachers analyzed the textbook and syllabi during the school internship, while 61.52% did not.
2. 41.12% of student-teachers analyzed textbook and syllabi based on students' abilities, interests, and intellectual levels, while 31.47% of student-teachers focused on real-life examples and content, figures, and image appropriateness. 18.78% of student-teachers considered internal and external textbook characteristics, while 8.63% emphasized specific times in which content could be covered.

□ **Meeting with School Principals**

1. 83.40% of student-teachers had meetings with the school principal during their school internship, while 16.60% of student-teachers did not.
2. 24.12% of student-teachers met with the school principal once a month, 19.43% of student-teachers had meetings once within fifteen days, 14.52% of student-teachers responded that school principals conducted meetings weekly, and 6.32% of student-teachers had meetings daily. 1.89% of student-teachers mentioned that *“the school principal came to school twice a week”*.
3. 33.72% of student-teachers met school principals only for signature and stamp, permission for leave, and organize activities; 27.56% of student-teachers discussed the annual function and celebration of festivals, and 18.73% of student-teachers discussed

curriculum implementation, course completion, and lesson plans. 13.43% of student-teachers discussed related to the school students.

□ **Observation of fellow students**

1. All student-teachers observed classes of fellow students. A majority, 54.30% of student-teachers, responded that they observed ten classes, while 25% of student-teachers observed twenty-five classes.

□ **Case Study**

1. 77.73% of student-teachers conducted case studies during the school internship, while 22.27% did not.
2. 83.42% of student-teachers selected students' performance, disinterest in studies, mischievous behaviour, and feelings of loneliness, while 9.04% of student-teachers focused on disabled students, emphasizing inclusive education.
3. 7.54% of student-teachers explored diverse institutions such as meditation centers, healthcare hospitals, NGOs, and women's home industries, highlighting a comprehensive approach to educational research.

□ **Preparation of the lesson plans**

1. All student-teachers prepared one unit plan for each teaching method during the block teaching and 66.41% of student-teachers prepared at least fifteen lesson plans during the school internship programme, while 33.59% prepared at least sixty lesson plans.

□ **Preparation of the Blueprint**

1. 93.75% of student-teachers prepared the question papers during the school internship, while 6.25% of student-teachers did not.
2. 33.75% of student-teachers followed a prescribed blueprint for preparing question papers, while 9.17% of student-teachers followed the blueprint but lacked knowledge about its components, and 57.08% did not follow it.

□ **Preparation of the Assessment tool**

1. 23.05% of student-teachers prepared assessment tools for various school competitions, such as patriotic songs and costume competitions. 76.95% of student-teachers did not prepare.

□ **Preparation of the Diagnostic test**

1. 30.66% of student-teachers prepared diagnostic tests during their school internship programme, while 69.34% of student-teachers did not prepare.

□ **Conduct remedial classes**

1. 48.24% of student-teachers conducted remedial teaching to school students during their school internship, while 51.76% of student-teachers did not conduct it.
2. 32.39% of student-teachers addressed subject-specific doubts, 24.70% of student-teachers focused on basic skills like reading, writing, and counting, and 16.19% of student-teachers conducted as part of their action research.
3. 10.12% of student-teachers addressed difficulties in reading and writing in the English subject, while 8.5% of student-teachers participated in the Mission Vidhya initiative. 8.10% of student-teachers focused on students who lacked basic skills, including subtraction and alphabet knowledge.

□ **Action research**

1. 76.76% of student-teachers conducted action research during their school internship programme, while 23.24% of student-teachers did not.
2. 58.02% of student-teachers had a proper understanding of the process of action research, while 41.98% of student-teachers lacked knowledge of it.
3. 45.80% of student-teachers spent one week completing the action research, 35.37% dedicated two weeks, 9.92% spent twenty-five days, and 8.91% completed their action research within a single class.

□ **Term paper**

1. Only 8.59% of student-teachers wrote term papers as part of their school internship programme, while 91.41% of student-teachers did not write.
2. Among 8.59% of student-teachers who wrote term papers, 4.30% of student-teachers had written on specific subjects for teaching like Hindi, Gujarati, English, Science, Mathematics, and Sanskrit and 4.30% of student-teachers explored broader topics related to Gandhian principles and their application in education, covering diverse subjects such as cleanliness, unemployment, moral value education, and the challenges in present education systems.

□ **Reflective Dairy**

1. 68.75% of student-teachers maintained reflective diaries during their school internship programme, while 31.25% did not.
2. 51.14% of student-teachers recorded daily activities and completed tasks, 25.85% documented teaching work experiences, activity planning, and classroom interactions, and 5.40% reflected on the emotional aspects of their teaching roles.

□ **Cultural Programme**

1. 86.72% of student-teachers actively organized cultural programs in the schools where they completed their internship, while 13.28% did not.

□ **Community-related activities**

1. 72.85% of student-teachers organized community-related activities during the school internship, while 27.15% did not organize.
2. They conducted different activities, including plantation, cleanliness campaigns, rallies on save girls, save waters, women empowerment, T.B. free India and other topics, environment awareness programme, blood donation camps, parent contact activities, and initiatives addressing social issues.
3. 45.31% organized community activities for one week, 37.53% of student-teachers spent ten days, and 17.16% dedicated fifteen days.

□ **Administrative activities**

1. 16.21% of student-teachers did not meet non-teaching staff and had not done any administrative work.
2. 83.79% of student-teachers had done administrative work, but 50.58% of student-teachers had done only the work assigned by the teacher education institutions, while 49.42% of student-teachers filled up online attendance, maintained different registers, involved in the distribution of bicycles, and prepared leaving certificates, students' ID cards and certificates.

5.1.6 Experiences of School Principals during the school internship

1. School principals shared the experiences that student-teachers lacked the content mastery and did not use teaching learning material during the teaching. Student-teachers had no idea about the reference book, used the blackboard inappropriately, and did not manage the classroom appropriately.

2. They were not serious about the internship and lack of clarity about their responsibilities. They came only to complete their internship work; they did not think about students' learning outcome.
3. Student-teachers came to the school, and the school planning was disturbed because school teachers had no time for revision.
4. School principals were also concerned about them because they felt that student-teachers were being exploited as they were not provided stipends.
5. The school principal did not give permission if they had enough staff, and they did not observe the classes and gave the certificates to the student-teachers. Even one principal said that observation of classes is not our duty and they observed only when student-teachers teach very well.
6. Few school principals responded that student-teachers did well in schools and schools get support because sometimes few school teachers have BLO (Booth level officer) work, and few teachers go for training; at that time, student-teachers managed classes very well.

5.1.7 Experiences of Mentors during the school internship

1. Mentors described the experiences that school students knew that student-teachers came for a few days, so they misbehaved in the classroom.
2. Student-teachers were hard-working in schools and learned during the internship. Sometimes, staff was absent, so the schools got benefits from student-teachers.
3. Mentors observed the classes only for 5-10 minutes. If student-teachers taught innovatively, then they observed the whole class. They also told student-teachers that they had to show their lectures, so they could not sit in all classes.
4. Student-teachers were not serious and just came for a certificate, lacked content mastery, did not come with the preparation for the lecture, had no idea how to prepare the lesson plans, and a few student-teachers just copied from YouTube. Student-teachers focused more on marks.
5. Sometimes, supervisors came just for the shake and did superficial work.

