

Article Title

Roles of Cooperating Teachers and Practicum Supervisors and their Effect on EFL Student-Teachers' Teaching Skills

Author

Abdallah Ahmad Baniabdelrahman, Ph. D,
Curriculum and Instruction Department
Faculty of Education
Yarmouk University
Irbid
Jordan

Bio Data

High school teacher 1983 – 1995
Full time lectures and practicum supervisor at the department of curriculum and instruction/ Yarmouk University 1995 – 2000
Assistant Prof. Yarmouk University-Jordan 2003 - ...

Qualifications

M.A. in TEFL/ Yarmouk University (1991)
Ph D. in TEFL/ University of Arkansas/ USA (2003)

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of three different practicum teaching and supervision methods based on the type of visits a student - teacher receives and the number of cooperating teachers they work with, in improving the practicum teaching English language student- teachers' performance in teaching English. It tried to answer the question: Are there significant differences in the performances of the student-teachers of the three groups in teaching English due to the method of supervision they receive or to their gender?

The population of the study consisted of all EFL students at Yarmouk University who were expected to attend two practicum teaching courses in their final semester at the University. The sample of the study consisted of all the practicum teaching two courses EFL students of the second semester of the academic year 2003/2004. They were 43 student-teachers practicing their practicum teaching in Irbid City schools.

The results of the study proved that the MSMCT method was significantly better than the MSICT and ISICT methods in improving the EFL student-teachers' teaching skills of English. The results also pointed out that the MSICT method was also significantly better than the ISICT method in improving the EFL student-teachers teaching skills of English. No significant effect was found for gender.

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended to offer student-teachers the opportunity to work with more than one practicum supervisor and with more than one cooperating teacher. Furthermore, other studies should be carried out using larger samples.

Roles of Cooperating Teachers and Practicum Supervisors and their Effect on EFL Student-Teachers' Teaching Skills

Introduction

In most of teacher preparation programs, student teachers spend a period of time in their study at university or college in practicing teaching in real situations under the supervision of a supervisor from the program and a cooperating teacher from the school s/he joins for practicum teaching. Although practicum supervision is important in the process of student-teacher preparation to be qualified teachers, very little is known about its influence and effect on student-teachers (Embeier, 2003). Alfunso (1990) points out that

the lack of research and continuing disagreement on the definition and purposes of supervision contributed to weak preparation programs for instructional supervision.

Regarding Jordan, practicum teaching is an essential component of EFL teacher preparation program. During practicum teaching, student-teachers have the opportunity to make connection between the content of the courses they have studied at university (EFL methodology) and its applications for classroom teaching. However, little information is available on practicum supervision of student teaching in EFL. There is a need in the field for a body of knowledge on how the supervision of student-teaching is conducted, how it should be conducted, and how it affects EFL student-teachers performance in teaching English. Such knowledge will help starting a research that examines the place practicum supervision in TEFL can occupy in EFL teacher preparation, the roles that practicum supervisors can play, and the ways in which supervisory effectiveness can be achieved and assessed.

Although very little has been written about group or multi-supervision, some writers believe student-teachers will benefit more if they are given the opportunity to work with more than one cooperating teacher and practicum supervisor (Kennedy 1993). This study comes to examine this claim. It is an experimental study that investigates the effect of three models of practicum supervision on EFL student-teachers' teaching skills

Practicum Supervision at Yarmouk University

Students of the English Language Teacher Preparation program at Yarmouk University/Jordan have to join a school in Irbid City or surrounding area to practice teaching English for a whole semester in their final semester at the university in their B.A.

program. They are supposed to teach any of the basic educational stage classes (grades 1-10). They are also expected to teach 8 - 10 class periods per week in the morning. They are allowed to have other academic courses in the university after they finish their teaching at schools.

The university supervisor is expected to visit each student two evaluation visits per semester in addition to a supervision visit during the first days of the semester for instructions. In each of the evaluation visits, the supervisor is expected to sit with the student-teacher in the presence of the cooperating teacher before his/her class discussing his/her lesson plan and giving recommendations and instructions regarding teaching. Then the supervisor attends the student-teacher's lesson also in the presence of the cooperating teacher, sitting in the class and taking notes about the student teacher's performance. After the lesson, the supervisor, the cooperating teacher and the student-teacher sit and discuss the lesson. The supervisor gives written recommendations to the student-teacher to keep them in his/her preparation notebook, and to benefit from them in his/her subsequent lessons. In each visit, the supervisor fills an evaluation form of 32 items assessing the student teacher's performance (Appendix A).

Problem of the Study

There is an agreement among educators regarding the important role of practicum teaching in teacher preparation process. There is also an agreement on the important roles of practicum supervisors and cooperating teachers in the same process. Cooperation among cooperating teachers, supervisors, and student-teachers is important for the benefit of the student-teachers. The problem is that there is a kind of disagreement on the form of practicum supervision whether it should be carried out individually or in groups (Kennedy

1993; Willis, 1996; Skehan, 1998). This study comes to investigate the effectiveness of individual and in group practicum supervision on EFL student-teachers acquisition of EFL teaching skills.

