

The Degree University Tutors, Cooperating Teachers and School Principals Practice their Roles during Student Teacher Practicum at Imam University.

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the degree university tutors, cooperating teachers and school principals in the faculty of Languages and Translation at Imam University practice their roles during student teacher practicum and their suggestions for improvement.

To collect data, a thirty item questionnaire was developed by the researcher and distributed to subjects who were involved in student teacher practicum in the Faculty of Languages and Translation during the academic year 2010/2011. Results indicated that the practice of university tutors of their roles was moderate, whereas the practice of cooperating teachers and school principals of their roles was low. In addition, the results also showed that there were significant differences in the practice of the participants of their roles in favor of female university tutors. A number of suggestions for improvement of student teacher practicum were offered by the participants included Providing student teachers with all instructional materials, textbooks, and teachers' guides they need, awarding cooperating schools certificates of recognition, and strengthening the relationship between universities and cooperating schools.

Key words: university tutors, cooperative teachers, school principals, and practicum.

Background of the study

Practicum programs of student teachers vary from one country to another in terms of goals and objectives, types and number of courses offered, duration of practicum, mentoring, evaluation, and follow up procedures. Nevertheless, these programs are expected to provide prospective teachers with effective teaching strategies, classroom management skills, ways of promoting classroom interaction, and ways of coordinating with other educational stakeholders such as colleagues, school administrators, supervisors, and parents.

The supervision of student teachers has always been a concern of teacher preparation institutions. Maynard and Furlong (1993, p. 71) contrast supervision 'where teachers are supervising trainees in the application of training acquired elsewhere' with the notion of mentoring 'where teachers themselves have an active role in the training process'. But regardless of these distinct roles of university and school, what student teachers actually need is a collaborative and supportive relationship with their cooperating teachers and university supervisors as a basis for developing confidence in the classroom through experimentation and risk-taking.

Providing the appropriate number of observations, adequate supervision, and feedback to student teachers is of utmost importance in the preparation of future teachers. However, university knowledge and theories are seen by some researchers as still far from practice. For example, many student teachers cannot apply the concepts and theories they learned at the university to the problems encountered by them during their teaching practice at schools due to different reasons. (Al-Smadi, 1999; Furlong, 2000; Smith, 2000; and Hammerness et al., 2002).

During practicum, student teachers observe classes, teach, and write their reflections for discussion with colleagues and mentors on weekly meetings. In particular, student teachers are expected to attend all classes with some cooperating teacher, practice partial

teaching for about one month, and full teaching during the last two months of the semester. The duration student teachers go through practicum vary from one teacher education program to another across different universities in Saudi Arabia, but- on average- this period ranges from three to five full- school days per week.

Student teachers at Imam university are assigned to neighboring schools so that university tutors, cooperating teachers and school principals- hence forth (participants)- supervise and evaluate student teachers during practicum. Ideally, there should be full partnership among all these parties during all phases of practicum (planning, organization, implementation, and evaluation.). For example, all these participants should develop and approve of goals and objectives of practicum, the stages of practicum, methods of follow up and evaluation, the criteria of assigning students to cooperating school and teachers, and ways of sharing feedback.

The Significance of the Study

Many studies have been conducted regarding practicum student teacher education. (Alyah, 1996; Al-Smadi, 1999; Diab, 1999; Al-Barakat, 2003; Alkhaldeh, 2006; Alkhaldeh, 2007, Abu Naba'h (2009).

However, the special significance of the present study is that it is the first study in Saudi Arabia which investigates the degree different stakeholders involved in teacher education programs (i.e. university tutors, cooperating teachers, and school principals) practice their roles during student teacher practicum.

The results of this study are expected to provide teacher educators in Saudi Arabia in general and the Faculty of Languages and Translation at Imam University in specific with insights that can help them reconsider the type and amount of coordination in reshaping student teacher practicum.

In particular, the present roles of participants may be modified in light of the results of this study, so that maximum utility and effectiveness can be reflected in student teachers' practices during practicum and during their in- service teaching later on.

The Objectives of the Study

The study is intended to investigate the degree the participants in the practicum program in the Faculty of Languages and Translation at Imam University, i.e. university tutors, cooperating teachers and school principals practice their roles during student teachers' practicum program.

The study will specifically attempt to answer the following questions:

1. To what degree do university tutors, cooperating teachers, and school principals at Imam University practice their roles during the student teacher practicum program?
2. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of the opinions of the university tutors, cooperating teachers, and school principals?
3. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of the opinions of the participants in the study due to gender?
4. What suggestions do those participants offer for improving student teacher practice ?

Limitations of the study

1. This study will be confined to those involved in student teacher practicum program at the Faculty of Languages and Translation in Imam University.

2. Results of this study will be generalized only to those who are involved in student teacher practicum in the academic year 1431/1432.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are operationally defined to achieve the purposes of this study:

Practicum: the period of time which students teachers spend teaching at cooperating schools under the supervision of university tutors, cooperating teachers, and school principals.

Planning: Refers to the roles of participating groups in meeting student teachers needs before they join cooperating schools, preparing student teachers for practicum, writing up the objectives and instructions of practicum, setting criteria for selecting cooperating schools and teachers and assigning student teachers to schools ..