5.1.8 Experiences of Student-teachers during the school internship

□ Learning During a School Internship

1. 49.02% of student-teachers had favorable experiences during the internship as they developed professional growth, administrative skills, teaching skills, classroom management school, organization skills, professionalism, and communication skills.
2. They also understood the roles of the teacher, enhanced their confidence in collaborative learning, and gradually adjusted to a school environment.

□ Experiences with School Principals

1. 63.35% of student-teachers shared their favourable experiences with the school principals as they responded that school principals were supportive, involved in school activities, and even school principals oriented about schools.
2. 36.65% described their unfavourable experiences with school principals. They responded that they were not supportive, sometimes isolated the student-teachers, assigned work forcefully, lacked encouragement and biased behaviour by the school principal, and even regular classes were not assigned to them.

□ Experiences with Mentors

1. 73.25% of student-teachers had favourable experiences with school teachers. They mentioned that school teachers were supportive and cooperative. They guided the student-teachers during the school internship.
2. 26.75% of student-teachers had unfavourable experiences with school teachers because sometimes school teachers' behaviour was not appropriate, not supportive, and inefficient mentors were there.

□ Experiences with schools

1. 33.33% of student-teachers had favourable experiences with the schools. They responded that they got an opportunity to teach again where they studied. So, they were already familiar with the school. The schools celebrated different days and organized different competitions.
2. 66.67% of student-teachers had unfavourable experiences with the school. They reported that there was a lack of school teachers, lack of discipline, and lack of facilities. They also said that school principals were assigned to teach lower classes, and the school environment was unorganized.

□ **Experiences with school students**

1. 65.97% of student-teachers had favourable experiences with school students. They described that students were cooperative and actively participated in all activities. Students respected the student-teachers, and they formed emotional bonds with school students. Even students cried when they left the school. Students were disciplined and also interested in learning.
2. 34.03% of student-teachers had unfavourable experiences with school students during the school internship. They responded that some schools' students could not even read and write. They did not even do the basic mathematical operations. Even students' behaviour was not appropriate and notorious. Students did not participate in different co-curricular activities and were not supportive. Students were not interested in learning and did not complete their assignments. Students were irregular in the schools, which affected their learning.

□ **Experiences with Supervisors**

1. 71.05% of student-teachers had favourable experiences. They described that supervisors were very encouraging and supportive.
2. Moreover, 28.95% of student-teachers had unfavourable experiences with their supervisors because they were not satisfied with their marks.

□ **Memorable Experiences**

1. 27.93% of student-teachers had memorable experiences during the school internship programme. Many programmes such as cultural programs, annual functions, and competitions were organized in school. So, student-teachers were involved in all the activities, guided the students, and built a bond. Even school principals and teachers praised them.
2. Student-teachers felt like they were permanent teachers in school. They felt happy when students provided good compliments related to their teaching. Student-teachers enjoyed the internship and learned with fun.

□ **Experiences related to teaching**

1. 10.55% of student-teachers expressed their experiences while teaching in the classroom. Student-teachers had fears initially, but gradually, reduced the stage of fear

and students were also cooperative. Sometimes, student-teachers were assigned more subjects and proxy lectures to engage the students.

2. Student-teachers faced problems related to time management as they were assigned many tasks and limited time for teaching. They faced challenges to engage the students in learning. They faced classroom management problems as there were 80-90 students in class, and 9th standard students could not do basic calculations, so they faced difficulty in teaching the further concepts.
3. They felt that the duration was less, so it was difficult to complete the assigned tasks, and sometimes, they could not focus on school internship work.

☐ **Experiences with Parents**

1. 3.13% of student-teachers shared their unpleasant experiences with school parents as teachers scolded the students; parents came the next day and misbehaved with those teachers.

☐ **Experiences with fellow students**

1. 2.92% of student-teachers had unfavourable experiences with fellow students. There was a lack of communication among the student-teachers, and few student-teachers did not take regular classes in the school. So, they were fighting with each other.

5.1.9 Expectations of Supervisors during the School Internship

☐ **Duration of School Internship Programme**

1. 65% of supervisors expected that the duration of the school internship should be five months. They believed that this allows comprehensive training for the student-teachers; they can develop personal growth, teaching skills, and an in-depth understanding of school functioning. Student-teachers can also improve their confidence levels and acquire a realistic understanding of classroom dynamics.
2. 35% of supervisors preferred a shorter school internship period of one month as they mentioned issues related to school selection and student-teachers' dedication. They also believed that the required work could be accomplished within one month. They said that if the duration of an internship is long, a situation may arise where some student-teachers do not attend school regularly.

□ **When School Internship to be organized?**

1. 57.50% of supervisors expressed that the school internship should be in the 4th semester. They argued that by this stage, student-teachers would have acquired theoretical knowledge up to the 3rd semester, making the 4th semester an ideal time for practical application. It provides a smooth transition between the internship and academic studies, allows continuous practice, and prepares the future teaching role.
2. 42.50% of supervisors responded that the internship should be conducted in the 3rd and 4th semesters. They argued that the foundational knowledge acquired in the first two semesters would provide a strong theoretical background before practical experiences and improved mistakes as they have done in 3rd semester in schools during the school internship.

□ **Selection of Schools for internship**

1. 42.50% of supervisors expected that teacher education institutions should allot schools to student-teachers for internship as they allot schools where they can implement knowledge and teaching skills. They also responded that some student-teachers choose schools based on personal connections and nearer to their residence area which is challenging for monitoring and observation of student-teachers.
2. 50% of supervisors expected student-teachers should have the autonomy to select their schools; due to this, student-teachers' commuting difficulties were reduced, increased dedication towards schools' duties.
3. One supervisor expected that student-teachers should select schools in government settings, while teacher education institutions should select the schools when the schools are private.

□ **Organizing internship in various types of Schools**

1. 35% of supervisors expected the school internship to be conducted in government schools because student-teachers can learn effectively and know the rules and regulations of the schools. They also believed that private schools provide certificates to the student-teachers without performing activities and do not give the student-teachers permission for internship and regular classes.

2. 42.50% of supervisors expected that school internship should be conducted in all types of schools, including government, grant-in-aid, and private so that they can acquire valuable experiences from all three schools.
3. 7.50% of supervisors responded that internship should be conducted in government and private schools. Their reasoning emphasized that student-teachers can understand the functioning of both school types and learning from different environments.
4. 5.00% of supervisors expected internship to be in private schools. They responded that student-teachers benefit from facilities, regular teaching staff, and the availability of resources.
5. 5.00% mentioned internship should be in government and grant-in-aid schools as these schools provide facilities and opportunities to the student-teachers.

□ **A number of student-teachers in schools**

1. 60% of supervisors expected that three to four student-teachers should be allocated to each school for the internship programme, while 40% of supervisors anticipated that a minimum of two student-teachers should be allocated to a single school for the internship programme.

□ **Internship orientation to School Principals and teachers**

1. 67.50% of supervisors expected that orientation should be provided to the school principals and school teachers related to school internship as they opined that it could help newly joined teachers in task allocation, preparation of school timetable, and ensuring that student-teachers' activities align with the objectives and goals of the internship. Student-teachers can organize activities effectively and receive support from the schools during the internship, whereas 13 (32.50%) supervisors responded that it was unnecessary to provide orientation to school principals and teachers.
2. 67.50% of supervisors mentioned that the duration of internship, activities that student-teachers have to perform in schools, information related to student-teachers and their subjects, observing and assessing the student-teachers, and involving them in school activities should be oriented.

