

Siddhajyoti Interdisciplinary Journal (SIJ)

Vol. VII, January 2026

(A Peer Reviewed Open Access Research Journal)

ISSN: 2645-8381

Published by Research Management Cell, Siddhajyoti Education Campus, Sindhuli, Nepal

Article History: Received: 30 June 2025; Reviewed: 30 November 2025; Accepted: 01 December 2025

Student Teachers' In-Campus and Off-Campus Engagement in Teaching Practice

Resham Bahadur Bist (PhD)¹, Rajan Kumar Kandel²

¹Graduate School of Humanities and Social Science, Mid-West University, Nepal

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-2305-4709>

²Surkhet Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4704-2491>

Corresponding Author: Rajan Kumar Kandel; **Email:** rajan.kandel@sc.tu.edu.np

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/sij.v7i1.92551>

Abstract

Student teachers (STs) are scholars who are in the process of becoming certified teachers. They plan for and complete a required teaching practice (TP) as part of their university course within a period of time in simulated and real classrooms under the supervision of mentor teachers. This article examines STs' perception of on-campus and off-campus activities in TP. Using a quantitative survey research design, data were collected from 80 randomly selected STs (out of 100), who were assigned to 30 cooperative schools across the Surkhet district from Surkhet Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University. A structured questionnaire was administered to collect the insights of STs about TP in-campus preparation and off-campus teaching experiences. Through descriptive statistical analysis of the data, the findings revealed that STs generally performed well during both on-campus and off-campus teaching practices, demonstrating effective engagement in lesson planning, assessment, and classroom instruction. However, they faced challenges related to peer observation, consistency of supervision, and preparation for assessments. Moreover, the study highlighted that structured feedback mechanisms, such as teaching workshops and encouragement of self-reflection, are essential to enhance the teaching performance of STs. The study recommends that the Department of Teaching Practice (DTP) identify and implement robust supervision mechanisms to promote STs' experiential reflective learning of professional skills, which improves the overall quality of teacher education programs.

Keywords: Assessment preparation, Classroom instruction, Lesson planning, Student teachers, Supervision, Peer observation, Teaching practice

Introduction

Teacher education in Nepal was initiated formally by the College of Education, established in 1956. It was later merged with the Institute of Education (IOE), Tribhuvan University (TU),

Copyright 2026 © Author(s) This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons



Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

following the Nepal Education System Plan (NESP, 1971-76) to conduct all pre-service as well as in-service teacher training/education under an umbrella which was ultimately made the Faculty of Education (FoE), TU by the Royal Commission on Higher Education (1980) (Awasthi, 2003). Teaching Practice (TP) in the Faculty/School of Education under the universities of Nepal, led primarily by the FoE, TU, attempts to bridge the gap between pedagogical theories and STs' contextual classroom realities. They bear the sole responsibility of preservice teacher training at present. TP is the practical step where students apply the theoretical knowledge attained through the course in real classroom settings. After completing their classroom-based studies, students are involved in TP to gain hands-on experience and develop teaching skills needed for their future careers. As indicated by the researchers, TP is essential for producing competent and qualified teachers (Byler & Byler, 1984; Clarke et al., 2014; Schumann, 1969). It is a mandatory part of teacher education programs, which provides the first official opportunity for trainee teachers to engage in actual teaching in the classroom (Perry, 2004). The main aim of the PT is to bridge the gap between educational theory and practice (Ligadu, 2004). The performance of student teachers during TP is critical to the overall quality of education, as effective teaching depends on teachers' ability to manage classrooms and facilitate learning. To ensure effective teaching, student teachers begin by preparing lesson plans, which is a key step in organizing and delivering lessons (Korthagen, 2010). Besides, STs felt difficulties during their teaching practice because it is challenging for them to implement the teaching methods they learned in the course in a real classroom. Likewise, their English proficiency also made it harder for them to teach well and to build their identity and connection as teachers. Therefore, pre-service English teacher training programs need to be improved, particularly in the EFL context (Gan, 2014).

Teaching practice is widely recognized as a major component of teacher preparation, which includes all the learning experiences that student teachers undergo (Clarke et al., 2014). In Nepal, TP has become an essential part of teacher education programs in all universities. TP also plays a vital role in preparing future teachers, as it provides the hands-on training necessary for developing highly qualified teachers (Rubeena, 2022). Furthermore, TP can drive educational improvements and help incorporate new developments in curricula and teaching strategies. Teachers who have high-quality performance in TP will bring about meaningful change in society by inspiring and motivating their students. Given the growing demand for teachers, higher educational institutions are exploring innovative approaches to teacher training, with TP being a key element of such programs (Kandel & Bist, 2024).