Objectives of the study:

This study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of three different practicum teaching and supervision models in improving the practicum teaching English language student- teachers' performance in teaching English.

Questions of Study

This study tries to answer the following question:

Are there significant differences in the performances of the student-teachers of the three groups in teaching English due to the method of supervision they receive or to their gender?

Significance of the Study

There is a necessity for reforming practicum teaching to concentrate on the understanding of the learning/teaching process rather than concentrating on teaching skills acquisition only. Instead of being limited to one model of teaching, exposing student-teachers to different models might be more helpful on the long-term development of a teacher identity as well as skills.

The significance of the study is evident by the fact that an exemplary English instruction supervisory model could help to facilitate the achievement of the goals and expectations of an English teacher preparation program. Although practicum supervision is an important component of any teacher preparation program, little information is available

about its effectiveness. This study will help in starting a research in the supervision field that examines the place that the practicum supervision in TEFL can occupy in EFL teacher preparation, and the roles that practicum supervisors can play.

An examination of three models of practicum supervision in TEFL which this study will do will help in achieving better understanding of how practicum supervision can be carried out. This study will offer decision makers with objective information for decision making. It will also offer EFL supervisors with information about alternative forms of carrying out supervision.

Literature Review

Sandholtz and Shannon (2000) stress the important role of practicum supervision in teacher preparation programs. The supervisor's role is not only as a subject matter expert and to focus only on pedagogical strategies for teaching a particular discipline, but he/she is a leading subject matter resource for student teachers. Adey and Speedy (1993) and Hawkey (1998) also stress the significant role that both practicum supervisor and a cooperating teacher may play in the success of student teacher in his/her practicum teaching. They stress the need to establish a good degree of cooperation between the practicum supervisor and the cooperating teacher. The supervisor's role and responsibilities are changing depending on the development and requirements of the teaching-learning process and the teacher preparation methods.

The skills of cooperating teachers need to be recognized and they should be used to help in the design of practicum teaching programs because that will empower cooperating teachers as equal participants in the teacher education process. Cooperating teachers perceive their participation in practicum teaching as recognition of their experience and

qualifications (Hawkey, 1998). Wilson (1995) points out the important role of cooperating teachers and stresses that involving them in the practicum teaching process increases their confidence and enhances their supervisory abilities which are reflected on the student-teachers.

Although the feedback that cooperating teachers provide to the student-teachers is critical and important (Pelletier, 2000), it is limited in quality and quantity (Veal & Rikard, 1998; Wilkins-Canter, 1997). Essential to the practicum training process is the existence of a clear and shared vision amongst the participants (practicum supervisor, student-teacher, and cooperating teacher) that takes them from working individually to work as a group (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Communication and cooperation amongst the participants of practicum teaching is essential to overcoming some of the problems associated with the practicum (Hargreaves, 1994; Hulshof & Verloop, 1994; Sudzina & Coolican, 1994).

One of the practicum supervision problems is how to balance between theory and practice. The lack of communication and common frames of reference are the main reasons of the conflict between theory and practice in teacher preparation (Gafery & Porter, 1990; Hawkey, 1998). The very much important question is: Is it enough for the practicum supervisor to comment on a trainee's performance? Bourke (2001) believes that 'talk' quickly evaporates and that it seldom brings about the desired outcome. He prefers a task-based approach to training, along the lines suggested by Wajnryb (1992) and Parrott (1993) and the mentoring approach proposed by Malderez and Bodoczky (1999). Furthermore, Bourke prefers the video programs produced by the University of Dayton, which focus on cases or tasks and involve student teachers in the processes of observing,

analyzing and reflecting on practice. Bourke (2001) argues that practicum supervision should focus on teacher development, rather than teacher training.

A review of literature presents the necessity for reforming practicum teaching to concentrate on the understanding of the learning/teaching process rather than concentrating on teaching skills acquisition only. What is taught/learned, and how it will be applied in real situation is important in practicum teaching (Gore, 1995; Northfield & Gunstone, 1997). The supervisor-student teacher relationship which is built during mentoring and during lesson conferences is important and dynamic. The practicum supervisor has to take into consideration student teachers' perceptions, feelings, and justifications (Sharpe et al., 1994).

Sandholtz and Shannon (2000) state that the availability of practicum supervisor at a school site helps student teachers through referring to him/her when he/she is needed. It also facilitates the supervisor's ability to hold on-site seminars. They reported a description of the effectiveness of a model of supervision used in a teacher preparation program in the Professional Development School. In that model, student teachers were placed in cohorts of six to twelve at each professional development school. A supervisor from the University of California was assigned to each site. The supervisors were a liaison between the university and the school and worked closely with administrators, teachers, and student teacher over the entire school year. Each supervisor was assigned a permanent room at the school, which facilitated the ability of each to hold on-site seminars and to work primarily at the school site. This arrangement allowed the supervisors to be more readily available to both student teachers and cooperating teachers. This also built understanding of school

culture and enhanced the supervisor's ability to counsel student teachers about specific situations.