Organization: Refers to participants' roles in helping cooperating schools to host student teachers, helping parents understand the benefits of having student teachers at schools, helping student teachers develop intimate relationship with the local communities and arranging with educational institutions to get job opportunities for prospective teachers.

Implementation: Refers to participants' roles in helping student teachers exchange visits for feedback and improvement, design, analyze and interpret results of evaluative measures, design and implement remedial plans, develop a portfolio and conduct action research during practicum.

Evaluation: Refers to participants' roles in providing student teachers with on -going feedback, evaluating portfolios at the end of the semester, evaluating their administrative and academic performance of student teachers during practicum, sharing other groups the final grade of student teachers and writing a final report on the student teacher's progress during practicum.

University tutors: are faculty members who provide a detailed practical plan for training in co-ordination with cooperative teachers and school principals and evaluate the performance of student teachers during the practicum course in the cooperative schools.

Student teacher: the classroom teacher or pre-school teacher at the faculty of Languages and Translation at Imam University who are registered for practicum during their last semester of their BA study.

School principals: The principals of schools where student teachers spend their practicum according to special arrangements between the Ministry of Education and the university.

Cooperating teachers: teachers at cooperating schools and who are assigned student teachers to mentor during practicum. These teachers are normally nominated by their school principals.

Degree of practice: Refers to one of five degrees (very high, high, moderate, low and very low) which were suggested by the referees to describe the roles of participants in student teacher practicum: The degree is considered very high if the percentage is 80% and above, high if the percentage is 70%-79%, moderate if the percentage is 60%- 69%, low if the percentage is 50%-59.9%, and very low if it is less than 50%.

Review of Literature

Many studies have been conducted to address different aspects of pre-service teacher education. For example, al basheer et al (2009) investigated the perceptions of student teachers regarding the effectiveness of university supervisors, school principals and co-operating teachers participating in the teacher education program at the Hashemite University

in Jordan. The results indicated that participants perceived favorable high agreement toward the effectiveness of university supervisors and co-operating teachers and moderate agreement toward the effectiveness of school principals.

Ghatani (1991) explored the roles of cooperating teacher in the preparation of Saudi student teachers during their experience. The findings of the study revealed that the cooperating teachers were unaware of their roles regarding student teachers preparation, and they practiced those roles to a moderate degree.

McNay and Cole (1993) also described a practicum program in Waterloo Region in which student teachers, schools, the faculty, and the educational board were engaged in a pre-service teacher education program. Results showed that the "Whole School" project appeared to be successful since everyone involved in the project reported professional or pedagogical benefits. However, it was suggested that student teachers be assigned to different cooperating teachers, and the whole school staff including non-teaching staff be involved in supporting trainees.

Cameron-Jones and O'Hara (1995) investigated the attitudes of mentors towards their roles during student teacher practicum.. Two self-report techniques were used to collect data of the study. Results showed that mentors concentrated on supporting their students by being a professional model, explaining their own practice to their students; giving continuous feedback to their students, and they perceived themselves as playing roles which could be viewed as complementary to, rather than as duplicating, the roles of university tutors.

Melser (2004) studied the effectiveness of university supervisors' role as liaisons. Forest Dale Elementary School became a Professional Development School where seven cooperating teachers, the school principal, and the university liaison worked collaboratively during student teacher practicum. Results showed that the majority of teachers enjoyed

sharing the supervision of student teachers with the university liaison because they had more opportunities to provide feedback to their student teachers, and that student teachers were aware of how the supervisory process worked. Another important aspect of the university liaison model was that it provided more services to the school in the areas of staff training, substitute teaching, and professional development.

Christie, et al., (2004) investigated the effectiveness of the partnership between schools and universities in the supervision of students on placement in a one-year Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) program in Scotland. Data were collected from 84 supervising teachers and 17 university tutors through interviews and questionnaires. Results showed that school staff had only a weak understanding of the overall direction of the PGCE program and they were uncertain about how best to fulfill their role in placement supervision. As a result, student teachers found it hard to integrate school and university experiences. It was recommended that the links between school and university be strengthened.

Anderson (2007) investigated the influence of cooperating teachers on student teachers. The population of the study included 98 student teachers and their cooperating teachers at Midwestern University in 2006. A questionnaire and some interviews were used to collect data of the study. Cooperating teachers were found to exercise power over their student teachers through their evaluations, rewards, and vested authority. It was concluded that cooperating teachers need to be taught how to combine pressure and support in order to give student teachers the proper feedback and guidance they need to develop their teaching identities.

Flynn and Nolan (2008) evaluated a mentor teacher program (Mentorville's program) in a New York State (NYS) suburban school district.. Results revealed that a significant factor in the program's success was the procedure of mentor selection which was based on

evidence of mastery of subject matter and pedagogical skills, evidence of professional growth, willingness to participate, and interpersonal qualities that would generate mutual trust and respect. Another reason was the involvement of different stakeholders (school principals, superintendents, coordinators, and university) in regular organization sessions regarding the characteristics of an effective new-teacher support system and evaluation of the program.

Alyah (1996) investigated the conditions under which probationers serve in the schools of Jordan. A questionnaire was applied to 142 novice teachers, school heads and supervisors in three Governorates of Education in Amman during the academic year 1995-1996. Results revealed that new teachers could not keep in touch with university tutors simply they were overloaded with teaching responsibilities. School heads as well as educational supervisors were also overburdened with clerical work. To support supervisory staff perform an outstanding job, it was recommended that master teachers be assigned in every school or a group of neighboring schools to help new teachers pass the bridging period between initial and in-service training.