In the teaching practice process, there is a collaborative relationship among student teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating school teachers. The cooperating teacher plays a crucial role in the professional development of student teachers, as they spend significant time teaching under the guidance and supervision of these educators (Clarke et al., 2014; Deeds et al., 1991; Martin & Yoder, 1985; Rubeena, 2022). It is grounded in the belief that the practicum enables teacher trainees to develop a professional identity, enhance their teaching abilities, and engage in a variety of complex, real-world experiences that are crucial for effective teaching and learning (Baidoo, 2016).

Universities in Nepal offer TP is a key element of teacher education programs, which is designed to provide STs with practical experience in real classroom settings. It supports them to develop effective teaching strategies, manage classrooms efficiently, plan lessons thoughtfully, and engage in reflective teaching practices (Timsina, 2024). Additionally, it provides insight into

the academic and administrative management of schools. The off-campus teaching practicum takes place in a school environment, offering student teachers direct, hands-on experience with teaching specific groups of students (Perry, 2003). During this time, trainees receive guidance and support from professors, supervisors, and cooperating school teachers (Al-Mahrooqi et al., 2015).

Additionally, bridging the school-university partnership is also essential for the overall improvement of the education system, which helps connect educational theory and its real practical implementation, enhances STs' professional learning and benefits both schools and universities. (Ramsaroop et al., 2024; Thant Sin, 2022). STs gain firsthand experience with the realities of classroom management, student engagement, and school culture. They implement the pedagogical theories, teaching strategies, and curriculum knowledge attained during their university course. Moreover, Allen et al. (2013) highlight that "the development of genuine partnerships between schools and universities can assist in narrowing the disconnectedness between theory and practice and in enhancing the practicum experience for both pre-service and colleague teachers" (p. 122). As they stated, the two-way interaction benefits both institutions: schools receive fresh ideas and enthusiastic support from ST, while universities gain valuable insights into the practical challenges of education, allowing them to adapt and improve their teacher preparation programs. Through this dynamic, STs not only refine their professional skills but also contribute to the strengthening of school-university partnerships. However, it should change the traditional model of university-based teacher education, which treats academic knowledge as the primary authority. It needs to shift toward a more collaborative approach that values the shared expertise of schools and universities, STs, and communities. This inclusive, nonhierarchical model can offer richer learning experiences and better prepare future teachers for the complexities of real-world teaching (Zeichner, 2010).

While TP encompasses a range of activities related to the teaching profession, the performance of STs both on-campus and off-campus to fill the gap between campus and school remains insufficiently explored. Given these gaps, it is valuable to conduct a study that examines STs' performances during teaching practice and to improve the policies and practices related to TP to make it more effective. In this context, it would be insightful to investigate STs' practices during TP and how their performance impacts their profession as English language teachers. This research aims to address the following questions:

1. What on-campus activities do STs get engaged in during the pre-practice teaching phase at the university?
2. What are the main off-campus activities undertaken by STs during their TP?
3. In what ways do STs fulfill their roles in bridging the gap between the school and the university during TP?

Methods and Procedures

This study employed a quantitative survey research design with descriptive statistical analysis (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). It explored the perceptions and experiences of STs regarding TP. The design allowed us to collect information from a relatively larger number of diverse STs assigned to teach English so that we could generalize the findings to a wider population. The study surveyed 80 randomly selected STs (80% of the total population) from Surkhet Multiple Campus of Tribhuvan University, assigned to 30 cooperative schools in the Surkhet district. DTP sends the students to the respective cooperative schools around the campus based on the students' priority of selection for TP. The student records of the DTP were used to identify STs for the participants of

the study (Cohen et al., 2018). Researchers personally visited the cooperative schools and collected the data from them. Before data collection, a notice was circulated to STs through the head teacher of each school where they were placed.