Although there are good books and manuals (Ellis, 1990; Ur, 1996), but these works have little to say on the subject of practicum teaching supervision. The difficulty is to cope with change. TESL/TEFL changed radically with the advent of task-based learning (Willis, 1996; Skehan, 1998) and the implications for teacher training and supervision are far-reaching. There is a gap between what teachers do in their classrooms and what practicum supervisors think they have to do.

Study Design and Methodology

Sample and Population of Study

The population of the study consisted of all EFL students at Yarmouk University who were expected to attend two practicum teaching courses in their final semester at the University. The sample of the study consisted of the EFL students of the practicum teaching two courses of the second semester of the academic year 2003/2004. In that semester, there were 43 students practicing their practicum teaching in Irbid City schools. The English language practicum teaching supervisor randomly divided them into three groups of (14, 15, and 14). The first group was supervised according to Method One, the second group was supervised according to Method Two, and group three was supervised according to Method Three (The three methods will be explained in details below). In order to check their equivalence after the randomization distribution, a teaching evaluation form of 32 items (Appendix A) was filled for each one of them by two different supervisors from the two directorates of education (Irbid the First and Second) in the first week of their

program through attending a whole class for each one. The data were analyzed then using ANOVA test (two way analysis of variance).

Instrumentation and Data Collection

After dividing the participants randomly into three groups, a teaching evaluation form of 32 items (Appendix A) was completed for each one of them by two different supervisors from the two directorates of education (Irbid the First and Second) in the first week of their program through attending a whole class for each one. Then the mean of the two evaluations was calculated. Then the data were used to check the equivalence of the three groups by using ANOVA test (Two Way Analysis of Variance). The results are presented in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics (Mean and Standard Deviations) of Participants' Scores before Treatment

Method	Male			Female		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
ISICT	5	74.00	17.89	9	82.00	20.18
MSICT	6	87.17	15.43	9	87.99	12.66
MSMCT	5	84.40	20.94	9	89.44	21.63

Note: Scores are out of 160

Table 1 shows that the participants' scores before treatment in the three groups (ISICT, MSICT, and MSMCT) were very closed which might not reveal significant differences among them.

Table 2

Results of ANOVA Test: Two Way Analysis of Variance of Participants' Scores before Treatment by Gender and Method

Source	DF	SS	MS	F-Value	Pr>F
Method	2	162.099	81.05	0.24	0.7881
Gender	1	632.91	632.91	1.87	0.1796
Method*Gender	2	533.96	266.98	0.79	0.4617
Within Groups	37	12515.10	338.25		
Corrected Total	42	13681.62			

Table 2 shows that there were no significant differences in the participants' mean scores neither due to their gender nor to the method of supervision which means that the three groups were equivalent.

Method One (ISICT): Individual Supervision and Individual Cooperating Teacher

In this method, the student-teachers of the practicum teaching program were supervised by the practicum supervisor and one cooperating teacher. They were visited three visits by the same supervisor of the practicum teaching program in addition to a quick visit at the first days of the program for instructions.

Method Two (MSICT): Multi-Supervision and Individual Cooperating Teacher

In this method, the student-teachers of the practicum teaching program were supervised by the practicum teaching program supervisor and two other supervisors from Irbid City Directorates of Education the First and Second. The student-teachers also worked with one cooperating teacher each. They were visited once by the supervisor of the program in addition to the quick visit at the first days of the program for instructions. Moreover the student-teachers in this method were visited two more visits by two different supervisors from Irbid City Directorates of Education the First and Second.

Method Three (MSMCT): Multi-Supervision and Multi-Cooperating Teachers

In this method, the student-teachers of the practicum teaching program worked with two or three cooperating teachers each. They were also supervised by the practicum teaching supervisor and two other supervisors from Irbid City Directorates of Education the First and Second. They were visited once by the supervisor of the program in addition to the quick visit at the first days of the program for instructions. Moreover the student-teachers in this method were visited two more visits by two different supervisors from Irbid City Directorates of Education the First and Second.

The practicum teaching supervisor at Yarmouk University discussed with supervisors from the two directorate of education in Irbid city the purposes of the study and the procedures that would be used. Then the practicum supervisor requested their help in carrying out the study for the benefit of the educational process in Jordan. Five of the supervisors of the Directorates of Education in Irbid City the First and Second, expressed a high degree of enthusiasm to cooperate in carrying out the study. Then two of them who hold an MA degree in English language teaching were selected to participate in carrying out the study. Then the practicum supervisor and the two supervisors of the Directorates of Education of Irbid the First and Second discussed the procedures of conducting the study. The practicum supervisor explained that there were three groups of student-teachers that would receive three different models of supervisions. The three models were also explained. The practicum supervisors also told the two supervisors of the Directorates of Education that student teachers would be evaluated using the same evaluation form that the Practicum Teaching Program at Yarmouk University used.