Al-Smadi (1999) conducted an evaluative study of student teachers at the University of Jordan. One main finding was that student teachers were unaware of the objectives of practicum. Another finding was that the content of the practicum program was irrelevant to the school curriculum.

Diab (1999) also explored the attitudes of 143 student teachers enrolled in the practical education program at the University of Jordan towards different issues including the roles of cooperating schools and university supervisors in pre-service teacher education. The data were collected via a 52-item questionnaire covering a wide range of themes. Results showed that student teachers were generally positive concerning the relationships they

maintained with the cooperating schools staff and with their university supervisors, but they expressed some reservations regarding adequacy of supervision and organizational matters.

Al-Barakat (2003) explored the factors affecting the preparation of 95 student teachers at Yarmouk University during their phase experience 2001/2002. Data were collected through a 30- item questionnaire. The findings of the study revealed that the co-operating teachers were not aware of their supervisory roles, university supervisors' assessment of student teachers was ineffective, the field experience period was insufficient, and the necessary instructional resources were unavailable at cooperating schools.

Alkhalwaldeh (2006) investigated the roles of the university and co-operating schools in practical education program in Jordan. A questionnaire and follow up interviews were used to collect data from 96 student teachers enrolled in a four- month practicum at two universities in 2001-2002. The findings of the study showed that the role of the university tutor was mainly a provider of ideas and theories pertaining to teaching and learning, whereas the role of the co-operating teacher was to provide immediate feedback to student teachers. Results also showed that support and encouragement from school administrators and staff had a positive contribution to student teachers' success during the practicum. It was recommended that universities make themselves clear to co-operating schools in terms of objectives and courses offered to the student teachers during practicum.

Alkhalwaldeh (2006) also investigated the perceptions of seventy (70) EFL student teachers at the University of Jordan of the roles of the different partners responsible for the pre-service training. Data were collected through a questionnaire and student teachers' reflective journals. Results of the study revealed that the majority of student teachers estimated the roles of university tutors and trainers more than they estimated the roles of cooperating teachers and school administrators. It was recommended that cooperating teachers and school principals attend more to student teachers training needs, and to

coordinate their efforts with university tutors and trainers for more effective pre-service teacher training.

Alkhaldeh (2007) also investigated the roles of EFL student teachers in Jordan as change agents in the cooperating schools. Seventy six (76) EFL student teachers participated in the study. The results of the study showed that among the challenges student teachers faced during practicum were: resistance of cooperating teachers to allow for change, lack of encouragement from principals, and lack of school resources. It was recommended that university supervisors ensure that the student teachers can apply what they subscribe to and believe in as prospective teachers.

Procedures of the study

Participants

The participants of the study consisted of all male and female university tutors, cooperating teachers and school principals who were involved in student teachers' practicum in the faculty of languages and Translation at Imam University during the academic year 2010/2011. The distribution of participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The distribution of the participants in the student teacher's practicum at Imam University.

Participants	Males	Females
University tutors	15	15
Cooperating teachers	15	15
School principals	15	15
Total	45	45

Research instrument

For the purpose of this study, the researcher devised a questionnaire that measures the participants' opinions of student teacher practicum program at the Faculty of languages and translation at imam University. The questionnaire consisted of 930 items distributed among the main phases of student teacher practicum program practicum:

1. The planning phase. (items 1-8).
2. The organization phase.(Items 9-15).
3. The implementation phase.(Items 16-22).
4. The evaluation phase. (Items 23-30) (See Appendix A).

The level of answers for each item in the questionnaire was designed in accordance with Likert scale: always (5), often (4), sometimes (3), rarely (2), never (1).

Validity of the instrument

To ensure the validity of the questionnaire, it was judged by a jury of five university professors in the field. Some minor changes in the wording of the items were made based on the suggestions and comments of the jury .However, all agreed that the questionnaire was valid for measuring what it was designed for.

Reliability of the questionnaire

The reliability of the items in each phase of the questionnaire was established by using Cronbach - Alpha as a measure of consistency coefficient. The reliability coefficient of the first phase was 0.86; of the second phase 0.82; of the third phase 0.80; and of the fourth phase .084. These values were, therefore, considered satisfactory to use the questionnaire to collect the data of this study.

Statistical procedures

The statistical package for social Sciences (SPSS) program was used in processing the data of this study. Means, percentages, standard deviations, T-test , ANOVA, and post multiple comparisons, and other statistical tests were used to answer the questions of the study. The following levels of percentages were used to interpret the results of the study:

More than 80%	very high
70%- 79%	high
60%-69%	moderate
50%-59.9%	low
Less than 50%	very low

Results and Discussion.