For the study, a structured questionnaire was developed, which was evaluated by experts, piloted, revised for its reliability (Taherdoost, 2016), and then administered to STs. It covered three major areas of TP: STs' perception of a) in-campus activities, b) off-campus activities with cooperative schools and teachers, and c) their overall perception of the TP program. The questionnaire contained 45 Likert scale items, with responses ranging from "Untrue for me" (1) to "True for me" (5) for presenting STs' responses. Particularly, 1 meant 'Untrue for me', 2 meant 'Slightly untrue for me', 3 meant 'Neutral', 4 meant 'Slightly true for me', and 5 meant 'True for me'. The 45-item questionnaire was divided into three dimensions to assess STs' perceptions, in which 12 items focused on in-campus activities, 27 items on off-campus activities, and 6 items on overall activities.

After the construction of data collection tools, data were collected from STs in person at cooperative schools of the Surkhet district, where STs were informed about the study and given self-administered questionnaires in small groups after granting informed consent. They were also given the required instructions regarding the filling of questionnaires. The collected data were organised into tables, and the frequency and percentage for each item within each scale were calculated. Then, the data were analysed using descriptive statistics and interpreted under relevant themes.

Results

The collected data were systematically organized and analyzed using both statistical and descriptive methods. The responses from the STs were aggregated, and their total frequency and percentage were computed for representation in a comprehensive table. The findings related to each investigated item are presented below, followed by a discussion.

On-Campus Activities of STs During Pre-Practice Teaching

This section shows the agreement of STs regarding their involvement in on-campus activities during the two-week pre-practice teaching phase. The survey data present the STs' participation in various activities related to orientation, lesson planning, teaching, observation, peer feedback, etc.

Table 1

On-Campus Activities During Pre-Practice Teaching/Simulation Teaching (2 Weeks)

Item No.	Statements	UT*%	SUT*%	Ne*%	ST*%	Tr*%
1.	I participated in the orientation program organized in campus regularly.	0	0	0	9.52	90.47
2.	I prepared at least five lesson plans in pre-PT.	0	0	0	4.76	95.23
3.	I presented at least three lessons in pre-PT.	0	0	4.76	38.09	57.14
4.	I participated in the discussion with the STs and the supervisors actively.	0	0	4.76	38.09	57.14

Item No.	Statements	UT*%	SUT*%	Ne*%	ST*%*	Tr*%
5.	I made/collected/managed teaching materials for each lesson I prepared.	0	4.76	0	19.04	76.19
6.	I wrote 31 test items, including: 5 multiple-choice items, 1 set of matching items (including 5 items in a set), 5 fill-in-the-blank items, 5 true false items, 5 very-short answer questions, 5 short-answer questions, and 5 long-answer questions From the lessons of my plan.	14.28	4.76	4.76	47.61	28.57
7.	I prepared the answer key for the objective items.	38.09	0	4.76	0	57.14
8.	I also prepared a marking scheme for the subjective questions.	90.47	0	4.76	0	4.76
9.	I observed the demonstration class of our campus supervisor at our campus during pre-PT.	9.52	0	4.76	23.80	61.90
10	I observed a class taught by my friend (another intern) carefully.	0	9.52	0	4.76	85.71
11	I filled the peer observation form duly and mentioned the weak points that needed to improve in his/her teaching.	0	0	23.80	23.80	52.39
12	I gave (wrote) my suggestions to overcome those weaknesses and improve his/her teaching.	23.80	0	4.76	19.04	52.39

UT* =Untrue for me, SUT* =Slightly Untrue for Me, Ne* =Neutral, ST* =Slightly True, and Tr* = True

Table 1 reveals that 90.47% of STs participated in the orientation regularly in the initial phase of the teaching program. Similarly, 95.23% of STs successfully prepared at least five lesson plans during the pre-practice teaching phase. Additionally, a significant number of STs (57.14%) presented at least three lessons during this period, with 38.09% presenting fewer lessons. In terms of participation in discussions with supervisors and peers, 57.14% of STs actively engaged in these discussions, while 38.09% were somewhat involved. The collection and preparation of teaching materials was also a priority for most STs. 76.19% of STs reported that they made, collected, or managed teaching materials for each lesson they prepared. However, 19.04% had less involvement in this area.

When it came to assessment preparation, 47.61% of STs wrote the full set of required test items, with 28.57% completing the task thoroughly. 14.28% of STs did not complete the test item preparation. Interestingly, 57.14% of STs prepared answer keys for objective items, though a large portion (38.09%) did not engage in this task. Additionally, 90.47% of STs prepared a marking scheme for subjective questions, showing high engagement with assessment planning.