Each student-teacher of the first group (ISICT Method) cooperated with one cooperating teacher. The practicum supervisor visited each student-teacher in this group two times in addition to the first quick supervision visit at the beginning of the program. Regarding the second group (MSICT Method), as the case was in the first group (ISICT Method), each student-teacher cooperated with one cooperating teacher. The student-teachers of this group were visited once by the supervisor of the practicum teaching program. They also received two visits by the two different supervisors of Irbid City Directorates of Education the First and Second. The third group (MSMCT Method) also received the same number of supervision visits from the same supervisors of the second group in addition to cooperating with two or three cooperating teachers each.

Before each visit with the three groups of student-teachers, the university practicum teaching supervisor or the two supervisors of the Directorates of Education in Irbid City used to sit with the practicum teaching student for 45 minutes discussing his/her lesson plan in the presence of the cooperating teacher(s) of the student-teacher. After each visit, the practicum supervisor or the supervisors of the directorates of education used to sit with the student-teacher for about 45 minutes to discuss his/her lesson and performance in the presence of the cooperating teacher(s). The supervisors used to write their notes and recommendations for the student-teacher to benefit from in future teaching periods. By the end of the semester, all student-teachers of the three groups were evaluated by the supervisor of the practicum teaching program and two of the supervisors of Irbid City Directorates of Education the First and Second. Each of the three supervisors completed an evaluation form for each student-teacher separately after attending a complete teaching lesson for each student-teacher. It was a 32 item evaluation scale (see appendix A). The

grade of each item was out of 5 points. One means weak and five means excellent. Then the average of the three evaluations was calculated.

For the purpose of the study the researcher used the same evaluation scale which the practicum teaching program uses in evaluating the students of that program. That evaluation scale was revised and evaluated several times by the faculty members of the program till it reached its final edition (Appendix A). The evaluation scale consists of 32 items. A grade out of 5 is given for the evaluated student-teacher on each of the items. The total is out of 160 points

Data Analysis

The researcher used the quantitative approach in the study because the study was a cause- effect and an experimental one.

1. Results Related to the Question: Are there significant differences in the performances of the student-teachers of the three groups in teaching English due to their gender and the method of supervision?

In order to analyze the collected data, the researcher used ANOVA test two way analysis of variance in addition to descriptive statistics. The results are presented in the following tables.

1. Student-Teachers' Responses on the Whole Scale

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics (Mean and Standard Deviations) of Participants' Scores after Treatment by Gender and Method

Variable	N	Mean	SD
ISICT	14	96.28	14.27

Method	MSICT	15	109.72	14.00
	MSMCT	14	123.02	12.41
Gender	Males	16	105.51	13.03
	Females	27	112.14	19.01

Note: Means are out of 160

Table 3 shows that the student-teachers of Method Three (MSMCT) scored better than the student-teachers of Method Two (MSICT); and the student-teachers of Method Two (MSICT) scored better than the student-teachers of Method One (ISICT). Their mean scores were 123.02, 109.72, and 96.28 respectively.

Table 4

Results of ANOVA test Two Way Analysis of Variance after Treatment by Gender and Method of Supervision

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	Pr>F
Method	2	4535.45	2267.72	12.08	0.0001*
Gender	1	444.69	444.69	2.37	0.1323
Method*Gender	2	5.05	2.52	0.01	0.3867
Within Groups	37	6947.79	187.78		
Total	42	12401			

* Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

The results show that there was no significant interaction between the method of supervision and the gender of the student-teachers at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($P > 0.71$). The results show

that there was significant difference in the student-teachers' mean scores on the whole scale due to the method of supervision. In order to identify for the favor of which method the significant difference was; Tukey test of Multi-comparisons was run. The results are presented in Table 6. The results did not reveal significant difference due to the participants' gender at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($P > 0.18$).

Table 5
Interaction between Gender and Supervision Methods

Method	Gender	N	Mean	DS
ISICT	Males	5	92.20	6.46
ISICT	Female	9	98.54	17.15
MSICT	Male	6	106.12	8.16
MSICT	Female	9	112.12	16.88
MSMCT	Males	5	118.10	9.80
MSMCT	females	9	125.76	13.37

Note: Means are out of 160.

Table 4 shows that although male and female student-teachers scored better in the MSMCT method (Method Three) than they scored in the MSICT method (Method Two); and they scored better in the MSICT method (Method Two) than they scored in the ISICT method (Method One), the differences were not statistically significant. This explains why no significant interaction appeared between gender and method of supervision. The mean scores of the male student-teachers were 92.20 in the ISICT method, 106.12 in the MSICT method and 118.10 in the MSMCT method. The mean scores of the female student-teachers in the ISICT method was 98.54, 112.12 in the MSICT method, and 125.76 in the MSMCT method.