To answer the first question “ *to what degree do university tutors, cooperating teachers, and school principals at Imam University practice their roles during the student teacher practicum program, the means and the percentages of each domain of the questionnaire were calculated for each participant in the study. Tables 2,3,4, show the results.*

Table 2

Means and Percentages and Degree of University Tutors’ Opinions on the Domains of the Study. N=30

Item No/ phase.	Mean	percent	Degree
Planning			
item1	2.60	52%	low
item2	2.93	58%	low
item3	2.93	58%	low
item4	2.67	53%	low
item5	2.67	53%	low
item6	3.03	60%	moderate
item7	3.03	60%	moderate
item8	2.67	53%	low
average	2.82	56%	low
Organization			
item9	2.73	54%	low
item10	1.47	29%	Very low

item11	2.57	51%	low
item12	4.10	80%	Very high
item13	3.87	77%	high
item14	3.50	70%	high
item15	3.67	73%	high
Average	3.13	62%	moderate
Implementation			
item16	2.43	48%	Very low
item17	3.93	78%	high
item18	3.83	76%	high
item19	3.57	71%	high
item20	4.07	81%	Very high
item21	4.13	82%	Very high
item22	4.03	80%	Very high
average	3.71	74%	high
Evaluation			
item23	4.40	85%	Very high
item24	4.13	82%	Very high
item25	4.20	84%	Very high
item26	3.87	77%	high
item27	4.50	90%	Very high
item28	2.63	52%	low
item29	2.83	55%	low
item30	4.40	85%	Very high
average	3.87	77%	high
Average of all domains	3.38	67%	moderat

Table (2) shows that the overall opinions of university tutors of the domains of the study were moderate with a percentage of 67%. It was low on the planning phase with a percentage of 56%, moderate on the organization phase with a percentage of 62%, whereas the opinions were high on the implementation and evaluation phases with percentages of 74% and 77% respectively.

Table 3

Means and Percentages and Degree of Cooperative Teachers' opinions on the domains of the study. N= 30

Item No.	Mean	Percent	Degree
Planning			
item1	1.33	26%	Very low
item2	1.67	33%	Very low
item3	1.60	32%	Very low
item4	1.20	24%	Very low
item5	1.40	28%	Very low
item6	1.53	36%	Very low
item7	1.93	38%	Very low
item8	1.33	26%	Very low

Average	1.50	30%	Very low
Organization			
item9	1.27	27%	Very low
item10	1.47	25%	Very low
item11	1.53	36%	Very low
item12	3.87	77%	high
item13	3.87	77%	high
item14	3.47	69%	moderate
item15	3.60	72%	high
average	2.72	54%	low
Implementation			
item16	1.60	32%	Very low
item17	3.80	76%	high
item18	3.73	74%	high
item19	3.27	65%	moderate
item20	3.87	77%	high
item21	3.80	76%	high
item22	3.73	75%	high
Average	3.40	68%	moderate
Evaluation			
item23	4.20	84%	Very high
item24	3.93	78%	high
item25	3.93	78%	high
item26	3.67	73%	high
item27	4.33	86%	Very high
item28	1.93	38%	Very low
item29	1.93	38%	Very low
item30	4.20	84%	Very high
Average	3.52	70%	high
<i>Average of all domains</i>	<i>2.77</i>	<i>55%</i>	<i>low</i>

Table (3) shows that the overall opinions of cooperative teachers of the domains of the study were low with a percentage of 55%. It was very low on the planning phase with a percentage of 29%, low on the organization phase with a percentage of 55%, whereas the opinions were moderate on the implementation with a percentage of 68% and high on the evaluation phase with a percentage of 70%.

Table (4)

Means and Percentages and Degree of School Principals' opinions on the domains of the study. N=30. N= 30

Phase/Item No.	Mean	Percent	Degree
Planning			
	1.30	26%	Very low

item1			
item2	1.60	32%	Very low
item3	1.55	31%	Very low
item4	1.25	25%	Very low
item5	1.39	28%	Very low
item6	1.55	31%	Very low
item7	1.85	37%	Very low
item8	1.37	27%	Very low
average	1.48	29%	Very low
Organization			
item9	1.20	25%	Very low
item10	1.45	29%	Very low
item11	1.30	26%	Very low
item12	3.74	75%	high
item13	3.72	75%	high
item14	3.43	68%	moderate
item15	3.50	70%	high
average	2.62	55%	low
Implementation			
item16	1.55	31%	Very low
item17	3.75	75%	high
item18	3.70	74%	high
item19	3.21	64%	moderate
item20	3.65	73%	high
item21	3.82	76%	high
item22	3.71	74%	high
Average	3.35	67%	moderate
Evaluation			
item23	4.21	84%	Very high
item24	3.65	73%	high
item25	3.75	75%	high
item26	3.64	73%	high
item27	4.25	85%	Very high
item28	1.82	36%	Very low
item29	1.85	37%	Very low
item30	4.19	84%	Very high
average	3.42	68%	moderate
Average of all domains	2.72	54%	low

Table (4) shows that the overall opinions of school principals of the domains of the study were low with a percentage of 54%. It was very low on the planning phase with a percentage of 29%, low on the organization phase with a percentage of 55%, whereas the opinions were moderate on the implementation and evaluation phases with a percentage of 67% and 68% respectively.

The above results are in agreement with those of (Ghatani, 1991; Melser, 2004; Christie, et al., 2004; Alkhawaldeh, 2006; and Alkhawaldeh, 2007).