Regarding observation, 61.90% of STs observed the demonstration class conducted by their campus supervisor, with 23.80% engaging in this activity occasionally. However, only 85.71% observed a class taught by a peer intern carefully, which highlights strong peer engagement in observation, although a small group (9.52%) was less involved. In peer observation and feedback, 52.39% of STs filled out the peer observation forms, identifying weaknesses in their peers' teaching. 52.39% also provided suggestions to address these weaknesses, which indicates a reasonable level of involvement in constructive peer feedback. However, it is worth noting that 23.80% of STs did not fill out the peer observation form thoroughly, and a similar percentage (23.80%) provided fewer suggestions to their peers.

Off-Campus Activities of STs in the Co-operating School During PT

This section is about the off-campus activities of STs during their six-week practice teaching period, which focuses on their involvement in teaching, observation, case studies, extracurricular activities, and reflections. Moreover, this section of the survey employed a Likert-type scale, where participants assessed their agreement levels on a scale from 1 (Untrue for me) to 5 (True).

Table 2

Off-Campus Activities in the Co-operating School During Practice Teaching. (6 Weeks)

Item No.	Statements	UT*%	SUT*%	Ne*%	ST*%	Tr*%
1.	I planned (and taught) at least 30 lessons during the entire period of PT.	0	0	0	0	100
2.	I attended the school regularly on all working days in the cooperating school during the period.	4.76	0	0	0	95.23
3.	I observed at least three lessons taught by the subject teacher of the cooperating school (taking his/her permission).	14.28	9.52	14.28	28.58	33.33
4.	I observed three lessons taught by other interns (s), filled out the peer observation form duly, mentioned the striking weaknesses, and provided suggestions.	0	14.28	28.58	14.28	42.85
5.	I observed those classes in the presence of the supervisor.	41.85	4.76	14.28	19.04	19.04

Item No.	Statements	UT*%	SUT*%	Ne*%	ST*%	Tr*%
6.	I got my class supervised by the class teacher and/or head teacher of the cooperating school every week.	19.04	9.52	19.04	14.28	38.09
7.	I kept a record in the daily logbook of what I accomplished every day in school.	14.28	0	19.04	4.76	61.90
8.	I wrote 60 test items, including: 25 multiple-choice items, 2 sets of matching items (including 5 items in a set), 5 fill-in-the-blank items, 5 true-false items, 5 very short answer questions, 10 short-answer questions, and 8 long-answer questions From the lessons of my plan	0	0	14.28	47.61	38.03
9.	I prepared the answer key for the objective items.	0	4.76	0	0	95.23
10.	I also prepared a marking scheme for the subjective questions.	80.95	0	0	14.28	4.76
11.	I assisted the teachers of the cooperating school in administering a test and preparing progress reports.	14.28	4.76	14.28	28.58	38.09
12.	I conducted a case study of a child in my class and prepared a report.	0	0	0	0	100
13.	I used direct observation, interviews, and questionnaires to collect data for the case study.	0	0	0	0	100
14.	I interviewed the parents/guardians to find out their concerns with regard to their child's progress.	0	0	19.04	14.28	66.67
15.	I organized the case study into the Preliminary part, Introduction, Methodology, Interpretation and Analysis, Conclusion and	0	0	0	28.58	71.42

Student Teachers' In-Campus.....		107	Resham Bahadur Bista et al.			
Item No.	Statements	UT*%	SUT*%	Ne*%	ST*%	Tr*%
	Suggestions of the Study, and References.					
16.	I assisted the school in organizing curricular and extracurricular activities.	4.76	0	0	4.76	90.47
17.	I prepared a report on the existing physical, organizational, and institutional conditions of the co-operating school.	0	0	0	4.76	95.23
18.	I consulted the head teacher, other teachers, and school reports/documents to prepare the school report.	0	0	14.28	19.04	66.66
19.	I also observed some facilities, problems, assets, etc. of the school personally to prepare the school report.	0	0	0	28.58	71.42
20.	I included the Preliminary part, Main part, and the Reference part in the school report.	0	0	9.52	28.58	61.90
21.	I (along with other STs) organized an extra-curricular activity and prepared a comprehensive report on it.	0	0	0	14.28	85.71
22.	I prepared/collected appropriate teaching materials (as mentioned in the lesson plan) for each lesson that I had to teach.	0	0	9.52	19.04	71.42
23.	I used all the materials mentioned in my plans carefully and purposefully.	0	4.76	0	9.52	85.71
24.	I made an SLC model question for compulsory English.	0	0	0	28.58	71.42
25.	I prepared the lesson during lesson planning to make myself confident and organized in the class.	0	0	4.76	9.52	85.71