Table 6**Results of Tukey Test of Multi-comparisons**

Methods		Differences between Means	Simultaneous Confidence Limits	95%
Method 2	Method 1	13.441	1.009	25.874*
Method 2	Method 3	- 13.301	- 25.734	- 0.869*
Method 3	Method 1	26.743	14.098	39.388*

* Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 5 shows that the student-teachers of method Three (MSMCT method) scored significantly higher than the student-teachers of Method Two (MSICT method) and Method One (ISICT method). The results also show that student-teachers of Method Two scored significantly higher than the student-teachers of Method One. This means that Method Three came first, Method Two came second, and Method One was the last.

2. Results of Student-Teachers' Scores on the Lesson Plan Subscale

This subscale, which consisted of 8 items (items 1 – 8), dealt with student-teachers' abilities in preparing their lesson plans. The results of student-teachers of the three methods are presented in the following tables.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics (Mean and Standard Deviations) of Participants on the Lesson Plan Subscale after Treatment by Gender and Method of Supervision

Variable		N	Mean	SD
	ISICT	14	24.63	4.54
Method	MSICT	15	27.34	4.01
	MSMCT	14	30.69	2.97

Gender	Male	16	26.12	3.88
	Female	27	28.39	4.76

Note: Scores are out of 40 points

Table 6 shows that the student-teachers of the MSMCT method scored better than the student-teachers of the two other methods. The results also point out that student-teachers of the MSICT method scored better than the student-teachers of the ISICT method. The table also points out that female student-teachers a little bit scored higher than male student-teachers.

Table 8

Results of ANOVA test Two Way Analysis of Variance of Participants' Scores on the Lesson Plan Subscale after Treatment by Gender and Method of Supervision

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	Pr>F
Method	2	247.82	123.91	8.38	0.0010*
Gender	1	53.48	53.48	3.62	0.0649
Method*Gender	2	9.87	4.94	0.33	0.7182
Within Groups	37	546.83	14.78		
Corrected Total	42	865.95			

* Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 8 shows that there was no significant interaction between student-teachers' gender and the method of supervision at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($P > 0.7182$). The results also did not reveal significant difference in the participants' mean scores due to their gender at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($P > 0.0649$), but they revealed significant difference due to the method of teaching at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($P = 0.0010$). To identify for the favor of which method(s) the significant difference was, Tukey Test of multi-comparisons was run (See table 10 below).

Table 9**Interaction between Gender and Method of Supervision on the Lesson Plan****Sub-Scale**

Method	Gender	N	Mean	DS
ISICT	Male	5	22.40	3.65
ISICT	Female	9	25.87	4.69
MSICT	Male	6	26.70	2.53
MSICT	Female	9	27.77	4.87
MSMCT	Males	5	29.14	2.42
MSMCT	Females	9	31.54	3.02

Note: Scores are out of 40 points

The results show that female and male student-teachers scored better in the MSMCT method than they scored in the MSICT method and the ISICT method. Male student-teachers scored 29.14 in the MSMCT method, 26.70 in the MSICT method, and 22.40 in the ISICT method, while female student-teachers scored 31.54 in the MSMCT Method, 27.77 in the MSICT method, and 25.87 in the ISICT method.

Table 10**Results of Tukey Test of Multi-Comparisons of Student-Teachers' Mean Scores on the Lesson Planning Scale**

Methods		Difference between Means	Simultaneous 95% Confidence Limits	
MSICT	ISICT	2.711	0.777	6.199
MSICT	MSMCT	- 3.346	- 6.834	0.142
MSMCT	ISICT	6.057	2.510	9.605*

Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

This table shows that there was significant difference at $\alpha = 0.05$ between the MSMCT method and the ISICT method for the favor of the MSMCT method on the lesson planning subscale. The student-teachers significantly scored better and higher in the

MSMCT method than they scored in the ISICT method. The comparisons did not reveal significant differences neither between the MSMCT method and The MSICT method, nor did they between the MSICT method and the ISICT method.

3. Results of Student-Teachers on the Performance Subscale by Gender and Method

The performance scale, which consisted of 24 items (items 9 – 32) dealt with the show (12 items), reaction skills with students (5 items), methods of evaluation (4 items), and student-teacher character (3 items). Results of the participants' scores are presented in the following tables.

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics (Mean and Standard Deviations) of Participants on the Performance Subscale by Gender and Method

Variable	N	Mean	SD
ISICT	14	71.65	10.28
Method			
MSICT	15	82.38	10.35
MSMCT	14	92.34	9.85
Gender			
Male	16	79.39	9.83
Female	27	83.75	14.53

Note: Means are out of 120 points

The results show that student-teachers of the MSMCT method scored better than the student teachers of the MSICT method and the student teachers of the ISICT method. The results also show that student-teachers of the MSICT method scored better than the

student-teacher of the ISICT method. Furthermore, the female students scored higher than the male students.

