

TRAINEES' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SUPERVISORS' CONCEPTS OF IMPLEMENTING AND SUPERVISING AN EFFECTIVE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM AT KUWAIT UNIVERSITY: A CASE STUDY

Ameena Ebraheem Al-Methan
Kuwait University

Abstract

The study examined how trainees in Kuwait University perceived their school and university supervisors' behavior during the teaching training program. The study also examined which one of the two supervisors delivered a more effective training supervision. Moreover, the study seeks to propose suggestions for the empowerment of the student teaching program participants. A total of 726 trainees participated in the present study. Those students participated in the student teaching programs of 2000/2001 and 2002/2003. The data collected from the participants indicated that the supervisory techniques did not reach the required level as specified in the teaching practice guidebook which was issued by the STC at Kuwait University. The results also showed that the performance of school supervisors were better than that of university or substitute supervisors, particularly during the observation period, especially in emphasizing to positive characteristics of the trainees' teaching performance and teaching lessons' preparations. The 32 items' mean scored favored the school supervisors in all the areas examined during the training program irrespective of whether the mean differences are statistically significant or not. The Teacher Training Program at the University of Kuwait could be empowered by the following: (1) Continuous evaluation of the achievement of supervisors at the end of teaching practice process. (2) Exclusion of supervisors who failed to be effective in carrying out their task from the supervisor process. (3) The administration of both college education and STC should work closely in order to select the best-qualified supervisors who emulate the mission set forth by the two institutions. (4) Creating more collaboration/cooperation between school/substitute and university supervisors. Such collaboration should be based on mutual respect and understanding for each other's expertise, perspective and roles. (5) Reducing the gap between theory and practice in the teacher-training program through more involvement of college staff members in the student teaching program.

Keywords: Perceptions, trainees, supervising, teacher training program, Kuwait University

Abstrak

Kajian ini mengkaji bagaimana pelatih-pelatih di Universiti Kuwait menanggapi sikap penyelia-penyelia di sekolah dan universiti semasa program latihan mengajar. Kajian ini juga mengkaji ciri-ciri penyelia yang berjaya menyampaikan penyeliaan latihan secara berkesan. Sebagai tambahan, kajian ini mengemukakan beberapa cadangan bagi memperkasakan para peserta program latihan mengajar. Sejumlah 726 orang pelatih telah mengambil bahagian dalam kajian ini. Mereka mengikuti program pendidikan guru bagi sesi 2001/2002 dan 2002/2003. Data yang dikutip daripada peserta menunjukkan bahawa teknik-teknik penyeliaan yang diamalkan tidak mencapai tahap yang telah ditentukan di dalam buku panduan mengajar yang dikeluarkan oleh STC di Universiti Kuwait. Keputusan kajian juga menunjukkan bahawa pencapaian para penyelia gantian, terutama sekali semasa tempoh pemerhatian, khasnya dalam penekanan ciri-ciri positif pengajaran para pelatih dan penyediaan pelajaran. Skor purata 32 item telah memihak kepada penyelia sekolah dalam semua segi semasa mengikuti program latihan tanpa mengira sama ada perbezaan purata tersebut jelas ataupun tidak. Program Latihan Guru di Universiti Kuwait boleh diperkasakan dengan; (1) Penilaian berterusan tentang pencapaian penyelia di penghujung proses latihan mengajar. (2) Pengecualian penyelia yang tidak berkesan dalam menjalankan tugas penyeliaan. (3) Pentadbiran keda-dua kolej pendidikan dan STC seharusnya berkerjasama erat untuk memilih penyelia yang paling bermutu demi mendukung misi yang telah ditetapkan oleh kedua-dua institusi. (4) Penyediaan lebih banyak kerjasama antara sekolah dan penyelia universiti. Kolaborasi sedemikian seharusnya berasaskan rasa hormat dan kefahaman mengenai kepakaran, persepektif dan peranan masing-masing. (5) Mengurangkan jurang antara teori dan amali dalam program latihan guru melalui lebih banyak penglibatan tenaga pengajar dalam program latihan mengajar.

Kata Kunci: Persepsi, pelatih, penyeliaan, program latihan guru, Universiti Kuwait

INTRODUCTION

The ultimate goal of any teacher education is the production of quality teachers (Kettle & Sellars, 1966; and Putz, 1999). Teachers should be properly equipped in the different skills required for successful teaching (Curtis, et al., 1991; Evertson, et al., 1985). To achieve this goal the Programs offered by institutes of teacher preparations should cover both theory and practice (Harnett, 1999).

Through the courses offered, candidates will understand the nature of the teaching-learning process, the principles and methods of teaching, and the management of the learning environment (Guyton, 1989).

Student teaching enables students to be trained to acquire the competencies and skills that will mould them into successful teachers. Many educators have considered student teaching to be very important and highly valued aspect of the teacher Kauffman (1992) and Zahorik (1988) considered that student education program. Teaching field experience is an essential component of learning to teach, where supervision plays an important role. Student teaching is the most appropriate time to guide trainees and to provide providing high quality instructions (Schaech, 1985). Moreover, Richardson-Koehler (1990) asserted that there is enough evidence to show that teachers consider teaching practice experience as one of the most important factors in their professional preparation, when the trainees received knowledge and skills form their professional supervisors.

STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM IN KUWAIT UNIVERSITY

The main objective of the College of Education in Kuwait University which offers an undergraduate program is to prepare them to teach in the Kindergarten, Elementary, Intermediate, or Secondary school. The teacher education program in the College of Education is quite similar to other universal teacher preparation programs and covers both theory and practice teaching (Hamett, 1991). In Kuwait University, in order to be certified as teachers, (see: Koff, Florio, and Cronin, 1976) all candidates should take a total of 132 credit hours which cover University, Specialization, and Professional courses. The Professional courses offered by the College of Education are divided into two sections: class courses and the student teaching program, each is equivalent to 10 credit hours. During student teaching, trainees spend one semester in training schools.

The advantage of spending one semester in a training school is to provide the student teachers with the opportunity to assume full responsibilities as a classroom teacher, which include teaching, preparing and grading tests, producing instructional materials and participating in other related school activities. The training program which lasts for 14 weeks, consists of two phases. The phases are the Observation Period phase and the Teaching Training Period phase. The observation period phase lasts for two weeks. The first week usually spent observing experienced teachers teaching while the second week is spent for peer teaching and peer-coaching. The teaching training period phase lasts for 12 weeks during which the actual teaching takes place. In this phase important knowledge and skills are acquired and developed by the student teacher before he is allowed to practice teaching.

School supervisors and College faculty members (i.e. mentors) assume the responsibility of training, providing guidance, evaluating students' performance, and offering suggestions to improve students' teachers teaching skills (Guyton 1989: and Schiechty, 1985).

The Center for Student Teaching assumes the responsibility of implementing and following-up student teaching program, assigning supervisors, and issuing a training guide to help all parties involved in the training program to understand the nature and the requirements of the program. The training guide, however, states the responsibilities and duties of all parties involved in the student teaching program, which include the responsibilities of student teachers, responsibilities of school administrators, the role of the school and college supervisors, as well as the methods and criteria to be used in evaluating student performance.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

Kauffman (1992) points out that even though university supervisors and school supervisors agree on the common goal of preparing student teachers to teach effectively, they have different views and perspectives on how the learning process should occur. Evertson, et al., (1984) argues that some critics have doubts and questions on the effectiveness of student teaching practice because of the discrepancy of perspectives between school and university supervisors as well as the differences between theory and practice.

In a study on teaching effectiveness the differences between the perceptions of university supervisors and school supervisors was considered to be an important factor (Al-Methen, 1995). Problems at the College of Education-Kuwait University were cited by graduates, trainees, and supervisor and they were asked to state their opinions on factors which affect student teaching program. The discrepancy between school and university supervisor's perceptions on the effective preservice training qualities was among these factors. Thus, following the recommendations proposed by the researcher in 1995 to the college administrators (Al-Methen, 1995), this follow up study was carried out in an attempt to find out how student teachers perceived their school and university supervisors behavior and whether both supervisor's concepts of effective training supervision are in agreement with the goals of the teacher training program stated by the college of education suggestions for empowerment in the student teaching program were examined. The research questions of this study include"

1. How successful were both supervisors in implementing supervision during teaching practice?

2. What were the differences between university and school supervisor's role during teaching practice?
3. What were the differences in weekly visits of both supervisors according to the perceptions of the trainees?
4. What were the trainees' perceptions of the benefits of the supervision?
5. What were the differences in the implementation of supervision between the two groups of supervisors?

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Several educators have highlighted the merits of follow up studies. Morell (1979) agrees that a follow up study helps to provide realistic explanations on program achievable and unachievable goals. Thus it provides insight on how a program could be further improved. Decision-makers could use the findings to change the structure or implementation of a program besides providing objective information on the purpose of defending or criticizing a program. Flynn (1995) stated that a follow up study highlights on the program effectiveness, and the conditions for program's effectiveness.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Instrument

A questionnaire was designed to measure the roles of supervisors in implementing a successful student teaching program (based on categories mentioned in the student teaching guidebook/1992). Major topics requested by the college of education to be performed by supervisors yielded a total of 48 items. The questionnaire items were then piloted. A random sample of 76 students teachers who were in their last week of teaching training program in the academic year 2001-2002 participated in this stage. Trainees were asked to state their opinion on the importance of each item using a 3-point scale ranging from agree to disagree (3-agree, 2-not sure, and 1 disagree). Trainee's ratings were based on their current experiences with their teaching supervisors. Statements with less than 20% (Anastasi, 1961) agreement were dropped. Twelve items were removed for receiving lowest rating from the participants and accordingly thirty-eight items remained.

The Validity of the Questionnaire

The remaining thirty-eight items in the questionnaire were given to 37 school and university/substitute supervisors to seek their opinions on each item administered on the clarity and appropriateness for study. Items which received less than 70% agreement were removed. A total of 32 items were found and suitable. A second sample of 166 trainees who had just completed their student teaching (during the academic year 1996/97) was asked to response the final questionnaire. Their responses were used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire.