□ **School-related orientation to the student-teachers**

1. 85% of supervisors expected that information related to schools should be provided to the student-teachers. So that they can be aware of the culture, values, and environment

of the schools, it can be helpful to prepare lesson plans accordingly and understand the policies and characteristics of the schools.

2. 15% of supervisors responded that some student-teachers have already adequate knowledge of the schools due to prior experiences, so it is unnecessary to provide information to them.
3. 88.24% of supervisors expected that school principals should provide information related to schools to the student-teachers. They expected that school principals should provide details about the intellectual level of students, the school's staff (both teaching and non-teaching), infrastructure, curriculum, and teaching methods to the student-teachers.
4. 11.76% of supervisors expressed the expectation that teacher education institutions should be responsible for providing school-related information, focusing on the school environment and the teachers at the school.

□ Preparation of Lesson Plans during the school internship

1. 85% of supervisors expected that student-teachers should prepare the lesson plans during the school internship to develop the habit of preparing it, get an in-depth understanding of a concept, implement lessons effectively, and manage time properly.
2. 15% of supervisors expected that lesson planning is unnecessary. They had concerns about the workload and the belief that student-teachers have sufficient knowledge from previous experiences, such as microteaching and stray lessons.

□ Number of Lesson Plans prepared by student-teachers

1. 50% of supervisors expected that student-teachers should prepare thirty lesson plans during the school internship, while 32.50% of supervisors anticipated that student-teachers should prepare lesson plans for all the classes. 17.50% of supervisors expected that a minimum of ten lesson plans should be prepared by student-teachers during the internship.

□ Supervisors visit schools during a school internship programme

1. 45% of supervisors expected that supervisors should visit the schools once a week, while 27.5% of supervisors expected they should visit within fifteen days. 15% of supervisors expected that they should visit twice a week, while 12.5% of supervisors mentioned they should visit monthly.

□ **Observation of the fellow students' classes**

1. 50% of supervisors expected method teachers should observe the classes taught by student-teachers, while 25% of supervisors expected that school teachers and principals should observe the classes of student-teachers. 15% supervisors expected that only school principals should observe the classes.
2. Only 10% of supervisors expected that school principals, school teachers, and supervisors should collectively conduct observations of the classes taught by student-teachers during the school internship programme.

□ **Feedback to the student-teachers**

1. 50% of supervisors expected method teachers should provide feedback to student-teachers, while 25% of supervisors expected that school teachers and principals should provide, 15% of supervisors specifically expected that school principals should provide, and 10% of supervisors expected that school principals, school teachers, and supervisors should collectively provide feedback to student-teachers.

□ **Assessment of student-teachers during the school internship**

1. 32.50% of supervisors expected that student-teachers should be assessed by multiple stakeholders, including supervisors, school principals, and school teachers, and 22.50% of supervisors expected that both supervisors and mentors should do an assessment. 17.50% of supervisors expected that only supervisors should be responsible for assessment, 15% of supervisors expected that mentors should assess, and only 10% of supervisors specifically expected that school principals should be involved in assessment.
2. Only one supervisor expressed the expectation that supervisors and school principals should be responsible for assessing student-teachers during the school internship programme.

□ **Stipends to the student-teachers**

1. 72.50% of supervisors expected that student-teachers should be provided stipends during the school internship. It reduces financial stress, covers expenses associated with internship, and acts as a motivational factor.
2. 27.50% of supervisors considered it was not necessary to provide stipends to the student-teachers, as they believed student-teachers should be motivated by their

dedication to the profession rather than financial stipends. They also emphasized that student-teachers are not fully qualified and should not expect stipends during their internship.

3. 62.07% of supervisors expected the government should provide stipends to student-teachers during the school internship, while 24.14% expected that teacher education institutions should provide stipends. 13.79% of supervisors expected that schools should provide stipends to student-teachers during their internship.

5.1.10 Expectations of School Principals during the School Internship

□ Duration of the school internship programme

1. 60% of school principals expected that the duration of the school internship should be one month only as they opined that student-teachers trained and developed teaching skills in a short period. Even supervisors can not monitor them as they select nearer schools for internship.
2. 35% of school principals favoured five months for school internship. They responded that student-teachers get proper training, comprehensive practical experience, develop teaching and organization skills, and know administrative work.
3. One school principal mentioned that the duration of the internship, whether short or long, might not significantly impact the learning outcomes of student-teachers.

□ When School Internship to be Organized?

1. 40% of school principals expected that internship should be conducted in the 4th semester because student-teachers can only focus on an internship after completion of theory coursework, and school principals are occupied in the 3rd semester, so they can guide them very well and assign classes properly to the student-teachers.
2. 40% of school principals mentioned that internship should be in 3rd semester. They responded that there is a shortage of teachers in schools after July, and new students are enrolled in school, so student-teachers clarify the concept, and schools also benefited from them.
3. 20% school internship expected internship should be in both the 3rd and 4th semesters. They emphasized that during the 3rd semester, student-teachers can assist in teaching, and in the 4th semester, they can assist 10th class students in revising the concept.

□ **Internship orientation to the school principals**

1. 70% of school principals expected that teacher education institutions should provide information related to school internship to the school principals, while 30% of principals expected orientation should be given to them related to the internship.
2. All school principals expected that the internship duration, total number and subject of student-teachers, and activities they are expected to undertake during their internship should be informed.

□ **School-related orientation to the student-teachers**

1. All School principals anticipated that school information should be provided to the student-teachers.
2. All school principals expected that student-teachers should be well-informed about their schools' educational and administrative aspects. It includes the school's establishment, staff, number of classes and students, preparation of leaving certificate, attendance sheet, timetable, co-curricular activities, admission form processes, maintenance registers, government regulations, smart board usage, and daily diary preparation.

□ **Preparation of Lesson plan**

1. 80% of school principals expected that student-teachers should prepare lesson plans during the school internship; due to this, student-teachers can teach and work systematically. Student-teachers understand how to teach and present the content.
2. 20% of school principals responded that student-teachers don't need to prepare lesson plans during the internship as they believed that effective teaching depends on the natural delivery of content. Student-teachers already planned during the microteaching and block teaching, and they play the roles of real teachers during the internship.

□ **Observations of school teachers**

1. 95% of school principals expected that student-teachers should observe school teachers' classes. They believed this practice would help student-teachers understand teaching methods, learn effective classroom management and communication skills, and gain inspiration from experienced educators.
2. Only one school principal stated that student-teachers already interacted with subject teachers and could learn effectively from them.

□ **Supervisors visit schools during school internship**

1. 35% of school principals expected that supervisors should visit schools weekly, while another 35% of school principals anticipated that supervisors should visit 2-3 times per week, 20% of school principals expected to visit daily, and 10% expected to visit once every 15 days.

□ **Observation of Student-teachers' classes**

1. 50% of school principals expected that supervisors should observe student-teachers' classes, while 30% anticipated that mentors should observe. 20% expected that supervisors, mentors, and school principals should observe student-teacher classes.