Table 12

Results of ANOVA Test Two Way Analysis of Variance of Participants' Scores on the Performance Subscale after Treatment by Gender and Method of Supervision

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-value	Pr>F
Method	2	2663.42	1331.71	12.53	0.0001*
Gender	1	189.74	189.74	1.79	0.1896
Method*Gender	2	10.82	5.41	0.05	0.9504
Within Groups	37	3931	106.25		
Corrected Total	42	7131.05			

* Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

This table shows that there was no significant interaction between the participants' gender and the method of supervision at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($P > 0.9504$) (See table 13 below for more clarification). The results show that there was no statistically significant difference in the participants' mean scores due to their gender at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($P > 0.1896$), but there was significant difference due to the method of supervision at $\alpha = 0.05$ ($P = 0.0001$). To identify for which method the favor was, Tukey test of multi-comparisons was run. The results are presented in table 14 below.

Table 13

Interaction between Gender and Supervision Methods on the Performance Subscale

Method	Gender	N	Mean	DS
ISICT	Male	5	69.80	2.86

ISICT	Female	9	72.68	12.82
MSICT	Male	6	79.42	6.69
MSICT	Female	9	84.36	12.20
MSMCT	Males	5	88.96	8.30
MSMCT	Females	9	94.21	10.58

Note: Means are out of 60 points

As was the case in the lesson plan sub scale, male and female student-teachers scored better in the MSMCT method than they scored in the MSICT method and the ISICT method but that was not significant. Male student-teachers scored 88.96 in the MSMCT method, 79.42 in the MSICT method, and 69.80 in the ISICT method. For females, they scored 94.21 in the MSMCT method, 84.36 in the MSICT method, and 72.68 in the ISICT method.

Table 14

Results of Tukey Test of Multi-Comparisons of the Participants' Results on the Performance Sub-scale

Methods		Difference between Means	95% Confidence Limits	
Method 2	Method 1	10.730	1.378	20.082*
Method 2	Method 3	- 9.956	- 19.308	- 0.604*
Method 3	Method 1	20.686	11.174	30.198*

The results point out that there were significant differences between the MSMCT method and the other two methods (MSICT and ISICT) for the favor of the MSMCT method. Student-teachers of MSMCT method scored significantly higher and better than the student-teachers of the other two methods (the ISICT and MSICT methods). This indicates that the MSMCT method was the best method, comes second the MSICT method, and comes last the ISICT method.

Discussion

Being supervised by more than one supervisor and cooperating with more than one cooperating teacher may offer the student-teacher an opportunity to exchange different ideas with different persons. Evaluating student-teachers by more than one supervisor could be more objective than being evaluated by only one person. Sometimes for a reason or another, a student may not be comfortable for his instructor. Giving him/her the opportunity to cooperate with more than one instructor may achieve for him/her the comfort. These points of view might be supported by the results of this study.

The results of this study revealed that the multi-supervision and the multi-cooperating teachers method (MSMCT Method) was more effective in supplying the EFL student-teachers with the teaching methods than the individual supervision and individual cooperating teacher method (ISICT Method) and the multi-supervision and individual cooperating teacher method (MSICT Method) did. The results also revealed that the MSICT Method was significantly more effective in supplying the EFL student-teachers with the English language teaching skills than the ISICT Method did. The EFL student teachers who were supervised by more than one supervisor and cooperated with more than one cooperating teacher demonstrated better in teaching English than the student-teachers who were supervised only by one supervisor and one cooperating teacher. They were also better than the student-teachers who were supervised by more than one supervisor but cooperated with only one cooperating teacher on the whole scale of evaluating teaching, and in the performance scale (the show, reaction skills with students, method of evaluation, and student-teacher character). Regarding the lesson plan subscale, the MSMCT Method was significantly better than the ISICT Method. These results might be because being supervised by more than one supervisor and cooperating with more than one cooperating

teacher may offer a trainee teacher the chance to benefit from different experiences of different persons which might not be available for those who are supervised or cooperate with only one supervisor and one cooperating teacher. These results support Kennedy's claim (1993) when he says that student teachers will benefit more if they are given the opportunity to work with more than one cooperating teacher and practicum supervisor.

Working with more than one supervisor and more than one practicum teacher could be effective because it enhances the interaction between the student-teacher and his/her cooperating teachers and practicum supervisors. Moreover, including supervisors from the field (Ministry of Education) could be effective because they live the field problems and needs. They might be more aware with the school students' needs and difficulties.

EFL/ESL students benefit when teachers demonstrate strategies for completing instructional tasks and problems, check for students understanding prior to asking them to work independently, and present varied examples of concepts being taught (Echevarria & Graves, 1998). Working and observing more than one cooperating teacher offers a student-teacher the chance to observe different strategies and different methods or techniques used by different teachers in teaching a certain task.