One reason for this result could be that university tutors and consider themselves more responsible for student teachers preparation than cooperative teachers and school principals schools are, mainly because student teachers spend the majority of their BA study in the campus and not at school. This sound logical since the goal of teacher education is to help teachers become critical, reflective change-agents and to promote learning in the future, rather than merely solve the immediate problems in the present. University tutors need to create opportunities for an inquiring stance that serve long-term goals of good teaching. (Tickle, 2000)

Another reason could be that cooperating teachers and school principals feel they are not mainly involved in student teachers' assessment because university tutors have the final say in the assessment of their students .teachers. Collaboration should not be carried out in intern, but also in university teaching where university tutors open dialogues and share goals to help attain collaboration and a mutually beneficial relationship between university and school. For example, university faculty member and the supervising classroom teacher should work together to complete observations, provide feedback, and complete summative evaluations of the student teachers' progress. (Fu and Shelton, 2002; Melser, 2004; Fear1991; and Sirotnik and Goodlad, 1988).

A third reason could be that university tutors are more pedagogically qualified to practice their roles during student teachers' practicum compared to administrators and subject matter teachers at school.

A fourth reason could be that student teachers have developed stronger relationship with their university tutors than with cooperating teachers and school principals due to the

comparatively long time they spend at the university campus. In turn, this could have helped university tutors and practice their roles more comfortably than school principals and cooperative teachers did. According to Moderatebanks et al, (2000), if mentors do not develop an intimate and supportive relationship with student teachers, they are likely to be perceived as impeding student teachers professional development more than promoting it.

However, this result is inconsistent with those of Hopper (2001) and Morris et al. (2000) who argue that no matter how much university tutors are involved in student teacher practicum, the cooperating teacher remains the one who watches the student teacher at work and provides him with ongoing immediate feedback. Therefore, they argue that cooperating teachers should be more responsible for the emotional well-being and confidence of student teachers than other participants are, simply because they are closer to them and student teachers generally resort to cooperating teachers first.

2. **To answer the second question “are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of the opinions of the university tutors, cooperating teachers, and school principals, means and standard deviations of all the domains are calculated and then a one way ANOVA and post comparisons were employed to find out if there are statistical significances amongst the opinions of the participants .Tables 5,6,and 7 show the results.**

Table(5)

Means and Standard Deviations of the Participants’ Opinions of the Domains of the Study

phase	name	Mean	Std. Deviation
Planning	University supervisor	2.82	1.36
	Cooperating teacher	1.50	0.28
	School Principal	1.48	0.28
	Average	1.93	1.02
Organization	University supervisor	3.13	0.46
	Cooperating teacher	2.72	0.21
	School Principal	2.62	0.21
	Average	2.82	0.36

Implementation	University supervisor	3.71	0.39
	Cooperating teacher	3.40	0.23
	School Principal	3.35	0.23
	Average	3.48	0.32
Evaluation	University supervisor	3.87	0.41
	Cooperating teacher	3.52	0.23
	School Principal	3.42	0.23
	Average	3.60	0.34

Table 6

Results of one-way (ANOVA) for differences in the means of the participants' opinions of the domains of the study

phase	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Planning	name	373.01	3.00	124.34	185.53	0.00
	Error	58.30	87.00	0.67		
	Total	431.31	90.00			
Organization	name	738.79	3.00	246.26	2496.99	0.00
	Error	8.58	87.00	0.10		
	Total	747.37	90.00			
Implementation	name	1107.48	3.00	369.16	4376.32	0.00
	Error	7.34	87.00	0.08		
	Total	1114.82	90.00			
Evaluation	name	1191.52	3.00	397.17	4337.04	0.00
	Error	7.97	87.00	0.09		
	Total	1199.48	90.00			

Table (6) shows that there are significant differences amongst the participants in the study. The computed (F) values for all domains were less than (0.05). These values are statistically significant. To find out these differences Post comparisons analysis (Chefe Test) was employed . Tables (7) shows the results.

Table (7)

Results of the Post Multiple comparisons for the participants opinions of the domains of the study

phase	(I) name	(J) name	Mean Difference (I-J)
Planning	University supervisor	Cooperating teacher	1.3167*
		School Principal	1.3167*
	Cooperating teacher	University supervisor	-1.3167-*
		School Principal	0.00
	School Principal	University supervisor	-1.3167-*
		Cooperating teacher	0.00

Organization	University supervisor	Cooperating teacher	.4048 [*]
		School Principal	.4048 [*]
	Cooperating teacher	University supervisor	-.4048 [*]
		School Principal	0.00
	School Principal	University supervisor	-.4048 [*]
		Cooperating teacher	0.00
implementation	University supervisor	Cooperating teacher	.3143 [*]
		School Principal	.3143 [*]
	Cooperating teacher	University supervisor	-.3143 [*]
		School Principal	0.00
	School Principal	University supervisor	-.3143 [*]
		Cooperating teacher	0.00
Evaluation	University supervisor	Cooperating teacher	.3542 [*]
		School Principal	.3542 [*]
	Cooperating teacher	University supervisor	-.3542 [*]
		School Principal	0.00
	School Principal	University supervisor	-.3542 [*]
		Cooperating teacher	0.00

Table (7) shows that there are significant statistical differences in the opinions of the participants of the study for the first domain of the study .i.e.’ Planning ‘in favour of university tutors. The results also show that there are statistical differences in the opinions of the participants in favour of the university tutors in other domains .i.e. organization, implementation, and evaluation.