The Reliability of the Questionnaire

There are many different techniques (such as: The test-retest, the parallel-form test, and the split-half procedure) to assess the reliability of any achievement or psychological test. (See: Ferguson, 1947; Tate, 1965; Anastasi, 1961, and 1968; McNemar, 1969; Ary, et al., 1972; Tuckman, 1978; and Ferguson, 1981). The difficulty that encounters the researcher in applying the parallel-forms technique lies in the difficulty in constructing two parallel form of test which are truly identical in form, length, level of difficulty, time, and the like (Anastasi, 1961; and Ary, *et al.*, 1972). Moreover, the repetition of the same test is conditioned by the duration that separated the two occasions during which the test is conditioned by the duration that separates the two occasions during which the test is administered. Thus, if the duration is too short, then the testees may recall their first responses of the former tests on the second occasion (McNemar, 1969; and Ferguson, 1981). On the other hand, if the duration between the administrations of the two tests is too long, then other factors such as physical and mental conditions of the testees may affect the reliability coefficient of the test (Ary, et al., 1972). Furthermore, Meerah (1990: 51) argues, "the shorter the test, generally the less reliable it is and the resultant correlation are less than expected". Therefore, by using the split-half procedure there is a possibility of obtaining "different estimate of reliability even though the same set of score is used". (Meerah, 1990: 52).

To gain the advantage of a single test administration, the internal consistency procedure was adopted in this study for the measurement of the reliability of the questionnaire. The computed reliability coefficient was 0.82, thus the questionnaire has high reliability.

Sample of the Study

A total of 726 student teachers participated in this study. These students have participated in the student teaching programs during 2001-2002 or 2002-2003 session. The total sample of this summative study constituted of 401 trainees who had completed student teaching during the first semester of 2001/2002 and 325 trainees who had completed student teaching during the first semester of 2002/2003. The sample comprise more than 70% of the target population (i.e., 1019 student teachers) that participated in the student teaching program in 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 academic years. In other words, the sample is representative to a high degree, the views of the trainees as a whole.

It is worth mentioning that this is a survey of opinions of students regarding the implementation of the student teaching and the roles of school supervisors, and university/substitute supervisors during the period. Percentage and a t-test analysis were adopted in this study. Percentage was used to display and summarize the data of the supervision processes. This technique is informative on the size of acceptance or rejection regarding every item. The t-test analysis was used to compare the performance of the two groups of supervisors.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The procedures of the research are:

1. The success of both supervisors in carrying out their task using the mean score of each item were identified. Since the questionnaire has three responses for each item “Yes, sometime/somewhat, and No”, the supervisors’ success was indicated by the mean score which was not less than 2.5;
2. The items given high scores by trainees for both supervisors were identified
3. The items that show superiority of the School Supervisors’ performance were identified
4. The items, which prove otherwise, i.e. superiority of the University/Substitute Supervisors’ performance were also identified.

RESULTS

The first research question was “How successful were both the university and school supervisors during teaching practice?” Success was measured by scores obtained by the supervisors for 2.5 and above. Table 1 indicated that university supervisors obtained 2.5 and above for only 10 out 32 items or (30%) namely items 7, 8, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25, 29, 31 and 32.

(53%) namely for 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 21, 25, 26, 29, 30-32. The results generally show that both university and school supervisors were not very successful in their supervisory practices having scored 2.5 on (30%) and (53%) of the items.

Table 1: Perceptions of supervisors role during teaching practice (n=726)

	Group	Mean	SD	St. Er	T	D.F.	Pro
1. Participated in scheduling my training timetable from the very beginning	1	1.77	.964	.048	-11.8	720	.000***
	2	2.55	.762	.043			
2. Designed a suitable training procedure	1	2.36	.819	.046	-6.70	715	.000***
	2	2.72	.624	.031			
3. Demonstrated how to impart my knowledge successfully to students	1	2.18	.841	.042	-4.07	707	.000***
	2	2.31	.828	.031			
4. Highlighted the importance of the observation period on my training program	1	2.40	.802	.045	-4.39	717	.000***
	2	2.64	.661	.033			
5. Assisted me while observing other school teachers	1	1.71	.894	.050	-8.61	724	.000***
	2	2.24	.820	.041			
6. Assisted me while peer coaching	1	1.97	.035	.035	-9.25	722	.000***
	2	2.66	.623	.035			
7. Valued constructive criticism	1	2.60	.647	.032	-2.63	718	.000***
	2	2.72	.555	.031			
8. Highlighted the importance of the teacher training program and its effect on my teaching training profession	1	2.73	.612	.031	3.01	720	.000***
	2	2.58	.690	.038			
9. Feed-back focused more on positive aspects of my teaching performances	1	1.61	.919	.046	-7.45	720	.000***
	2	2.13	.980	.055			