Student Teachers' In-Campus.....		108	Resham Bahadur Bista et al.			
Item No.	Statements	UT*%	SUT*%	Ne*%	ST*% *%	Tr*%
26.	I also benefited from the suggestions provided by other STs and the supervisors during PT.	0	0	0	28.58	71.42
27.	I performed very well on my part as a student teacher.	0	0	14.28	47.61	38.09

UT* =Untrue for me, SUT* =Slightly Untrue for Me, Ne* =Neutral, ST* =Slightly True, and Tr* = True

Table 2 reflects the STs' involvement in teaching, observation, case studies, extracurricular activities, and reflections on off-campus. Moreover, Table 2 shows the varied STs' agreement about their off-campus activities. Regarding the teaching plan, all of the STs (100%) planned and taught 30 lesson plans in a cooperative school with their responsibilities. Similarly, most of them (95.23%) attended the school regularly. However, a noticeable issue emerges with the observation tasks. Only 33.33% of STs observed three lessons taught by their subject teacher, and 42.85% observed peer lessons. Likewise, the issue of supervision also showed mixed results. Only 41.85% of STs observed classes in the presence of a supervisor. Additionally, while 38.09% had their class supervised weekly by the class teacher or head teacher, a substantial proportion had less regular supervision. On the positive side, 61.90% of STs kept a daily log of their activities. In terms of test items, the preparation of test items was fairly widespread, with 47.61% of STs prepared 60 test items. However, 95.23% of STs prepared answer keys for the objective items. Regarding the preparation of marking schemes for subjective questions, 80.95% completed this task. Furthermore, while 38.09% of STs assisted with administering tests and preparing progress reports, this level of involvement in assessment-related tasks varied among the group.

The conduct of a case study was an area where all STs participated, with 100% completing the task and preparing a report. However, when it came to interviewing parents or guardians, only 66.67% of STs conducted these interviews. Additionally, while 71.42% of STs successfully organized their case study report with all necessary sections, some (28.58%) may have missed key components, potentially affecting the depth of their analysis. Extracurricular involvement was another area where most STs showed strong participation. 90.47% of STs supported in organizing curricular and extracurricular activities, highlighting their contribution beyond regular classroom teaching. Furthermore, 85.71% organized an extracurricular activity alongside other STs, with a comprehensive report being prepared by the majority. This shows that most student teachers were actively involved in the broader school community, though some (4.76%) had less involvement.

In terms of lesson preparation and material use, 71.42% of STs collected the appropriate teaching materials for their teaching, and 85.71% used these materials purposefully in class, demonstrating that the majority of STs were well-prepared. However, there was a notable gap in the preparation of specific materials, such as the SLC model question for compulsory English, where only 71.42% of STs engaged in the work. Similarly, 85.71% of STs reported feeling confident in teaching due to effective lesson planning, but this left a small group who may not have felt as fully prepared. Feedback from peers and supervisors played an important role in the teaching of most STs. 71.42% reported benefiting from the suggestions provided by their peers and

supervisors. Finally, in terms of self-assessment, 38.09% of STs felt they performed very well as

Item No.	Statements	UT*%	SUT*%	Ne*%	ST*%	Tr*%
1	We made a team leader of the student teachers to bridge the cooperating school and the campus.	4.76	0	0	9.52	85.71
2	I helped the students (whom I taught) and stimulated them to learn.	0	0	0	9.52	90.47
3	I applied the approaches, methods, and techniques of classroom management and instruction into practice during PT.	0	0	0	19.04	80.95
4	I followed the rules and regulations of the cooperating school and worked as per the instructions provided by the school administration and staff.	0	0	4.76	0	95.23
5	I tried my best to build relationships with the members of the school.	0	0	0	23.80	76.19
6	I was aware of the democratic norms, values, ideologies, and behaviors, and tried to apply them in teaching.	0	4.76	4.76	38.09	52.38

student teachers, while a larger group (47.61%) had a more neutral or slightly positive assessment of their performance.

Overall Performance of the STs in PT

Table 3

Overall Performance of the STs in Practice Teaching

This section presents responses of STs about their overall performance during their teaching practice, highlighting their involvement in team-building, classroom management, adherence to school rules, relationship-building, and the application of democratic values.