The same arguments mentioned above could justify the results mentioned in the second question. University tutors consider themselves more responsible for student teachers preparation than cooperative teachers and school principals schools are, mainly because student teachers spend the majority of their BA study in the campus and not at school. In addition, student teachers have developed stronger relationship with their university tutors than with cooperating teachers and school principals due to the comparatively long time they spend at the university campus. In turn, this could have helped university tutors and practice their roles more comfortably than school principals and cooperative teachers did.

3. To answer the third question ‘ are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of the opinions of the participants in the study due to gender, Means , standard deviations, and a T- test was conducted . Table (8) shows the results.

Table (8)

Results of T-test differences in the participants opinion according to the gender variable.

phase	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig.
phase1	Male	45	1.50	.28078	-4.491-	88	.000
	female	45	2.38	1.28073			
phase2	Male	45	2.72	.20747	-3.756-	88	.000
	female	45	2.99	.43497			
phase3	Male	45	3.40	.22505	-3.231-	88	.001
	female	45	3.61	.37228			
phase4	Male	45	3.52	.22550	-3.460-	88	.000
	female	45	3.75	.39841			
all phase	Male	45	2.78	.12091	-4.512-	88	.000
	female	45	3.18	.57975			

Table (8) shows that there are significant differences amongst the participants in the study due to gender in all the domains of the study in favour of females. The computed (F) values for all domains were less than (0.05). These values are statistically significant.

One important reason for this result is that female participants have a clearer view about their roles in student teacher practicum program because the Department of English /Girls have published a manual guide for student teacher practicum program which specified clearly the roles of university tutors , cooperative teachers, and school principals. It also outlined the the phases of the practicum program and specified the duties of student teachers and ways of assessment.

Another reason for this result might be attributed to the fact that females are generally well organized and more aware of their duties and tasks and they abide by the prescribed rules that are stipulated by the department.

4. *To answer the fourth question ‘ what suggestions do you offer to improve the student teacher practicum at the Faculty of Languages and Translation at Imam University, structured interviews were conducted with samples of the participants in the study.*

The following are the suggestions that were shared by the majority of the participants of the study based on their experience in the field:

- Developing a set of criteria for selecting cooperating schools and teachers.

- Involving all participants in regular meeting to discuss matters related to student-teachers' practicum.
- Assigning well-defined roles for each group of participations.
- Organizing workshops for cooperating teachers before student teachers are assigned to them.
- Training student teachers to use computer assisted language learning (CALL) more effectively.
- Assigning a liaison to coordinates the efforts of school and university during practicum.
- Visiting student teachers in the classroom more often.
- Taking school' facilities into considerations when assigning student teachers to them.
- Providing student teachers with all instructional materials, textbooks, and teachers' guides they need.
- Awarding cooperating schools certificates of recognition.
- Giving student teachers some orientation about cooperating schools before they are assigned to them.
- Strengthening the relationship between universities and cooperating schools.

Conclusions

In the light of the study findings, the researcher concluded the following:

1. The overall practice of university tutors of their roles was rated moderate, whereas the overall practice of cooperating teachers and school principals of their roles was rated low.
2. In addition, the results also showed that there were significant differences in the practice of the participants of their roles in favor of female university tutors.

Recommendations

The following recommendations stemmed from the results of the study:

Student teachers need to learn how to plan for teaching, increase their confidence and teaching skills, and receive multiple forms of feedback on their performance as prospective teachers.

Because neither university tutors nor school principals and cooperative teachers can do this independently, there should be intensive regular coordination among these groups to achieve this purpose. For example, the traditional model of pre-service teacher education where university tutors and trainers have access to schools, but school mentors and principals do not have access to university programs should be reconsidered. Experienced teachers and principals may have a share in course plans, micro teaching, and weekly meetings with student teachers to discuss issues such as lesson planning, classroom management, classroom interaction, and assessment. University tutors need to listen to the views of practitioners to discuss with them issues related to the development of the teaching practice of the student teacher. This does not necessarily be face- to -face all the time; sometimes it can be carried out through virtual feedback and consultation using the email to save time and effort.

To help cooperating schools understand their roles better, teacher education programs at the university can provide contexts in which cooperating teachers of diverse school settings can discuss different organizational patterns and ways of working with student teachers. This can also bring school and university staff together to develop a shared understanding of the aims, curriculum and assessment of student teacher practicum. These educational stake holders should also reconsider pre service teacher education programs on on-going basis for improvement and quality management based on feedback from the workplace (Boreen & Niday, 2000; Awaya et al., 2003; Johnson, 2003; and Clarke & Jarvis-Selinger, 2005).

It is true that student teachers lack teaching experience, but they may be more enthusiastic and excited than their in-service counterparts. Therefore, there should also be more chances for fellow student-teachers to exchange classroom visits and reflect on them. Student teachers may learn from each other as much as- or even more than- they learn from cooperating teachers or mentors now that they are not under pressure (Anderson, 2007). Other researchers are recommended to investigate the effect of student teaching on the attitudes of school pupils during practicum.