An essential task for teachers is to show students strategies that work, and then to provide opportunities for them to practice using the strategies in academic situation (Padron & Waxman, 1993). So working with more than one supervisor and more than one cooperating teacher may help in providing EFL student-teachers with a variety of teaching strategies and methods and may help them to be more confident. Working with more than one cooperating teacher and supervisor may offer EFL student-teachers the opportunity to communicate their thoughts and ideas in a supportive and non-threatening environment

and to receive and discuss instructions from their supervisors that are suitable for their abilities.

In general in Jordan, female teachers teach in female schools and male teachers teach in male schools. There is no co-education in children schools except sometimes for grades 1 to 3. Co-education is a system used at university and college levels. For the student-teachers, female student-teachers practice their practicum teaching in female schools and male student-teachers in male schools. However female teachers could be supervised by male supervisors and the vice versa is correct.

The results revealed that there was no significant effect on the EFL student-teachers' teaching skills due to their gender. This might be because all the participants of the study practiced their teaching in public schools that are run by the Ministry of Education in Jordan. This means that they were practicing teaching under the same conditions with similar available facilities no matter whether they were male or female student-teachers. Furthermore, all the participants in the study were fourth year EFL students at Yarmouk University who completed the same syllabus of courses.

Conclusion

This study examined the claim that student teachers will benefit more if they are given the opportunity to work with more than one practicum supervisor and more than one cooperating teacher. The results of the study support this claim. The results of the study proved that the MSMCT method was significantly better than the MSICT and ISICT methods in improving the EFL student-teachers' teaching skills of English. The results also

pointed out that the MSICT method was also significantly better than the ISICT method. No significant effect was found for gender.

The results of the study pointed out that cooperation among cooperating teachers, supervisors, and student-teachers is important for the benefit of the student-teachers. The results of the study stressed the effectiveness of group practicum supervision on EFL student-teachers acquisition of EFL teaching skills.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended to offer student-teachers the opportunity to work with more than one practicum supervisor and more than one cooperating teacher. Furthermore, other studies to be carried out in different situations using larger samples. It is also recommended to carry out qualitative studies using interviews, observations of real situations, analysis of documents, and questionnaires. Studies of the perceptions of EFL student-teachers, practicum teaching supervisors, schools principals, and cooperating teachers may help in achieving an in depth vision of the effectiveness of practicum teaching.

REFERENCES

- Adey, K. L. & Speedy, G. (1993). End-on innovation: a school based approach to secondary teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 18(2), 34-39
- Alfunso, R. (1990). Supervision: Needed research: A research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 5(winter), 181-188.
- Bourke, J. M. (2001). The role of the TP TESL supervisor. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, (27)1, pp63-74.
- Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (1998). *Sheltered Content Instruction: Teaching English Language Learners with Diverse Abilities*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. (Oxford, Blackwell).
- Embeir, H. (2003). How supervision influences teacher efficacy and commitment: An investigation of a path model. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, (winter), 110-141.
- Fullan, M. & Miles, M. (1992). Getting reform right: what works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73, 745-752.
- Gaffery, C. & Porter, R. (1990). Seminars for co-operating teachers: are they effective? *Journal of Teaching Practice*, 10(2), 29-30.
- Gore, J. M. (1995). *Emerging Issues in Teacher Education*. Murdoch University: Innovative Links Project (Commonwealth of Australia).
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing Teachers, Changing Times*. London, Cassell.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (London & New York, Longman).
- Hawkey, K. (1998). Consultative supervision and mentor development: an initial exploration and case study. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 4(2), 331-348.
- Hulshof, H. & Verloop, N. (1994). The collaborating teacher as co-educator in teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 10(2), 25-34.
- Kennedy, J. (1993). Meeting the needs of teacher training practice. *ELT Journal*, 47(2), 157-165.
- Malderez, A. & Bodoczky (1999) *Mentor Courses*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

- Model Teach: A Proposal for the Revised Primary Teacher Education Program. (1999) (*Unpublished manuscript, University of Brunei Darussalam*).
- Northfield, J. & Gunstone, R. (1997). Teacher education as a process of developing teacher knowledge, in: J. Loughran & T. Russel. (Eds). *Teaching about Teaching: purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education*. London, Falmer Press.
- Padron, Y. N., & Waxman, H. C. (1993). Teaching and learning risks associated with limited cognitive mastery in science and mathematics for limited English proficient students. In office of Bilingual Education and Ministry Languages Affairs (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students: Focus on Middle and High School Issues*, Vol. 2 (pp. 511-547). Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Parrott, M. (1993) *Tasks for Language Teachers*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Pelletier, C.M. (2000). *A handbook of techniques and strategies for coaching student teachers* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Rowley, J. & Hart, P. (1994). *Mentoring the New Teacher: Facilitator's Guide*. University of Dayton, Ohio, ASCD.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Shannon, H. D. (2000). Professional development school trade-offs in teacher preparation and renewal. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 27(1), 7-27.
- Sharpe, L., Ngoh, M.S., Crawford, D, L. & Gopinathan, S. (1994). *Teacher Supervision Patterns and Discourse*. (Singapore, National Institute of Education).
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Sudzina, M. R. & Coolican, M. J. (1994). Mentor or tormentor: the role of the cooperating teacher in student teacher success. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators*, Educational Resources Information Centre, Atlanta, GA, 12-16 February.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Veal, M. L., & Rikard, G. L. (1998). Cooperating teachers' perspectives on the student teaching triad. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(108), 108-119.
- Wajnryb, R. (1992). *Classroom Observation Tasks*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-based Learning*. (London, Longman).