UT* =Untrue for me, SUT* =Slightly Untrue for Me, Ne* =Neutral, ST* =Slightly True, and Tr* = True

As revealed in Table 3, one of the most notable strengths is the formation of a team leader to bridge the communication between the cooperating school and the campus. 85.71% of STs reported that this strategy was successful. This helped to ensure smoother communication and coordination throughout the practice period. Similarly, 90.47% of the STs reported that they successfully helped and stimulated their students to learn. When it comes to applying classroom management techniques and instructional methods, 80.95% of the STs felt they successfully implemented these practices in the classroom. This reflects a strong grasp of effective teaching methods. However, 19.04% of STs felt that their application of these techniques was only partial.

Regarding adherence to school rules and regulations, 95.23% of the STs followed the instructions provided by the school administration and staff. This high percentage reflects strong

professionalism and an understanding of the importance of working within the established guidelines of the cooperating school. However, a small number of STs (4.76%) may have struggled to fully follow these rules, indicating room for improvement in this area. In terms of building relationships with school members, 76.19% of the STs made a concerted effort to foster positive connections within the school community. This shows that most STs understood the value of relationship-building for creating a supportive teaching environment. However, 23.80% of STs were less successful in this area, suggesting that some students faced difficulties in establishing relationships with colleagues or school staff. Lastly, regarding the application of democratic norms, values, and behaviors in teaching, 52.38% of the STs successfully incorporated these principles into their practice. However, 38.09% felt that their application of these principles was only partial, and 4.76% did not feel confident in this area. This suggests that while democratic values were emphasized in the program, some students may have struggled to fully integrate them into their teaching.

Discussion

This study assessed the teaching performance of STs during a six-week off-campus and two-week on-campus teaching practice. The findings indicate that STs generally performed well, actively engaging in various teaching activities without encountering significant challenges in off-campus. This finding aligns with the findings of Annan-Brew and Arhin (2022), which also indicate that STs face minimal difficulties in their practising schools. However, contrary to these findings, Okobia et al. (2013) identify key challenges in teaching practice, including a lack of accommodation, insufficient instructional materials and resources, and inadequate orientation before the program's commencement. Similarly, Koirala's (2022) finding also relates to this finding. His study reflects that STs' TP remain largely traditional, with minimal ICT integration except during on-campus practice. Most STs struggle to link pedagogical and content knowledge to real-life contexts. Moreover, STs effectively plan and conduct lessons while maintaining daily activity logs with regular school attendance. However, many do not consistently observe peer or subject teacher lessons, and supervision by class teachers or supervisors is often irregular. This aligns with Kadel (2023), who identified a lack of constructive feedback from peers and supervisors in off-campus teaching practices. Moreover, he mentions that teaching practices in Nepal is just a ritual.

The study shows that STs effectively complete assessment tasks, such as answer keys and marking schemes, but are less engaged in test item preparation. While all STs participated in case studies, only a few of them conducted parent interviews, and some faced difficulties in organizing reports during off-campus teaching. Extracurricular involvement is generally strong, though a few STs had minimal participation. Most of them utilize teaching materials effectively; however, gaps remain in preparing specific resources like model questions. Peer and supervisor feedback prove valuable, yet self-assessment outcomes vary, reflecting differing confidence levels. These off-campus difficulties of ST align with the findings of Baidoo (2016), who identifies several challenges faced by pre-service teachers, including staff unreceptiveness, role ambiguity, supervision difficulties, lesson planning and assessment issues, poor trainee disposition, lack of preparedness, and ineffective teaching methods. To overcome these problems of STs in off-campus, Alexis's (2022) findings reveal that STs need to enhance their skills in classroom management, effective questioning techniques, student motivation, and assessment strategies.

Additionally, the findings of this study depict that STs actively engage in the on-campus activities, with strong participation in orientation, lesson planning, and peer observation. The main areas of concern involve a smaller group of STs who are less involved in assessment preparation, peer feedback, and lesson observation. These findings suggest that on-campus programs successfully encourage engagement of STs. These findings align with those of Adu-Yeboah and Kwaah (2018), who highlight that on-campus teaching practice enhances trainees' knowledge and skills in key pedagogical areas, including lesson planning, objective setting, lesson delivery, activity timing, and the use of teaching and learning resources. During on-campus teaching, STs prioritize in collection and preparation of teaching material, though some lagged in this area. In assessment preparation, while many STs develop test items, answer keys, and marking schemes, a few number of them engage in these tasks. Observation of demonstration classes and peer lessons is common, but some STs participate only occasionally. Peer feedback is moderately practiced, with just over half of STs identifying weaknesses and providing suggestions, though a considerable portion do not complete observation forms or offer constructive feedback thoroughly. It indicates that the campus mechanism for STs' active engagement in on-campus activities is less effective, and STs are also less motivated to do such activities.