□ **Feedback to the student-teachers**

1. 50% of school principals expected that supervisors should give feedback to student-teachers, while 30% expected that mentors should provide. 20% of school principals expected that feedback should be provided by supervisors, mentors, and school principals.
2. All the school principals expected that supervisors, school principals, and mentors should provide feedback in both oral and written forms.

□ **Assessment of Student-teachers during the school internship**

1. 40% of school principals expected that supervisors should assess the student-teachers during the internship, while 40% expected all personnel, including supervisors, mentors, and school principals should assess. Only 20% of school principals anticipated that school teachers and school principals should assess the student-teachers.

□ **Stipends to the student-teachers**

1. 85% of school principals expected that student-teachers should be provided the stipends because student-teachers play the roles of teachers in school. In other professions, students also get the stipends. Student-teachers can bear commuting costs and are motivated to give their best.
2. Their reasons included the student-teachers' significant role during an internship, potential commuting expenses, motivation to perform better, encouragement of enthusiasm, alignment with professional norms, and recognition of financial difficulties.

3. 15% of school principals responded that student-teachers should not be given stipends. They believed that internship is a part of learning, and such expectations should not be kept in the teaching profession.
4. 65% of school principals expected that the government should provide stipends to student-teachers during the school internship programme, while 23.53% expected teacher education institutions should provide them.

5.1.11 Expectations of Mentors during the school internship

□ Duration of School Internship Programme

1. 55% of mentors preferred a one-month duration for the school internship. Their reasons included concerns about disrupting school teacher planning, financial considerations for student-teachers, difficulties in completing the school syllabus, and the issue of guidance and regularity if student-teachers have a long internship duration.
2. 45% of mentors expected the duration of the school internship should be 20 weeks. They highlighted the benefits of gaining valuable, in-depth experience, shaping student-teachers more effectively, understanding school dynamics and student behaviour, becoming familiar with the school environment, and having enough time for learning and skill development in teaching and administrative tasks.

□ When School Internship to be Organized?

1. 22.50% of mentors expected that the internship should be conducted in 3rd semester. They mentioned the benefits such as relieving school teachers during board exams and allowing for extensive engagement with the syllabus.
2. 10% of mentors expected that internship should be conducted in the 4th semester because various activities and admission processes take place in the initial session of schools.
3. One mentor expected that the internship should be organized in the 3rd and 4th semesters.

□ Internship Orientation to the School Principals and Mentors

1. 75% of mentors responded that it is appropriate that teacher education institutions provide information related to school internship through written letters, while 25% of mentors expected that orientation should be provided to the school.

2. They believed that details about the objectives of school internship, lesson planning, teaching methods, and tasks assigned to student-teachers should be informed.

□ **School-related orientation to the student-teachers**

1. All mentors expected that student-teachers should be provided comprehensive information regarding the school's academic and administrative aspects.
2. It includes details such as the number of students, classes, and teachers, syllabus, academic performance, students' financial status, the school's atmosphere, physical facilities, co-curricular activities, leaving certificate procedures, and classroom management strategies.

□ **Observation of school teachers' classes**

1. All mentors expected that student-teachers should observe the classes of school teachers, as they believed that this practice helps them understand how teachers manage classrooms, how they motivate and respond to students, and how they conduct their teaching. Furthermore, they responded that student-teachers can identify weaknesses in their teaching and work towards improvement.
2. 60% of mentors expected that student-teachers should observe 15 classes of school teachers, 22.50% of mentors anticipated that student-teachers should observe 10 classes and 17.50% of mentors expected that student-teachers should observe 20 classes during the internship.

□ **Preparation of Lesson Plans during the school internship**

1. 92.50% of mentors expected that student-teachers should prepare lesson plans for their classes. They believed this practice would help student-teachers improve their classroom management, learn effective teaching strategies, and develop time management skills.
2. 7.50% of mentors felt that it was sufficient for student-teachers to write only key points of the topic and that there was no requirement for detailed lesson plans during the internship.
3. 81.08% of mentors expected that student-teachers should prepare lesson plans for all classes, and 18.92% expected that student-teachers should prepare 20 lesson plans.

□ **Supervisors visit schools during school internship**

1. 77.50% of mentors expected that supervisors should visit the school once a week, 12.50% of mentors anticipated supervisors should visit once every fifteen days, and 10% of mentors responded that supervisors should visit twice a week during the school internship programme.

□ **Observation of student-teachers' classes**

1. 27.50% of mentors expected that all supervisors, school principals, and mentors should collectively observe the classes of student-teachers during the school internship, while 22.50% expected that supervisors and mentors should observe.
2. 17.50% of mentors expected that only supervisors should observe, while the other 17.50% of mentors expected only mentors should observe. Only 12.50% of mentors expected both school principals and mentors should observe.

□ **Feedback to the student-teachers**

1. 27.50% of mentors expected that all supervisors, school principals, and mentors should collectively provide feedback to the student-teachers during the school internship, while 22.50% expected that supervisors and mentors should provide.
2. 17.50% of mentors expected that only supervisors should provide, while the other 17.50% of mentors expected that only mentors should provide. 12.50% of mentors expected that both school principals and mentors should provide.

□ **Assessment of student-teachers**

1. 47.50% of mentors expected that all supervisors, school principals, and mentors should assess student-teachers during their internship, 20% expected that supervisors and mentors should assess, and 17.50% expected that only mentors should assess. 12.50% of mentors expected that school principals and mentors should assess.

□ **Stipends to the student-teachers**

1. 52.50% of mentors expected that student-teachers should be provided stipends during their internship. They believed it fosters a positive attitude toward teaching, assists with travel expenses, aligns with practices in other professions, boosts enthusiasm, and supports student-teachers from disadvantaged backgrounds.
2. 47.50% of mentors responded that it is not necessary to provide stipends to the student-teachers during their internship. Their reasons included the internship as a part of

learning and training; they are still studying, are not fully qualified teachers, and have limited teaching responsibilities during the internship.

3. 80.95% of mentors expected that the government should provide stipends to student-teachers during their school internship, while 19.05% of mentors believed that teacher education institutions should provide them.

5.1.12 Expectations of Student-teachers during the school internship

□ Duration of the School Internship Programme

1. 61.33 % of student-teachers expected the school internship duration should be six months or more. Among these, 53.50% of student-teachers believed that school internship allowed them to learn, gain experience, develop teaching and classroom management skills, and build confidence; 20.06% of student-teachers found that they developed administrative skills and adjusted to the school environment during the six-month internship.
2. 16.56% thought that the extended internship allowed them to understand the actual classroom situation and complete the syllabus within a timeframe. 9.87% of student-teachers highlighted the benefit of improved understanding of school students and overcoming fears.
3. 38.67% of student-teachers expected that the duration of the school internship should be of two months or less due to boredom, and they believed that it was enough time; in some schools, teachers repeat the syllabus, which shows a waste of time.

□ When School Internship to be Organized?

1. 75.78% of student-teachers expected that the internship should be conducted in the 4th semester of their B.Ed. Programme. They provided reasons that they get a job immediately, continue their teaching practice, and implement teaching skills that learned in 3rd semester. They also responded that they get bored to study again after completing the internship.
2. 24.22% of student-teachers expected that internship should be conducted in both the 3rd and 4th semesters. Student-teachers believed that they can avoid mistakes they make in 3rd semester; it also reduces the burden and gives them valuable experiences from different schools.