	Group	Mean	SD	St. Er	T	D.F.	Pro																																																																																																																				
10. Used to discuss my teaching skills after each supervised lesson	1	1.94	.890	.045	6.60	713	.000***																																																																																																																				
	2	1.51	.787	.044				11. Enhanced me with means to inspire students with an interest for learning	1	1.96	.950	.104	2.18	360	.030*	2	1.71	.921	.055	12. Taught me the fundamental elements of planning a successful lesson	1	2.30	.742	.037	-4.22	718	.000***	2	2.53	.713	.040	13. Instructed me on how to prepare successful lesson	1	2.23	.807	.040	-.606	717	N.S.	2	2.27	.834	.047	14. Directed me on how maintain students' focus on a seatwork	1	2.36	.770	.058	6.48	328	.000***	2	1.79	.827	.067	15. Explain to me how maintain students' attention	1	2.76	.540	.027	1.64	715	N.S.	2	2.31	.624	.031	16. Showed me how to use black-board efficiently	1	2.58	.700	.039	-2.93	719	.000***	2	2.72	.611	.030	17. His/her supervised visits used to last for the entire class period	1	1.86	.710	.035	.86	720	N.S.	2	1.82	.733	.041	18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.	2	2.28	.793	.044	19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.
11. Enhanced me with means to inspire students with an interest for learning	1	1.96	.950	.104	2.18	360	.030*																																																																																																																				
	2	1.71	.921	.055				12. Taught me the fundamental elements of planning a successful lesson	1	2.30	.742	.037	-4.22	718	.000***	2	2.53	.713	.040	13. Instructed me on how to prepare successful lesson	1	2.23	.807	.040	-.606	717	N.S.	2	2.27	.834	.047	14. Directed me on how maintain students' focus on a seatwork	1	2.36	.770	.058	6.48	328	.000***	2	1.79	.827	.067	15. Explain to me how maintain students' attention	1	2.76	.540	.027	1.64	715	N.S.	2	2.31	.624	.031	16. Showed me how to use black-board efficiently	1	2.58	.700	.039	-2.93	719	.000***	2	2.72	.611	.030	17. His/her supervised visits used to last for the entire class period	1	1.86	.710	.035	.86	720	N.S.	2	1.82	.733	.041	18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.	2	2.28	.793	.044	19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034								
12. Taught me the fundamental elements of planning a successful lesson	1	2.30	.742	.037	-4.22	718	.000***																																																																																																																				
	2	2.53	.713	.040				13. Instructed me on how to prepare successful lesson	1	2.23	.807	.040	-.606	717	N.S.	2	2.27	.834	.047	14. Directed me on how maintain students' focus on a seatwork	1	2.36	.770	.058	6.48	328	.000***	2	1.79	.827	.067	15. Explain to me how maintain students' attention	1	2.76	.540	.027	1.64	715	N.S.	2	2.31	.624	.031	16. Showed me how to use black-board efficiently	1	2.58	.700	.039	-2.93	719	.000***	2	2.72	.611	.030	17. His/her supervised visits used to last for the entire class period	1	1.86	.710	.035	.86	720	N.S.	2	1.82	.733	.041	18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.	2	2.28	.793	.044	19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034																				
13. Instructed me on how to prepare successful lesson	1	2.23	.807	.040	-.606	717	N.S.																																																																																																																				
	2	2.27	.834	.047				14. Directed me on how maintain students' focus on a seatwork	1	2.36	.770	.058	6.48	328	.000***	2	1.79	.827	.067	15. Explain to me how maintain students' attention	1	2.76	.540	.027	1.64	715	N.S.	2	2.31	.624	.031	16. Showed me how to use black-board efficiently	1	2.58	.700	.039	-2.93	719	.000***	2	2.72	.611	.030	17. His/her supervised visits used to last for the entire class period	1	1.86	.710	.035	.86	720	N.S.	2	1.82	.733	.041	18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.	2	2.28	.793	.044	19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034																																
14. Directed me on how maintain students' focus on a seatwork	1	2.36	.770	.058	6.48	328	.000***																																																																																																																				
	2	1.79	.827	.067				15. Explain to me how maintain students' attention	1	2.76	.540	.027	1.64	715	N.S.	2	2.31	.624	.031	16. Showed me how to use black-board efficiently	1	2.58	.700	.039	-2.93	719	.000***	2	2.72	.611	.030	17. His/her supervised visits used to last for the entire class period	1	1.86	.710	.035	.86	720	N.S.	2	1.82	.733	.041	18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.	2	2.28	.793	.044	19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034																																												
15. Explain to me how maintain students' attention	1	2.76	.540	.027	1.64	715	N.S.																																																																																																																				
	2	2.31	.624	.031				16. Showed me how to use black-board efficiently	1	2.58	.700	.039	-2.93	719	.000***	2	2.72	.611	.030	17. His/her supervised visits used to last for the entire class period	1	1.86	.710	.035	.86	720	N.S.	2	1.82	.733	.041	18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.	2	2.28	.793	.044	19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034																																																								
16. Showed me how to use black-board efficiently	1	2.58	.700	.039	-2.93	719	.000***																																																																																																																				
	2	2.72	.611	.030				17. His/her supervised visits used to last for the entire class period	1	1.86	.710	.035	.86	720	N.S.	2	1.82	.733	.041	18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.	2	2.28	.793	.044	19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034																																																																				
17. His/her supervised visits used to last for the entire class period	1	1.86	.710	.035	.86	720	N.S.																																																																																																																				
	2	1.82	.733	.041				18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.	2	2.28	.793	.044	19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034																																																																																
18. Made me aware of areas of improvement I had accomplished during my teacher training	1	2.24	.759	.038	-.67	722	N.S.																																																																																																																				
	2	2.28	.793	.044				19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***	2	1.93	.298	.017	20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034																																																																																												
19. Checked my daily preparation notebook on a continues basis	1	1.81	.390	.019	-4.52	722	.000***																																																																																																																				
	2	1.93	.298	.017				20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.	2	2.25	.608	.034																																																																																																								
20. Assisted me on how to select the best instructional materials that can be of assistance	1	2.66	.637	.033	.07	720	N.S.																																																																																																																				
	2	2.25	.608	.034																																																																																																																							