Wilkins-Canter, E.A. (1997). The nature and effectiveness of feedback given by cooperating teachers to student teachers. *Teacher Educator*, 32, 235-250.

Wilson, E. K. (1995). Empowering teachers as full partners in the preparation of new teachers. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, San Francisco, 18-22 April.

Appendix A
Evaluation Form
Faculty of Education & Arts

Practicum Education Program

Yarmouk University

Evaluation Model for Student-Teacher in Practicum Education Course

Name of Student-Teacher:

Semester:

School:

Class:

Subject:

Date:

Put a mark out of (5) for each of the following items

First: Education Plan

Elements of the Plan	No	Paragraph	Grade of (5)
Educational objectives	1	Comprehensive, integrated & combined	
	2		
Educational Methods and Activities	3	Using the contents to achieve the educational purposes.	
	4	Several educational methods and occasions.	
	5	The activities related to the educational purposes.	
	6	Show the practical side of the educational course.	
Evaluation Methods	7	Measures the range of educational purposes achievement.	
	8	Different and comprehensive.	

Second: Performance

Elements of the Performance	No	Paragraph	Grade of (5)
The show	9	Prepare students and encourage them to learn	
	10	The logical continuity and connection.	
	11	Take care of scientific and printing mistakes	
	12	Differences in educational methods and activities.	
	13	Encourage the students to initiate and share effectively in activities.	
			To employ the educational tools to _____

	14	achieve the objects. Get use of tie and its distribution.
	15	
	16	Emphasize on gaining basic information, skills and directions.
	17	Guide the students to develop their information and skills which related to educational position.
	18	To use a good language suitable to level of the student.
	19	To employ previous experiences of students, to have a simple easy learning.
	20	To connect knowledge with life.
Reaction Skills with Students	21	Accept the students, and grant a friendly atmosphere.
	22	Treat effectively the controlling problems.
	23	To get the answers and questions from the students with good language.
	24	Take care of personal differences between students.
	25	Support the students, and decrease the importance of mistakes.
Methods of Evaluation	26	Different methods of evaluation.
	27	Follow up homework, and class training.
	28	Get the use of the evaluation results and feedback in the educational position.
	29	Ask questions that encourage the students to think.
Character	30	Active and responsible.
	31	Initiative and invention.
	32	Good appearance.

End Mark: $\frac{\text{Average marks for every paragraph}}{5} \times 100 =$

Notes:

Name:

Signature

ادوار المعلمين المتعاونين ومشرفو التربية العملية ومدى تأثيرها على مهارات التدريس لدى الطلبة المعلمين تخصص لغة انجليزية لغير الناطقين بها

هدفت هذه الدراسة الى استقصاء مدى فاعلية ثلاث طرق من التربية العملية والاشراف العملي في اكساب طلبة التربية العملية تخصص لغة انجليزية لغير الناطقين بها مهارات التدريس اعتمادا على نوع الزيارات التي يقوم بها مشرفو التربية العملية وكذلك على عدد المشرفين وعدد المعلمين المتعاونين.

وقد هدفت الدراسة الى الاجابة عن السؤال التالي:

هل توجد هناك فروق ذات دلالة في اداء الطلبة المعلمين تخصص لغة انجليزية كلغة اجنبية تعزى الى طريقة الاشراف العملي؟

تكون مجتمع الدراسة من كل طلبة تخصص لغة انجليزية لغير الناطقين بها في جامعة اليرموك في العام الدراسي 2003-2004. اما عينة الدراسة فقد تكونت من جميع طلبة تخصص لغة انجليزية لغير الناطقين بها اللذين التحقو بمساقى التربية العملية في الفصل الثاني من العام الدراسي 2003-2004 في نفس الجامعة.

اظهرت نتائج الدراسة ان طريقة الاشراف المتعدد من اكثر من مشرف واحد ومن اكثر من معلم متعاون واحد (MSMCT) كانت افضل في تحسين قدرات الطلبة المعلمين تخصص اللغة الانجليزية لغير الناطقين بها من الطريقة التي يكون فيها مشرفون متعددون ومعلم متعاون واحد (MSICT) ومن طريقة مشرف واحد ومعلم متعاون واحد (ISICT). واطهرت النتائج ايضا ان طريقة (MSICT) كانت ايضا افضل من طريقة (ISICT). اعتمادا على هذه النتائج اوصت الدراسة باعتماد طريقة الاشراف العملي المتعدد من اكثر من مشرف واكثر من معلم متعاون واحد.