□ **Selection of schools for internship**

1. 55.47% of student-teachers expected that student-teachers should have the freedom to select the schools for their internship. They believed that schools near the residence area and familiarity with the school environment leads to a better experience.
2. 33.79% of student-teachers expected that the teacher education institutions should allot the schools to them for internship. They believed the institutions knew about the school, providing valuable experience and equal opportunity.
3. 6.05% of student-teachers expressed concerns that if student-teachers selected schools themselves, they might choose based on familiarity or convenience, potentially leading to a lack of accountability. They believed that institution-allotted schools would enable better monitoring of student-teacher progress.
4. 4.69% of student-teachers expected that both student-teachers and teacher education institutions should assign the schools to them jointly. Hence, they gain better experience in familiar schools and learn from different school environments, which teacher education institutions assign.

□ **Organizing internship in various types of schools**

1. 62.70% of student-teachers expected that school internship should be conducted in government schools because 44.55% of student-teachers believed that they understood the policies, rules, and regulations of government schools, and 24.92% of student-teachers felt that there was a shortage of teachers in government school. Hence, they can help both students and teachers. 13.08% of student-teachers believed private schools do not provide adequate opportunities and guidance. 11.53% of student-teachers believed that government teachers are well-qualified and supportive.
2. 11.52% of student-teachers expected that internship should be organized in all three Government, Grant-in-aid, and Private types of schools, while 8.20% of student-teachers expected that internship should be organized in government and grant-in-aid schools as they believed that both schools have good facilities, and assign regular classes to the student-teachers.
3. 6.06% of student-teachers expected that internship should be organized in government and private schools as they understand the rules of both schools.

4. 5.86% of student-teachers expected that internship should be organized in private schools only because they felt that the teaching staff is enough, all facilities are available, organize the activities properly, and they get a better experience.
5. 5.66% of student-teachers expected in grant-in-aid schools, and 58.62% of students believed that teachers are not supportive in private schools and have fewer learning opportunities in government schools. 41.38% of student-teachers believed that grant-in-aid schools provide adequate classes and that the education level of students is good.

□ **Internship orientation to the school principals and mentors**

1. 71.09% of student-teachers expected that teacher education institutions should provide orientation to school principals about the school internship programme. So, they can inform the school teachers and students, understand the objective of the internship, and student-teachers also get support in completing the tasks and organizing the activities.
2. 28.91% of student-teachers responded that there was no need to provide orientation to the school principals as they believed that they already possessed sufficient knowledge and capabilities to manage the internship programme.

□ **Internship-related information related to the school principals**

1. 38.67% of student-teachers expected that orientation should be provided to school principals regarding the specific activities performed by the student-teachers during the school internship programme, while 22.27% of student-teachers expected the duration of the school internship programme. 16.41% of student-teachers expected a number and subject of student-teachers, 14.06% of student-teachers expected the purpose of the internship, and 8.59% of student-teachers expected the evaluation process should be oriented to the school principals.

□ **School-related information to the student-teachers**

1. 80.86% of student-teachers expected that orientation related to schools should be provided to the student-teachers during the internship programme as they believed that they understand the school's environment, culture, policies, and procedures and teach students effectively.
2. 34.03% of student-teachers responded that there was no need to provide orientation as they felt they had prior teaching experience and abilities to adapt to the new school environment without orientation.

3. The majority, 70.29% of student-teachers, expected that the school should provide orientation about school to the student-teachers during the internship. Among these, 85.91% of student-teachers expected that the school principal should provide orientation, 14.09% expected that mentors should provide orientation, and 29.72% expected that supervisors should provide.
4. 71.26% of student-teachers expected that the school's location, rules, regulations, facilities, culture, administration, and management related information should be provided to them during the school internship programme, while 16.67% of student-teachers expected that the information related to number and subject of teachers should be provided so they could plan lessons accordingly. 12.07% of student-teachers expected that inform them about school students' IQ levels and interests so that they can prepare the lesson.

□ **Observation of classes of School teachers**

1. 85.55% of student-teachers expected that they should observe the classes of school teachers, and 71.23% believed that observing teachers allowed them to learn teaching skills, techniques, and management of classrooms. 19.41% of student-teachers responded that they understand students' behaviour and learn to create a positive environment. 9.36% of student-teachers emphasized mastering subject content and understanding the school curriculum.
2. 14.45% of student-teachers did not consider it necessary to observe school teachers, as 36.49% believed school teachers were already qualified, experienced, and well-trained. 20.27% felt they were still in the learning phase and were not qualified to evaluate experienced teachers. 16.22% said that few school teachers used outdated teaching methods. 22.97% expressed that teachers are defensiveness if they identify weaknesses in their performance. 1.35% mentioned concerns about lacking basic skills among some school teachers and viewed observation as a mere formality.
3. 42.57% of student-teachers expected that they should observe five classes of school teachers during the school internship, 35.93% of student-teachers expected that they should observe ten classes, and 7.03% of student-teachers expected that they should observe 20 classes.

□ Preparation of Lesson Plan

1. 76.95% of student-teachers expected that student-teachers should prepare lesson plans during their school internship programme, 68.78% of student-teachers felt that preparing lesson plans help them be well-prepared for classes, sequence lessons effectively, and maintain the flow of the class, and 31.22% believed that lesson planning improved their understanding of the subject, plan their class in structured and organized way.
2. 21.88% of student-teachers believed there was no need to prepare lesson plans during the school internship programme. 70.54% of student-teachers felt that lesson plans are unnatural and do not work in real classrooms. 16.07% of student-teachers responded that they had already prepared for block teaching and found it time-consuming, and 13.39% believed that limiting writing is required. Lesson plans may take up unnecessary time.
3. 1.17% of student-teachers provided mixed responses that the necessity for lesson plans should depend on the student's level of understanding, with the flexibility to adapt to the actual classroom situation. They emphasized that a rigid adherence to lesson plans may not always be adequate.

□ Number of Lesson plans

1. 26.37% of student-teachers expected that student-teachers should prepare only five lesson plans during the school internship, while 20.31% of student-teachers expected that they should prepare fifteen lesson plans. 13.20%, 10.15%, 8.12%, 3.55%, and 3.30% of student-teachers expected that they should prepare twenty, ten, thirty, twenty-five, and forty lesson plans, respectively.

□ Supervisors visit schools during School Internship

1. 57.23% of student-teachers expected that supervisors should visit the schools weekly during the school internship, 24.80% of student-teachers anticipated that visit should be every fifteen days, 11.33% of student-teachers expected visit should be once a month, and 6.64% of student-teachers expected visit should be twice a week.

□ Observation of Student-teachers' classes

1. 53.32% of student-teachers expected that a mentor should observe the classes of student-teachers, while 18.55% of student-teachers expected that supervisors should

observe, 11.34% expected that supervisors and school principals should observe jointly, 8.59% expected supervisors and mentors should observe, and 8.20% expected that school principals should observe.

□ **Observation of the number of classes of fellow students**

1. 34.18% of student-teachers expected that they should observe fifteen classes of fellow students during the school internship programme, while 29.88% mentioned that they had to observe a minimum of five classes, 26.76% stated that student-teachers were required to observe more than thirty classes, and 9.18% reported that they had to observe a minimum of ten classes.