	Group	Mean	SD	St. Er	T	D.F.	Pro
21. Advised me on how utilize class-time effectively	1	2.82	.482	.024	.96	718	N.S.
	2	2.78	.544	.030			
22. Assisted me on how utilize class-time effectively	1	2.43	.772	.039	-.14	690	N.S.*
	2	2.43	.791	.046			
23. Assisted me on how to establish a positive teacher-student relationships	1	2.18	.841	.042	-2.07	707	.039*
	2	2.31	.828	.047			
24. His/her monthly evaluation of my teaching efforts was objective	1	1.81	.792	.040	-1.32	713	N.S.
	2	1.90	.856	.048			
25. Behaved impartially towards us regardless of our performance level	1	2.60	.648	.032	-2.63	718	.000***
	2	2.72	.556	.031			
26. Emphasized on the positive characteristics of my teaching performance	1	2.45	.747	.037	-1.94	715	N.S.
	2	2.56	.722	.041			
27. Spend an extra time with us to illustrate the main characteristics of successful teaching	1	1.61	.919	.046	-7.45	720	.000***
	2	2.13	.980	.055			
28. Assisted me as to how employ various methods for measuring students understanding	1	2.34	.819	.041	-.75	714	N.S.
	2	2.39	.831	.047			
29. Treated us with respect	1	2.75	.582	.029	2.67	717	.000***

	Group	Mean	SD	St. Er	T	D.F.	Pro
30. His/her instructions were very helpful to me during my training program	1	2.39					
	2	2.58					
31.	1	2.62	.689	.034	-.80	722	N.S.

Where: * significant at the .05, ** significant at .01, *** significant at the .001

Where: Group 1 = university/ substitute supervisors and Group 2 = school supervisors.

The second research question related to the differences between university and school supervisors performance during teaching practice. Significant differences were obtained between university and school supervisors in 18 out of 32 items namely items 1-8; 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 25, 27, 29 and 30. For instance, school supervisors obtained higher mean scores (2.72) than the mean score of substitute/university supervisors (2.60) for item 7. Item 7 shows that school supervisors valued constructive criticisms more than university lecturers. School supervisors (2.72) behaved more impartially towards trainees regardless of their performance as compared to university/substitute supervisors (2.60 (item 25). They paid more attention (2.72) as well as the showed trainees how to use the blackboard efficiently, while the mean score of their counterparts is (2.58) (item 16). However, there is no significant difference in favor of “university/substitute supervisors”, they obtained higher mean score (2.73) than that of school supervisors (2.58) in highlighting the importance of teacher training program (item 8). Even though university/substitute supervisors obtained a higher mean score (2.66) in assisting trainees on how to select best instructional material, the difference was not statistically on maintaining student attention the significant ($p > 0.05$). Similarly, on item 15 university supervisors did obtained higher scores (2.76) but the differences were not significant.

As shown in Table 1, the mean scores for both supervisors are less than 2 for items 10, 11, 17, 19, and 24. Significant differences were found for items 10 and 11, where university/substitute supervisors obtained higher mean scores (1.94 and 1.96), than school supervisors scores (1.93 and 1.90) respectively. Nevertheless items 10, 11, 17, 19 indicated weak areas for both supervisors.

Trainees Views of Supervisors Visits

The third research question refers to the trainee’s views or perceptions on supervisors’ visits during student teaching.

The trainees' views on supervisors' visits, is shown in Table 2 which indicates that school supervisors have shown the committee to visit the trainees twice a week (as required) (55.4%), and 44.6% of the trainees indicated that school supervisors paid extra visits (more than 2 visits) 56.3% of the trainees indicated that university supervisors paid 2 visits per month. However only 43% paid more than 2 visits per month.

The fourth research question gauged the trainee's views on the benefits of the supervision they received from both supervisors.