Additionally, STs perceive some notable strengths in communication, classroom management, and professionalism, indicating their ability to effectively engage students and maintain a structured learning environment through on-campus and off-campus teaching practices. This aligns with the findings of Gebretinsae and Karvinen (2018), who emphasize that student teachers recognize teaching practice as a crucial component in their professional development. Their study highlights that practical experience enhances preparedness for the teaching profession. Moreover, STs think that the formation of a team leader significantly improves coordination between the cooperating school and campus, ensuring smoother communication. Most STs successfully engaged their students in learning and applied effective classroom management techniques, though a few faced challenges in fully implementing these methods. Professionalism is evident, with the majority adhering to school rules and regulations, though a small group struggled in this aspect. Relationship-building within the school community is also a key strength, but some STs have difficulties establishing strong connections. Additionally, while over half of the STs successfully incorporate democratic values into their teaching, a considerable number only partially implement these principles, indicating a need for further emphasis on integrating democratic norms into classroom practice. While there are some limitations in student teachers' performance during both off-campus and on-campus activities, their overall teaching effectiveness remains satisfactory. This aligns with Wenglinisky (2002), who states that STs demonstrate satisfactory teaching performance.

Conclusion

In the evaluation of STs' teaching performance during a six-week off-campus and two-week on-campus teaching practice, STs generally performed well, engaging actively in lesson planning, assessment tasks, and teaching activities without certain areas requiring significant improvement. Off-campus teaching performances were largely effective, with minimal challenges, but supervision inconsistencies and limited peer observation remain areas of concern. On-campus teaching provides structured opportunities for professional development, though gaps exist in assessment preparation and peer feedback. Overall, these areas of concern suggest that while the majority of student teachers performed well, further support or training in these areas could

enhance the overall teaching performances of STs. Based on the conclusion, teaching practices should be upgraded, ensuring regularity and structured feedback from peers and supervisors to make STs' teaching performance effective. Workshops on classroom management, questioning techniques, and student engagement strategies should be conducted to improve teaching practices. Encouraging self-assessment and reflective teaching is recommended for the development of STs' critical evaluation of their performance and stronger pedagogical skills. Additionally, it is suggested that the DTP can better prepare to further enhance STs' teaching performance in on-campus and off-campus settings by improving supervision mechanisms, which can contribute to more effective teacher education programs to improve the quality of education at large.

The first limitation of the study is in the design; it employed only a quantitative survey design using self-reported data, which may be influenced by social desirability bias. Regarding the study area, the study was limited only to STs from a single Surkhet Multiple Campus of Tribhuvan University in Surkhet district, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other regions or institutions in Nepal. Similarly, the study was limited to using solely descriptive statistics without incorporating qualitative data, which could have provided deeper insights into the challenges and contextual realities of teaching practice.

Authors' Contribution

The first author (RBB) revised the conceptual format and prepared the initial draft of the manuscript, while the second author (RKK) led the initial conceptualization of the study, development of research instruments, and data collection. Both authors reviewed the final version for the submission, provided informed consent for publication, and addressed the reviewer comments. RKK oversaw the correspondence for the publication process and contributed as a corresponding author.

References

- Adu-Yeboah, C., & Kwaah, C. Y. (2018). Preparing teacher trainees for field experience: lessons from the on-campus practical experience in colleges of education in Ghana. *Sage Open*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018807619>
- Alexis A. E. (2022). Off-campus Performance of Student Teachers. *LC International Journal of STEM (ISSN: 2708-7123)*, 3(2), 105-120. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6844888>
- Allen, J. M., Ambrosetti, A., & Turner, D. (2013). How school and university supervising staff perceive the pre-service teacher education practicum: a comparative study. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(4). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n4.9>
- Al-Mahrooqi, R., Denman, C., & Al Issa, A. (2015). Student perspectives of quality assurance mechanisms in an EFL program in the Sultanate of Oman. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 8(5), 81–106
- Annan-Brew, R., & Arhin, D (2022). Perceived challenges faced by student-teachers (prospective teachers) from universities and colleges in Ghana during off-campus teaching practice. *J Adv Educ Philos*, 6(9): 498-505.
- Awasthi, J. R. (2003). Teacher education with special reference to English language teaching in Nepal. *Journal of NELTA*, 8(1,2), 17-28.
- Baidoo, A. N. A. (2016). *Assessment of the challenges of off-campus teaching practice in the University of Cape Coast: Management education pre-service teachers' perspective* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cape Coast).