□ **Feedback to the student-teachers**

1. 34.77% of student-teachers expected that mentors should provide feedback to them, and 32.23% of student-teachers expected that school principals, mentors, and supervisors should provide feedback to them during the school internship programme.
2. Additionally, 16.02% of student-teachers expected that both school principals and mentors should provide, whereas 7.61% expected that supervisors and mentors should provide. Moreover, 5.47% expected that only supervisors should provide feedback, and 3.90% of student-teachers expected that both supervisors and school principals should provide feedback

□ **Guide the student-teachers**

1. 24.02% of student-teachers expected that all supervisors, school principals, and supervisors should guide the student-teachers during the school internship, while 21.48% of student-teachers expected that mentors should provide.
2. 22.27% of student-teachers expected guidance from supervisors and mentors, 20.31% of student-teachers expected from supervisors, and 6.25% anticipated guidance from school principals.

□ **For which topics to provide guidance**

1. 63.68% of student-teachers expected that the guidance related to the teaching method, preparation of lesson plans, strategies for management of the classroom, and engagement of students should be provided to them.

2. 22.07% of student-teachers expected guidance related to the organization of activities, while 6.64% of student-teachers expected guidance related to handle and solve the problems of students should be provided.
3. 6.05% of student-teachers expected guidance related to the type of tasks they need to perform in school, whereas 1.56% of student-teachers expected guidance to be provided related to the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET) and Teacher Aptitude Test (TAT) exams, as well as career orientation.

□ **Assessment of student-teachers during the school internship**

1. 31.64% of student-teachers expected that mentors should assess them, 21.88% of student-teachers expected that school principals should assess them, and 20.51% responded that supervisors should assess them.
2. Only 12.11% of student-teachers expected that all supervisors, school principals, and mentors should assess the student-teachers jointly.

□ **Stipends to the student-teachers**

1. 69.92% of student-teachers expected that they should be provided stipends during the school internship programme. They cited that they worked as real teachers in school, spent money on activities and transportation, and also believed that stipends motivate them to perform better.
2. 30.08% of student-teachers responded that they should not be paid during the school internship programme as they believed internship provides learning and training opportunities, emphasizing that its purpose is to gain experience and obtain their degree, not earn money.
3. 45.70% of student-teachers expected that teacher education institutions should provide stipends to student-teachers during the school internship, 32.03% of student-teachers expected the school to provide, 17.19% of student-teachers expected the government to provide, and 5.08% of student-teachers expected both teacher education institutions and schools should provide stipends.

5.1.13 Problems Faced by Supervisors during the School Internship

1. Supervisors faced problems during the school internship related to discipline and irregularity of school students, selection of schools for internship, and school support.

They also noted that few school teachers assigned student-teachers to teach the whole syllabus, and inadequate guidance was received from schools.

2. They also faced problems related to the communication gap between schools and teacher education institutions.
3. Many student-teachers had limited opportunities to teach students, sometimes they merely sat without active involvement. Some student-teachers did not submit documents on time, which delayed entering marks.

5.1.14 Problems Faced by School Principals during the School Internship

1. 20% of School principals faced several challenges related to task assignment, provided facilities to the student-teachers, and encountered classroom management problems during the school internship.
2. They also faced problems related to the completion of the syllabus and larger number of student-teachers who had the same subjects coming to the same school, making it difficult to assign classes.
3. They also responded that there was a lack of content mastery among the student-teachers.

5.1.15 Problems Faced by Mentors during the School Internship

1. 35% of mentors faced several challenges related to classroom management during the school internship programme; sometimes, they had to repeat the syllabus, and the routine was disturbed.
2. They also faced problems allocating classes to the student-teachers, and during the activities, school students participated, so it was difficult for teachers to teach the next topic.

5.1.16 Problems faced by student-teachers during the School Internship

□ Preparation of lesson plans

1. 76.17% of student-teachers faced problems with the skill of introduction, time management, content comprehension, writing lesson plans, selecting teaching aids, connecting topics, providing appropriate examples, and finding supplementary materials.
2. They also faced difficulties in the selection of teaching methods, assessment of students, lack of resources, taking into account the intelligence level of their students

while preparing the questions and writing objectives, and use of blackboard effectively.

□ **Lack of resources**

1. During the internship, 32.61% of student-teachers encountered various challenges related to inadequate human and physical resources in the allotted schools. They faced problems such as, lack of proper drinking water facilities, classrooms, sports grounds, washrooms and toilets, ICT facilities, and teaching staff. Even schools lacked the equipment for sports, libraries, and laboratories.
2. 9.77% of student-teachers faced transportation problems during the internship as internship schools were far from the residence area of students. The bus or vehicle facilities were not available for transportation, so it was time-consuming to reach schools.

□ **Reflective Diary**

1. 17.58% of student-teachers encountered challenges in writing their reflective diary during the school internship. They initially faced problems with what to write and how to express their experiences, mainly where they had free classes.
2. Sometimes, they did not have enough time to write, and bored to write repetitive questions. Sometimes, it was difficult for them to remember everything, and they could not express their thoughts.

□ **School Principal-related Problems**

1. 18.16% of student-teachers reported that school principals assigned to organise activities instead of classes, they were assigned lower classes, and even classes were not running as per timetable.
2. They faced problems related to lack of staff, lack of cooperation from school principals, lack of facilities, and involvement of local authorities in schools. Student-teachers had to teach subjects other than their disciplined subjects.
3. Student-teachers reported that they were not adequately informed about various school programs and activities and felt they were not respected during the school programme.

□ **Mentors related problems**

1. 14.65% of student-teachers faced challenges related to lack of support, guidance, and encouragement from school teachers, who were focused on completing the syllabus and often assigned personal work.
2. Supervisors did not come for observation, and mentors disturbed the class during the teaching; there was no unity among the school staff, Mentors did not involve student-teachers in school activities, and teachers had already been told that they should teach students using the school's teaching method.

□ **CCA related Problems**

1. 11.13% of student-teachers reported that limited time was allocated for CCA, activities were done just for the sake, and not allowed for permission to organise it. Schools gave more emphasis on academic achievement.
2. Sometimes, school principals did not support them, and sometimes, students did not participate in CCA activities.

□ **Fellow students related Problems**

1. 7.03% of student-teachers encountered difficulties related to their fellow students during their internship because some student-teachers were unwilling to take teaching responsibilities and lacked cooperation among fellow students during the organization of activities.
2. Sometimes, they felt isolated from the group leader, and conflicts arose among the student-teachers.

□ **Evaluation related Problems**

1. 33.33% of student-teachers believed that the evaluation was not conducted fairly, and supervisors gave less marks to them. Even school teachers were not assessing them; sometimes, they felt stressed about their marks.

□ **TEI-related Problems and Submission-related Problems**

1. 3.32% of student-teachers encountered submission-related challenges during their internship. They mentioned that there was excessive written work, which diverted from their studies. They also faced difficulties in expressing their experiences and reflections.

□ **College Supervisor-related Problems**

1. 1.75% of student-teachers encountered issues related to supervisors who did not come for observation in schools.

□ **Feedback related Problems**

1. 1.37% of student-teachers reported that they did not receive adequate feedback during their school internship.