Table 2: Trainees' views on Supervisor's visits

	Number	Frequency	%
Visits carried out by school supervisors	2	402	55.4
	> 2	324	44.64
Visits carried out by university/ substitute supervisors	2	409	56.3
	> 2	64	43.7

Minimum visits required from supervisors are 2 visits/week
 1 = university supervisor 2 = school supervisors

Table 3 refers to the overall degree of benefits. 43% of the trainees regarded the visits as being very beneficial whilst 29.4% of the trainees indicated that the visits were somewhat beneficial; 27.3% regarded the visits as not beneficial. Related to those visits is Item 17, which refers to the supervisors' visits duration (i.e., whether they stayed for the entire class period). This item obtained one of the lowest mean scores (M= 1.86, and M= 1.82) for both supervisors. Furthermore, trainees also showed poor response to item 24 with regard to the monthly reports by both supervisors (M= 1.81, and M= 1.90). The reports were not objective from the trainees' viewpoints. It is also noticeable that only 40% of the trainees agreed that their supervisors visited them more than twice a week.

Table 3: Degree of benefits from overall supervisors' visits

	values	Frequency	%
Very beneficial	3	314	43.3
Somewhat beneficial	2	214	29.4
Not beneficial	1	198	27.3

CONCLUSION

The first research question is related to the success of both supervisors in implementing and supervising the training program which is based on guidelines included in the teaching practice guidebook. Besides the mean scores that reflect the trainees' viewpoints, it is evidently clear that both supervisors have achieved success to some extent as indicated in the responses item 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, 25, 29, 31, and 32. However, both supervisors are not as successful in achieving their required task included as indicated in the responses to items 10, 11, 17, 19, and 24. Between comparing the high-evaluated items and the low-evaluated ones, it is quite clear that these items, particularly 10, 11, 19, and 17, are more essential to the success of the training program and the highly evaluated items are mostly focused on attitude. Therefore, a conclusion can be made that the supervising method did not reach the required level as stated in the training program's objectives issued by the STC in Kuwait University.

The findings related to the second research question showed that differences existed between the performance of school supervisors and that of the university supervisors, particularly during the observation period, in emphasizing the positive characteristics of the trainees' teaching performance, and on lessons' preparations. The scores on the 32 items (mean scores) as shown in Table 1 favored the school whether the mean differences were university supervisors in all the cases irrespective of statistically significant or not. The findings of the study showed an alarming 27% of the trainees who reported having received no benefit from the supervisors' supervision.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study that a school supervisor has the superiority to his university/substitute counterpart in supervising the teaching practice process, comes in accordance with the views of some educators. This superiority gives school supervisors the upper hand to dominate trainees' thoughts and consequently abolish the theory that trainees' have acquired during their study at the university and thus increases the gap between theory and practice. Richardson-Koehler (1988) expresses his concern about the consequent effects of school supervisors' domination as it helps create a tendency among trainees to imitate their cooperating teachers' behavior. As a result, they may not adhere to the theoretical and general principles studied at the university, which help them deal with the various situations in classroom. Some educators, therefore, raised questions on the importance of university supervisors' role and the possibility to their exclusion, so as the supervision process would be only restricted to school supervisors.

Moreover, other educators went even further and proposed to eliminate the University Supervisor's role, as he does not have as much as immediate influence on student teachers compared to school supervisor (Brown, 1979; Wood, 1989; Zahorik, 1988; and Kauffman, 1992). On the other hand, other educators do not support the suggestion that only school supervisors will be responsible for the teaching practice, since it risky and many increase the gap between theory and practice. Marrou (1989), stresses the significance of the university supervisor's role as critical, but not as one that duplicate the observing and evaluating role of the cooperating teacher. Zimpher, deVoss, and Nott, (1980) and Wood (1989) have suggested the university supervisor's role as someone who acts as personal confident to the cooperating teacher and student teachers, or who manages that administrative, managerial, and technical aspects of supervision rather than the instructional or personal.

The following are reasons behind the difference between school supervisors and university/substitute supervisors in guiding the trainees during the training program. First, some educators believe that the objectives' ambiguity was a main reason justifying for the differences among supervisors while performing their task during the teaching practice. In this concern Boydell (1986); Grimmett and Ratzlaff (1986) and Richardson-KoWer (1988) argue for the difficulty of stating the concept of the ambiguous roles of both school and effective supervision due to university/substitute supervisors. Woods (1989) explains that the ambiguity of both supervisors' objectives may have probably caused misunderstanding whenever the two supervisors discharged different roles. Second, other educators gave plausible explanation for the differences among supervisors. They asserted that both supervisors differed their views and priorities due to the lack of interaction between each other during the teaching practice. Kauffman (1992), for example, states that while preparing trainees to be effective teachers is a common goal for both school and university/substitute supervisors, they have different perspectives regarding the training process. Among other factors, misunderstanding in interaction because of the different roles, lack of substantive communication and lack of cooperation between school and university/ substitute supervisors seem to have negative effects and hindered the progress of student teaching process (Applegate and Lasley, 1986; Hoover, O'Shea, and Carroll, 1988; Bhagat, Clark, and Combs, 1989). Third, differences may be attributed to various circumstances and responsibilities which school and university/substitute supervisors undertook. A matter which is likely to have negative influence on their capability to effectively assume their task. Nevertheless, a lot responsibility on the part of supervisors does not justify for their carelessness, as trainees are the ones who are negatively affected. Hence, the STC should play its role and ensure that interested supervisors participating in the training program must fully undertake their duties.