Based on the findings Of the study, the following suggestions are proposed by the researcher:

- It is imperative that pre–student-teaching practicum experience not be left to chance if we want to enhance the value of student teaching. Closer working relationships between the university and the Ministry of Education must be forged to organize the selection of cooperative schools and teachers.
- The faculty of Languages and Translation must have a say in the selection of cooperative teachers. There must be criteria or fixed bases for choosing those mentors .Care must be used to place students with cooperating teachers who are effective models of the target language and foreign language pedagogy at each level.
- The faculty of Languages and Translation must prepare a practicum manual, and explain in detail what is expected of the practicum student and what type of observational techniques are used to evaluate the pre–student teacher, as well as how to do it.
- University tutors must visit prospective cooperating schools and maintain a list of qualified cooperating teachers, spending some time with them so that all individuals (student, university tutors, cooperating teacher, and school principals) are working toward the same end.
- University tutors must define precise tasks and specific objectives for practicum. When expectations are clearly defined and stated for practicum students, supervisors are able to monitor and provide feedback that reflects those expectations, and cooperating teachers are able to understand more clearly their role in the practicum experience.

References

Abdal-Haqq, F. (1998). *Professional Development Schools: Weighing the Evidence*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Abu Naba'h, Abdallah, Al-Omari, Hamza, Ihmeideh, Fathi and Al-Wa'ily, Suad(2009)"**Teacher Education Programs in Jordan: A Reform Plan**", Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education,30:3,272 — 284

Al-Barakat, A. (2003). Factors influencing the preparation of student teachers in the class teacher specialization at Yarmouk University during their phase experience. *Dirasat, Educational Sciences*, 30 (2): 420-432

Alkhaldeh, A. (2007) English Language Student Teachers as Change Agents with Reference to the Training Experience in the University of Jordan. *Association of Arab Universities Journal for Education and Psychology*, 5(1), 15-52.

Alkhaldeh, A. (2006) . Jordanian EFL Student Teachers' Views about the Contribution of University and Co-operating School to Their Initial Teacher Education. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9, 127-144.

Alkhaldeh, A. (2006). EFL Teachers' perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of different partners contributing to Pre-service Training program. *Journal of Linguistics and Translation*.2 (4)

Al-Smadi, Y. (1999). 'Evaluation of the ' *Class-Teacher' Pre-service Teacher Education Programme at the University of Jordan*' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sussex, England.

Alyah, M. (1996). A Study of induction year program for beginning teachers in Jordan. *Teacher Education and School Reform, ICET, 43 World Assembly Proceedings, Amman, Jordan, second volume*: pp 313-330.

Anderson, D. (2007) .The role of cooperating teachers' power in student teaching. *Education*, 128, (2).

Awaya, A., McEwan, H., Heyler, D., Linsky, S., Lum, D. & Wakukawa, P. (2003). Mentoring as a journey. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 45–56.

Boreen, J. & Niday, D. (2000). Breaking through the isolation: mentoring beginning teachers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44, 152–163

Cameron-Jones, M., and O'Hara, P. (1995). Mentors' perceptions of their roles with students in initial teacher training. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 25, (2): 34-45.

Christie, F., Conlon, T., Gemmell, T., and Long, A. (2004) . Effective partnership? Perceptions of PGCE student teacher supervision. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 27(2).

Clarke, A. & Jarvis-Selinger, S. (2005). What the teaching perspectives of cooperating teachers tell us about their advisory practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 65–78.

Diab, T. (1999). Attitudes of student teachers towards the practical education programme at the University of Jordan: an evaluative study. *Dirasat, Educational Sciences*, 26 (1):143-165.

Fear, K. (1991). A Critical Analysis of Collaboration within Professional development Schools. Michigan: National center for Research on Teacher Learning, *ERIC Document reproduction Service* No. ED 342083.

Flynn, G. and Nolan, B. (2008). The Rise and Fall of a Successful Mentor Program: What Lessons Can Be Learned? *The Clearing House*, 81(4):173-179

Fu, D. & Shelton, N. (2002) Teaching Collaboration between a University professor and a Classroom

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1994). The teacher as a person, in: M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.) *Teacher development and educational change* (London, The Falmer Press).

Furlong, J. (2000) . School mentors and University tutors: Lessons from the English Experiment. *Theory into Practice*, 39, (1): 12-20.

Ghatani, S. (1991). The role and effect of the cooperating teacher on the preparation of student teachers during the practice teaching period. *Arabic Gulf Risalat*, (51):37-79.

Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L. and Schulman, L. (2002) Towards expert thinking: How curriculum case writing prompts the development of theory-based professional knowledge in student teachers, *Teaching Education*,13(2): 221-224.

Hopper, B. (2001). The role of the HEI tutor in initial teacher education school-based placements. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 9 (3): 211-223.

Johnson, K. (2003) Every experience is a moving force: Identity and growth through mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 787–800.