□ **Teaching Related Problems**

1. Student-teachers faced problems related to time management while teaching innovative lessons; sometimes, students did not understand the topic and student-teachers did not complete the syllabus within the time frame.
2. Student-teachers faced problems related to classroom management as students were making noise and fighting in the classroom. Even though students were not serious about their studies; students were not cooperative, misbehaved, disrespectful towards the teachers, not bringing their homework.
3. Students did not understand the English language, faced difficulties in mathematics and science, and were not educated according to their age level.
4. Student-teachers faced difficulties in using different teaching skills, such as the skill of introduction, the skill of probing, the skill of questioning, and the skill of blackboard work. They also faced problems to explain concepts, time management, and difficulties in using teaching aids effectively.
5. Student-teachers faced problems related to lesson planning as they could not always follow it in class, sometimes forgot essential points, and faced difficulties in using different approaches during teaching.

5.1.17 Suggestions provided by supervisors for improvement of SIP

□ **Suggestions for TEIs**

1. The internship should be conducted in the 4th semester; supervisors should visit schools and communicate with school principals once a week, monitor continuously lessons digitally, and assign research work to the student-teachers.
2. Student-teachers should prepare a minimum of 30 lessons, and it should be based on a constructive approach and integrated with ICT. It should not be considered if student-

teachers did not attend the school regularly and not complete their work. Student-teachers should visit teacher education institutions so they can solve their problems.

3. TEIs should allot different schools to the student-teachers so they gain a better experience.
4. The school internship should have been made compulsory for all student-teachers. The university should assess student-teachers, and student-teachers should be provided stipends for internship.

□ **Suggestions for Schools**

1. School principals should report accurately regarding student-teachers' performance and support them in organizing the activities.
2. Subject teachers should observe and guide them, assign subjects based on the discipline subject of student-teachers, and collect feedback from school students. School principals should be aware of their responsibilities.

□ **Suggestions for Student-teachers**

1. Student-teachers should have maintained honesty, performed their tasks appropriately, and prepared lesson plans based on different approaches.

5.1.18 Suggestions Provided by School Principals for improvement of SIP

1. The school internship programme should be conducted in the 4th semester.
2. Student-teachers should be sent to the schools where specific subject teachers are not available and sent to the different types of schools, and the same subject of students should not be allotted to same schools.
3. Supervisors should visit schools regularly, observe student-teachers' classes, provide feedback, and conduct meetings with school principals.
4. Student-teachers should visit the schools before the internship to get information about the syllabus and give more examples to the students in the classroom.

5.1.19 Suggestions Provided by Mentors for improvement of SIP

1. There should be an entrance exam and interview for students seeking admission to the B.Ed. programme. During the internship, student-teachers should be involved in the assessment process, and they should be sent in groups to schools. They should come to schools during the intervening period for the internship and come with subject preparation.

2. Teacher education institutions should provide orientation related to school internship to the student-teachers, school principals, and mentors; supervisors should visit schools and observe the student-teachers weekly. Strict rules such as wearing sari should not be kept. TEIs should provide teaching learning materials and stipends to the student-teachers. School teachers should assess them.

5.1.20 Suggestions provided by Student-teachers for improvement of SIP

1. The school internship should be conducted in the 4th semester and the rules and regulations of internship should be standardized for all TEIs.
2. TEIs should allot the schools for internship to the student-teachers. TEIs should allot schools that are best and nearer to home, assign 6th to 10th standard classes for teaching, provide stipends to them, provide school internship orientation to the school principals and mentors, and provide orientation related to school to the student-teachers.
3. There should not be too much emphasis on activities during the internship, and the activities and submission work should be reduced.
4. The supervisor should visit the schools twice a week and assess student-teachers to prevent any biases. Student-teachers should be sent to different schools, and in groups, only one student-teacher of a specific subject should be sent to schools and certificates should be provided.

5.1.21 Suggestions Provided by Researcher for improvement of SIP

1. School internship should be for the duration of six months.
2. School internship should be conducted in 4th semester.
3. All the TEIs should provide one school internship hand book and list of activities which student-teachers have to perform in schools and objectives of those activities.
4. During the school internship, first two weeks student-teachers and school teachers should teach together in one class. Co-teaching should be there. Mentors should sit together with student-teachers and prepare lesson plans according to the level of school students.
5. School teachers and supervisors should monitor the progress of the student-teachers regularly.
6. Supervisors should conduct meeting with school principals and mentors and discuss the progress of the student-teachers.

5.2 Discussion

The present research aimed to study the B.Ed. school internship programme in Gujarat. The National Council for Teacher Education in 2014 revised the curriculum of the B.Ed. programme, introducing the new concept of "School Internship" in place of "Practice Teaching" and increasing the duration of the school internship. The school internship is considered the core component of the teacher education programme (NEP, 2020). Teacher education institutions and schools play crucial roles in implementing the school internship. Therefore, the research focused on studying the current practices of school internship in teacher education institutions and schools.

The research focused on the implementation of a school internship programme in various teacher education institutions affiliated to state universities in Gujarat. Additionally, it examined other aspects such as the roles of supervisors, school principals, mentors, and student-teachers. Studying the expectations of supervisors, school principals, mentors, and student-teachers constituted significant research components. The research also focused on the experiences of school principals, mentors, and student-teachers during the school internship programme. Supervisors, school principals, mentors, and student-teachers are the significant components in implementing the internship so the study aimed to identify the challenges faced by them during the internship. Recognizing them as the main pillars of the school internship program, the research also took up suggestions from supervisors, school principals, mentors, and student-teachers based on their experiences.

The discussion of the findings of the different objectives is as follows.

The findings of **objective I** revealed that the overall organization and administration of the school internship were diverse in nature in all the TEIs; the same result was found in a study by **Raj (1984)**. All the teacher education institutions focused on microteaching and block teaching during the pre-school internship. This indicates that all teacher education institutions considered microteaching as the foundation of the school internship. They might believe that if student-teachers are not engaged in microteaching, they might lack confidence and experience fear during classroom teaching or microteaching has been practiced for years, so they may have an attitude to do it which is in contrast to the constructivist approach and even school internship framework (2016) has not mentioned about microteaching. All the TEIs focused only on a few teaching skills. The researcher

felt that other important skills such as the skill of recognizing attentive behaviour, the skill of silence and non-verbal clues, the skill of explanation, the skill of probing, the skill of achieving closure, and the use of ICT should also be given importance. The school internship was conducted in the 3rd semester in four TEIs. This raises a question about the relevance of the subjects learned in the 4th semester. The overall distribution of weightage of marks was different across the ten TEIs. This finding also supports the findings revealed by the study of **Shah (1986)**. Supervisors had more weightage to assess student-teachers in eight teacher education institutions than mentors. This indicates that the role of the mentor is very limited in assessing student-teachers. Furthermore, the findings also revealed that the majority of student-teachers did not get opportunities to do internship in different types of schools and teach in secondary schools, similar types of findings were arrived at by **Sharma (1973)** and **Mtika (2008)**, respectively. This might be due to either the selection of schools done by student teachers or the lack of awareness among the supervisors regarding the school internship framework (2016), in which it is mentioned that school internship should be conducted in two types of schools.