Since both school and substitute supervisors are financially rewarded for their teacher-training task at Kuwait University, the supervision process was considered as a part of the university supervisors' academic responsibility.

No one can argue that the discrepancy and the lack of consistency between school and university supervisors in mentoring student teachers may have caused the student teaching experience to have a negative impact on the goals of teacher education programs (Ervay, 1982). In this concern Pinnegar and Carte (1990:20) stated that trainees and beginning teachers are usually frustrated because of the discrepancy between theory and practice. Hunter (1989:53) addressed such a point by stating "a critical point in the success of training pre-service and in-service teachers was the bridging of the chasm that exists between theory and practice." It was difficult to teach theoretical fundamentals and expect others probably with different educational philosophy to accept, apply, and practice them exactly as you desire (Harnett, 1991). The need for bridging the gap between theories studied at the College and practice implemented at the training schools (Vare, 1992) was one of the main points that influenced the validity of any teacher-training program.

However, it is important to mention at this point that in Kuwait, student teachers did not have the privilege of field experience prior to their student teaching. Toss and Smith (1992: 94) highlighted the advantages of the field experience in stating that it helped student teachers "to identify and examine their perspectives on teaching and students". Moreover, in a study by Bischoff et al. (1988: 22) four points of the probable advantage of the early field experience were highlighted. Such points are: (1) to explore teaching as a career choice early in the college experience (Henry, 1983); (2) to bridge the gap between theory and classroom practice (Krustchinsky and Moore, 1981); (3) to socialize prospective teachers for their roles in the classroom (Dueck et al., 1984); and (4) to refine basic teaching skills (Henry, 1983). Therefore, the only opportunity available for student teachers in Kuwait to put theory into practice (Jin, 1996; and Kyriacou and Stephens (1999), was during the teaching practice period.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. One of the major aspects, which came under the responsibilities of the STC, was the evaluation of the achievement of each supervisor at the end of the teaching practice process. Hence, those who were not effective in carrying out this task, either school or substitute supervisor will be excluded. The STC and the Administration of the College of Education must attempt to involve as large as possible the university teaching staff in the teaching practice supervision. This will enhance the quality of supervision.

2. Administrators of both the College of Education and the STC should work closely in order to select the best-qualified supervisors, who emulate the mission set forth by the two institutions. Program directors should focus more on creating optimal conditions that facilitate the success of the student teaching program and creating more cooperation between both sides to believe in and work as equal partners responsible for the success of the program (Kirchhoff, 1989). Such collaborative efforts would provide trainees with opportunity to fully apply theory and practice into their teaching. In addition, the cooperation between school and university supervisors should be based on mutual respect and understanding for each other's expertise, perspectives and roles. In this respect, the STC may hold meeting between both supervisors in order to decrease the gap between their views and perspectives on the one hand and their performance on the other.
3. Communication and training program should be improved. A prominent part of the recent reform agenda calls for cooperating teachers and university supervisors to work as equal partners and in projects that link universities and school districts (Kirchhoff, 1989). Cooperating teachers, building principals, and university supervisors should work together to enable cooperating teachers to enhance their knowledge on the theoretical part of teacher education and hence their ability to match with the supervisory styles required for the developmental stages of the preservice teachers. Principals should incorporate newly acquired knowledge into their role as instructional leaders. University supervisors could extend their cooperation with school supervisors while sharing the responsibility of supervising (Oja, 1988). Zimpher (1988) and Kirchhoff (1989) stressed on the benefits of weekly meeting between school and university supervisors to discuss trainees' progress, handle the basis of working together as a team and link theory and practice.

REFERENCES

- AbuLibde, A. and Gardner, W. E., 1995. *Professional Development Schools What Role In UAEU'S Teacher Education Program?*
- Al-Methen, Amena Ebraheem, 1995. Answers to Student Teacher Training Problem at the College of Education: Kuwait University. Paper presented at the Symposium of Student Teaching at the Colleges of Teacher Education at the Gulf Corporation Council. Kuwait University, Kuwait. 29-31 October.
- Anastasi, A., 1968. *Psychological Testing*. 3rd ed. New York, Macmillan.
- Applegate, J. H., and Lesley, T. J., 1986. *Early Field Experience: A Synthesis of Roleperspective Studies*. Washington, DC: ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