- Bist, R. B., & Kandel, R. K. (2024). Reader response approach for enhancing literary comprehension in an EFL context. *International Journal of Educational Reform*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10567879241226712>
- Byler, B., & Byler, L. (1984). Analysis of student teacher morale before and after student teaching. *27 Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 25(3), 22-28. <https://eurekamag.com/research/015/035/015035984.php>
- Clarke, A., Triggs, V., & Nielsen, W. (2014). Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(2), 163-202. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313499618>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Deeds, J. P., Flowers, J., & Arrington, L. R. (1991). Cooperating teacher attitudes and opinions regarding agricultural education student teaching expectations and policies. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 32(2), 2-9. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.1991.02002>
- Gan, Z. (2013). Learning to teach English language in the practicum: What challenges do non-native ESL student teachers face?. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* (Online), 38(3), 92-108.
- Gebretinsae, D. Y., & Karvinen, I. (2018). Teaching practice program in the college of education—its strengths and challenges. *Open Science Journal*, 3(3).
- Kadel, P. B. (2023). Issues of teaching practice in master of English education: Supervisors' perspectives. *Tribhuvan University Journal*, 38(01), 74–87. <https://doi.org/10.3126/tuj.v38i01.56144>
- Kandel, R. K., & Bist, R. B. (2024). Perceptions of English specialized student teachers towards teaching practice. *English Language Teaching Perspectives*, 9(1-2), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.3126/eltp.v9i1-2.68715>
- Koirala, K. P. (2022). Practices of pre-service science teacher education program: review and reflection. *The Educator Journal*, 10(1), 126–134. <https://doi.org/10.3126/tej.v10i1.4673>
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2010). How teacher education can make a difference. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(4), 407–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2010.513854>
- Ligadu, C. (2004). *Mentoring during university practicum: Perceptions of teacher mentors and student teacher trainees*. University of Wollongong.
- Martin, R. A., & Yoder, E. P. (1985). Clinical teaching analysis: A procedure for supervising. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 26(4), 16-21. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ326208>
- Okobia, E. O., Ogumogu, E. A., & Osagie, R. O. (2013). An analysis of the perceived challenges faced by student-teachers during teaching practice exercises. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(11), 7–11. Retrieved from www.iiste.org
- Perry, R. (2004). *Teaching practice for early childhood: A guide for students*. Routledge Falmer. https://books.google.com.np/books?id=1OTG0irN_yQC
- Ramsaroop, S., Mahase, M. F., & Petersen, N. (2024). Bridging the theory-practice divide: Reflections of school-based student teachers. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 14(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v14i1.1558>

- Robinson, M., & Feldman, J. (2023) *University-school partnerships in initial teacher education. International Encyclopaedia of Education*. Elsevier.
- Rubeena, D. (2022). Student teachers' perception of online teaching practice programme. *Review of Research, 11(7)*, 19-23. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362290110>
- Schumann, H. (1969). The cooperating teacher's role in student teaching. *The Agricultural Education Magazine, 41(7)*, 156. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ000581>
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument: How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management, 5(3)*, 28–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205040>
- Thant Sin, K. K. (2022). School-university partnership: Perceptions and experiences of school teachers and student teachers on current collaboration in teacher education in Myanmar. *Journal of Adult Learning, Knowledge and Innovation, 4(2)*, 62-75. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2059.2021.00050>
- Timsina, J. N. (2024). Teaching practice at undergraduate level: A comparative analysis of policies across universities in Nepal. *Education Quarterly, 5(1)*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jeqtu.v5i1.76737>
- Wenglinsky, H. (2002). The link between teacher classroom practices and student academic performance. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10*, 12-12.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61(1-2)*, 89-99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671>

Authors

Resham Bahadur Bist (PhD) is an Assistant Professor at Central Department of English and Nepali, Graduate School of Humanities and Social Science, Mid-West University, Nepal

Rajan Kumar Kandel is a Lecturer at Department of English Education, Surkhet Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal. He has completed his MPhil.