The findings of **objective II** showed that the teacher education institutions provided orientation to student-teachers. However, they did not provide orientation related to lesson plans, including guidance on modifying the lesson plan according to the intellectual level of the students. School principals and mentors were not orientated related to the internship. This was also confirmed by 90% of school principals and all mentors. These findings were also revealed by studies by **Khan (2017)** and **Najmudddeen & Areekkuzhiyil (2019)**. Supervisors visited only those schools which are nearer to their TEIs and some of the supervisors, school principals, mentors, and student teachers had no meetings with each other which is also found in studies by **Mohanty (1984)**; **Mtika (2008)**; and **Parveen & Mirza (2012)**. There was a lack of observation of student-teachers which is similar to the studies by **Mohanty (1984)**; **Akbar (2001)**; **Azeem (2011)** and **Singh, Ahmad, Pandey & Singh (2012)**, and a lack of feedback mechanism during the school internship. The reason could be the majority of student-teachers selected schools on their own for an internship. It might be possible that they select schools nearer to their residence areas and it might be possible that each student-teacher would select a different school. This leads to difficulty for supervisors to visit the school, identify mentors, and observe the student-

teachers. This can also raise the question of monitoring. This might result in reducing the quality of school internship. Some of the supervisors, school principals, and mentors examined documents after the completion of the school internship and only once a week or month. This indicates that this practice is not meaningful because student-teachers do not get the opportunity to correct their mistakes. If documents are examined during the internship, the mistakes of the student-teachers can be corrected. This indicates that the roles of all personnel are significant during the internship, but the reality is different. The findings also showed that the majority of student-teachers did not analyze the textbook and syllabus, did not conduct case study, remedial classes, and action research, did not prepare question papers, diagnostic tests, and assessment tools, did not follow the components of the blueprint while making question papers, and did not write a term paper. Furthermore, they had written only daily activities instead of reflection, did not perform administrative activities, or performed only assigned tasks given by the teacher education institutions, which described similar findings by **Sharma (1973)**. The reason could be that student-teachers may not be attending school internship regularly, or there is a lack of orientation related to school internship and a lack of monitoring of student-teachers in schools. These could hinder the ability of future teachers to deliver effective teaching and might impact the learning of school students. This could impact in quality of education in classrooms. To address these challenges, student-teachers should be monitored by all the personnel regularly.

It was found from **objective III** that few school principals and mentors responded that student-teachers were not serious, they had no concern about the learning outcomes of the school students during the school internship. These responses raise the question of whether the student-teachers are not inclined towards pursuing a career in the teaching profession. The findings also revealed that student-teachers had favourable and unfavourable experiences during the school internship. Many student teachers shared favourable experiences that school principals and mentors were supportive and involved them in the activities of schools. This reflects that student-teachers had a good bond with them. Some student teachers responded that school principals and mentors were not supportive, did not encourage them and sometimes they felt isolated by the staff. They also responded that schools lacked proper facilities. Some students' behaviour was inappropriate, similar to the

studies by **Heeralal & Bayaga (2011)** and **Kirbulut et al. (2012)**. This indicates the impact of school internship on the student-teachers in different ways. It shows that students face challenges but also gain positive experiences, demonstrating their ability to handle various aspects of education.

The findings of **objective IV** highlighted that the majority of supervisors, school principals, mentors, and student-teachers expected that the school internship framework (2016) guidelines should be followed. However, a few of them responded that the duration of the internship should be two months only, lesson plans should not be prepared during the internship, and orientation regarding the internship should not be provided to the student teachers. This leads to the question of whether their attitude was such that they saw the internship as merely a requirement to complete their degree. School principals and supervisors expected each other to observe the student teachers but if they both performed their duties well, the student-teachers would benefit as supervisors know about teaching skills and mentors have subject knowledge. Hence, if the student-teachers are given feedback and monitoring by both of them, they will be able to teach effectively in the classroom.

From the findings of **objective V**, it was found that school principals and mentors faced issues related to the completion of the syllabus which is similar to the study by **Rai (1995)**, stating that the long duration of the internship disrupted the planning of schools. Often, Mentors had to be re-taught the concepts. This situation can be avoided if the mentor and student-teachers do co-teaching. During the internship, student-teachers encountered problems related to the preparation of lesson plans, similar to the findings in the study by **Gafoor and Farooque (2010)**. They faced challenges in using various teaching skills, including the skills of introduction, probing, blackboard work, and the selection of teaching aids which is similar to the study by **Tok (2010)**, and time management issues that are similar to the study by **Panda & Nayak (2014)** and **Gupta (2019)**. They also faced problems related to classroom management as school students being mischievous, making noise, and lacking discipline. which is similar to the studies by **Alkhawaldeh (2011)**; **Boz & Kutucu (2012)**; **Gupta (2019)**; **Heeralal & Bayaga (2011)**; **Kirbulut, Mudzielwana & Maphosa (2014)**; **Panda & Nayak (2014)** and **Ranjan (2013)**. All these problems occurred due to a lack of teaching practice and lack of communication. So, it could be said

that these problems were hindrances to the effective learning of student-teachers. Student-teachers faced problems related to the submission work as they responded that they had to devote more time in preparing reports than teaching which is similar to the study by **Heerala & Bayaga (2011)**. Student-teachers highlighted issues related to lack of cooperation from school principals which is similar to the study by **Parveen & Saeed (2014)**, school teachers which is similar to the studies by **Heeralal & Bayaga (2011)** and **Gupta (2019)**, and fellow students. Student-teachers expressed teaching-related problems such as inadequate school resources, including the lack of libraries, laboratories, and sports equipment which is similar to the studies by **Shah (1986)**; **Kirbulut, Boz & Kutucu (2012)**; **Khan (2017)** and **Gupta (2019)**. These responses do not seem correct. During the data collection, the researcher herself observed that a few of the student teachers did not attend the institution regularly, and due to COVID-19, the researcher could not go for observation. If triangulation of the same data had been done, the result could have been different. Even supervisors also mentioned the irregularity and lack of discipline among student-teachers during the internship.

Overall, the implementation of the school internship was varying in different TEIs. The recommendations are given by JVC (2012), PBC (2014), and NCFTE (2009) that the mentors should monitor the classes, provide support to the student-teachers, focusing on “how to think” rather than “what to think”, and involve student-teachers in all activities of the schools, conduct a meeting with school principals. These recommendations were not implemented in practice. The reasons could be the selection of schools for internship by student-teachers, lack of orientation, monitoring, and communication. So, there is a need to implement the guidelines to improve the quality of the school internship programme. TEIs should select the schools for student-teachers and continuously monitor them during the internship.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

1. There can be a comparative study of school internship programme between the government, grant-in-aid, and private teacher education institutions of different state universities.
2. A case study can be conducted for the specific Teacher Education Institution.
3. The School Internship in 4 years Integrated B.Ed. Programme can be studied.

4. Similar study can be conducted for the M.Ed. programme.

5.4 Conclusion

The study investigated school internship practices in Gujarat across ten teacher education institutions, revealing variations in structure, duration, and weightage assignment. Most student-teachers selected only one school for internship and lacked opportunities to teach in secondary schools. Orientation was provided to student-teachers but not extended to school principals and mentors. Supervisors and mentors occasionally observed and provided feedback on student-teachers' classes, affecting the implementation of the School Internship Framework (2016) guidelines. Problems identified encompassed lesson plan preparation, resource shortages, inadequate feedback, and insufficient observation during internships. Issues of school selection, lack of orientation, and monitoring deficiencies were underscored. In conclusion, the study strongly recommends to standardized internship practices, orientation for principals and mentors, school selection by TEIs only, monitoring the student-teachers, and enhanced collaboration to reinforce the pivotal role of internship to shape the future educators' professional development.