- Argyle Michael, 1997. "The Psychology of Interpersonal Behaviour." Code and Wyman, Ltd.
- Bhagat, D., Clark, C., and Coombs, G., 1989. "A Study of Shared Self-interests in a University-school Partnership". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco. ED 307 668. March.
- Bischoff, J. Farris, P. and Henniger, M., 1988. Student Perceptions of Early Clinical Field Experiences. In *Journal of Teacher Education. Fall. X(3): 2225.*
- Boydell, D., 1986. Issues in Teaching Practice Supervision Research: A Review of the Literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education. 2(2): 115-25.*
- Brown, B., Obler, R. Soar, R. and Webb, J. N., 1968. "The Florida Taxonomy of Cognitive Behaviours", Institute for Development of Human Resources, The University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Curts, Stephen M. and Others, 1991. "Faculty and Staff Development: Two Models of Administrative-Faculty Linkages". Paper presented at "Leadership 2000", the Annual International Conference of the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program 93rd, Chicago, II, July 7-10).
- Dueck, K., Altman, H., Haslett, K., and Latimer, J., 1984. Early Exploratory Field Experiences in Teacher Preparation Programs. *Education Canada. 24(1): 6670.*
- Everston, C., Hawley, W., and Zlotnik, M., 1984. "The Characteristics of Effective Teacher Education Preparation Programs: A Review of the Research". Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Peabody College.
- Ferguson, A. George, 1981. *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education.* Fifth Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Flynn, Robert, J., 1995. Follow-Up Evaluation of Career-Counselling Programs. ERIC Digest.
- Goodlad, J., 1990. *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grimmett, P. P., and Ratzlaff, H. C., 1986. Expectations for the Cooperating Teacher Role. *Journal of Teacher Education. 37(6): 41-50.*
- Guyton Edith, 1989. Guidelines for Developing Educational Programs for Cooperating Teachers. *The Journal of the Association of Teacher Educators. Action in Teacher Education. 11(3): 54-57.*
- Hamett, Anne Marie, 1991. Preparation of Middle School Teachers. *ERIC Digest.*
- Henry, M., 1983. The Effect of Increased Exploratory Field Experiences Upon the Perceptions and Performance of Student Teaches. *Action in Teacher Education. S (1-2): 66-70.*

- Hoover, N. L., O'Shea, L. J., and Carroll, R.G., 1988. The Supervisor-intern Relationship and Effective Communication Skills. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 39(2): 22-27.
- Kauffman, Dagmar, 1992. Supervision of Student Teachers. *ERIC Digest*.
- Kettle, B. and Sillars, N., 1996. The Development of Student Teachers' Practical Theory of Teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 12: 1-24.
- Kirchhoff, S., 1989. "Collaborative University/School District Approaches for Student Teaching Supervision". Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of States in Inservice Education, San Antonio, TX. November 1989.
- Koff, R., Florio, D., and Cronin, J. M., 1976. Illionis Policy Project: Accreditation Certification, and Continuing Education. (Task Force Reports). Springfield, IL: State Office of Education; Chicago, IL: Roosevelt University.
- Krustchinsky, R., and Moor, B., 1981. Problems of Early Field Experiences. A Vital part in the Training of Elementary Teachers. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*. 17(4): 119-120.
- Kuwait Ministry of education, 1992. *Statistics of Government: Schools, Classes, Students and Teachers*. Ministry of Planning, Department of Statistics, Kuwait. 1990/92.
- Kuwait University, College of Education, 1999. *Statistical Data of Student' Enrollment in the Teacher Training Program*. Student Teaching Center, College of education. 1998/99.
- Meerah, T. S. M., 1990. Pembinaan Alat Kajian untuk Mengukur Tingkah Laku Pengajaran di Sekolah dan di Universiti. *Journal Pendidikan*. 15: 43-63.
- Morell, J., 1979. Follow-up Research as an Evaluation Strategy: Theory and Methodologies. In T. Abramson, C. K. Tittle, & L. Cohen (eds.), *Handbook of Vocational Education Evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pinegar, S. and Carter, K., 1990. Comparing Theories from Textbooks and Practicing Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*. Jan-Feb., 41(1): 20-27.
- Putz, Barry W., 1999. Putz, Barry., 1992. *Helping Beginning Teachers Succeed*. SSTA Research Centre Report # 92-13: 32.
- Richardson-Koe Wer, V., 1998. Barriers to the Effective Supervision of Student Teaching: A Field Study. In *Journal of Teacher Education*. 39(2): 28-34. EJ 376 998.
- Ross, Doreno D. and Smith, William, 1992. Understanding Preservice Teachers' Perspectives and Diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 43(2): 94-103.
- Schlechty, P., 1985. A Framework for Evaluating Introduction into Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 36, 1 (January-February): 37-41.
- Stephens, P., 1996. *Essential Mentoring Skills: A Practical Handbook for School Based Teacher Educators*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thomas.

- Tate, W. Merle., 1965. *Statistic in Education and Psychology*. A First Course; The MacMilan Company, New York, Collier MacMillan Canada Ltd., Toronto, Ontario.
- Tuckman, Bruce Wayne, 1978. *Conducting Educational Research*. Second Edition. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Var, Jonatha, W., 1992. Borderland Contrasts in a Microteaching Laboratory. Rosaldo.
- Wood, L. H., 1989. "Maximizing the Development of Student Teachers During Student Teaching". Paper presented at the Sununer Workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators. August 1989.
- Zahorik, J. A., 1988. The Observing-conferencing Role of University Supervisors. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 39(2): 9-16.
- Zimpher, N. L., deVoss, G., and Nott, D., 1980. A Closer Look at university Student Teacher Supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 31(4): 11-15.