- Maynard, T. & Furlong, J. (1993) Learning to teach and models of mentoring, in: D. McIntyre, H. Hagger & M. Wilkin (eds.) *Mentoring: perspectives on school-based Teacher Education* (pp.69–85). (London, Kogan Page),
- McNay, M., and Cole, A. (1993). A “Whole School” Approach to the Practicum. *McGill Journal of Education*, 28 (1): 115-131
- Melser, N. (2004). The Shared Supervision of Student Teachers: Leadership, Listening, and Lessons Learned. *The Professional Educator*, 26 (2): 31-38.
- Moderatebanks, C., Fredman, D., and Courtney, K. (2000). The role of the effective mentors in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(2):02-112.
- Morris, V., Nunnery, J., Taylor, S., Knight, J., and Brooks, P. (2000). Teacher empowerment: How does it emerge? In L. Chance (Ed.) *Professional development schools: Combining school improvement and teacher preparation*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Sirotnic, K. and Goodlad, J. (1988). The future of School-University partnerships. In K. Sirotnic and j. Goodlad (Eds), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, Cases and Concerns* (pp. 205-225). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Smith, M. (2000). The Role of the Tutor in Initial Teacher Education. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 8, (2):137-145.
- Taskin, C. (2006). Student teachers in the classroom: their perceptions of teaching practice. *Educational Studies*, 32(4): 387-398.
- Tickle, L. (2000). *Teacher induction: the way ahead*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Appendix A

Dear Colleagues

This study investigates the degree university tutors, cooperating teachers and school principals practice their roles during student teacher practicum at Imam University.

You are kindly requested to respond to the items of the questionnaire by ticking the box that expresses your opinion about student teacher practicum. The student teacher practicum is theoretically divided into four phases: planning, organization, implementation, and evaluation. The respondents in this study are kindly requested to rate their opinions on a five point scale about the items of the questionnaire. The responses will be strictly confidential and will be only used for educational research purposes.

Thank You for your cooperation

The Researcher

Dr. Abdallah Matar Abu Naba'h

Faculty of Languages & Translation

Department of English

Dear Colleague.

Please, fill in the following information:

Please, tick the appropriate box.

1. Name (Optional)

- University supervisor
- Cooperating teacher
- School Principal

2.College:

- College of Languages & Translation
- College of Arabic language

3. Gender :

Female
 Male

The Degree University Tutors, Cooperating Teachers and School Principals Practice their Roles during Student Teacher Practicum at Imam University.

Phase	Item	Always 5	Often 4	Sometimes 3	Rarely 2	Never 1
One (Planning).						
1	Writing up the supervision plans.					
2	Writing up the objectives of practicum.					
3	Writing up the instructions of practicum.					
4	Setting criteria for selecting cooperative schools .					
5	Describing the roles of participants in practicum.					
6	Setting criteria for selecting					

	cooperative teachers.					
7	Assigning student teachers to schools .					
8	Assigning student teachers to cooperative teachers.					
Two (Organization).						
9	Holding seminars and conferences on teacher education.					
10	Ensuring the availability of instructions materials at school					
11	Discussing the feedback of classroom visits with other participants in practicum.					
12	Helping student teachers adapt to the school environment.					
13	Identifying student teachers' professional needs and attending to them.					
14	Developing teacher education programs based on					

	available feedback.					
15	Arranging with educational institutions to get job opportunities for prospective teachers.					
Three (Implementation).						
16	Helping student teachers translate theory into practice.					
17	Helping student teachers exchange visits for feedback and improvement.					
18	Helping student teachers to design analyze and interpret evaluative measures.					
19	Helping student teachers design and implement remedial plans for their students.					
20	Helping student teachers develop a portfolio during their practicum.					
21	Helping student teachers conduct action research on their students.					
22	Discussing matters that hinder student teachers' work					

	at school.					
Four (Evaluation).						
23	Providing student teachers with feedback.					
24	Discussing the comments and reflections on classroom visits with other participating groups.					
25	Evaluating the student teacher portfolio at the end of the semester.					
26	Evaluating the administrative performance of student teachers during practicum.					
27	Evaluating the academic performance of student teachers during practicum.					
28	Sharing other groups the final grade of student teachers.					
29	Writing a final report on the student teacher's progress during practicum.					

30	Writing up criteria for assessing student teachers during practicum.					
----	--	--	--	--	--	--

درجة ممارسة مشرفي الجامعة والمعلمين المتعاونين ومدراء المدارس لأدوارهم في برنامج التربية العملية للطلبة المعلمين في جامعة الإمام

ملخص

تهدف الدراسة الى استقصاء درجة ممارسة مشرفي الجامعة والمعلمين المتعاونين ومدراء المدارس لأدوارهم في برنامج التربية العملية للطلبة المعلمين في جامعة الإمام واقتراحاتهم لأصلاحه. ولجمع البيانات تم تطوير استبانة تتكون من ثلاثين فقرة وزعت على المشاركين في برنامج التربية العملية في كلية اللغات والترجمة في جامعة الإمام خلال العام الدراسي 2010 / 2011

أظهرت النتائج أن درجة ممارسة مشرفي الجامعة لأدوارهم كان معتدلاً في حين كانت درجة ممارسة المعلمين المتعاونين ومدراء المدارس منخفضة. وبينت النتائج أيضاً أن هناك فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في درجة ممارسة المشاركين ولصالح مشرفي الجامعة الإناث.

قدم المشاركون في الدراسة عدداً من الاقتراحات لتحسين برنامج التربية العملية ومنها تزويد الطلبة المعلمين بما يحتاجون من المواد التدريسية والكتب المقررة وأدلة المعلمين ومنح المدارس المتعاونة شهادات تقدير وتقوية العلاقة بين الجامعة والمدارس المتعاونة.

الكلمات الدالة: مشرفو الجامعة، المعلمون المتعاونون، مدراء المدارس، الطالب المعلم، التربية العملية