

*

: - (216) -
 (67) - (16) (51) (41) - -
 (57) - -
 :

.MANOVA

Peterson, Kromrey, Lewis and Borg (1992)

Brawdy

and Byra (1995)

(2000)

(Clinical Supervision)
(1998)

(Blocker

and Swetnam, 1995)

Morris Cogan

.2004/6/2

2003/9/17

*

(4)

-

Cogan

Pajak (2002)

(1973)

(1) :

(2)

Wiedmer

(1995)

(3)

:

(4)

Cogan (1973)

(5)

(6)

Goldhammar, Anderson and

(7)

Krajewski (1993)

(8)

(Acheson and Gall, 1997; Daresh and Playko, 1995; Glickman, 1998; Serjiovani, 1993)

(Goldhammar, Anderson and Krajewski, 1993)

(3)

(2)

(1) :

(5)

(4)

Cogan (1976)

(Sullivan and Wircenki, 1988;

(1) :

Wiedmer, 1995)

(2)

(3)

-
- (1) (Acheson and Gall, 1997; Cook, 1996; Reiman and Sprinthal, 1998)
- (1) :
- ($\alpha = 0.05$) (2) :
- :
- :
- (2)
- ($\alpha = 0.05$) (3) :
- (3)
- ($\alpha = 0.05$) (4)
- (Cogan, 1973)
- ($\alpha = 0.05$) (5)
- ($\alpha = 0.05$) (6)
- (Ovando and Harris, 1993; Wiedmer, 1995)
- ($\alpha = 0.05$) (7)
- (8)
- (Lunenburg, 1998; Sullivan and Wircenski, 1988)

(4) .(Buckly et al., 1991)

(5)

(12) :

(1980)

(24)

(:

)

(

:

(1986)

:

(1)

(2)

(1) :

(2)

-

- -

(3)

(435)

(3)

()

(4)

.(%60)

Jerish (1990)

(20)

:

15

(1)

7-1 ()

(7)

(1992)

(%81)

(%82)

(%84)

(%77)

(1) :

.(%84)

Buckly, Williamson

and Elliott (1991)

(2)

-

(3)

(4)

(5)

Cramer and Koskela (1992)

(2000)

(314)

:

(%84)

(%39)

Brawdy and Byra (1995)

-2000)

- (16)

(2001

(216)

) :

) (

()

.(

:

.(51)

(57)

(67)

(41)

(30) (%10) (%20)

Kent (2001)

(Goldammar, Anderson and (1993)

Krajewski, 1993)

(16)

.(%61)

(54)

(%33)

- -) :

.(- -

	:	:	:				
(2)	:		(1)				
	:						
(4)		(3)					
	:	:				(%80)	
	:			(43)			
-				(11)	(11)	:	
					(6)		
					(4)	(11)	
2001/2000							
							30
							2001-2000
							(%87)
(216)		(%98)	(220)	(0.85)			(0.94)
					(0.53)	(0.61 0.44)	
					(0.85)		
(5)	:	(43)		(0.86)	(0.67 0.33)		(0.56)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)			
					(0.66)	(0.70 0.60)	
						(0.87)	
					(0.76 0.22)		
:							(0.64)
	1.5)	(1.5)				(0.65)	
	(3.5	2.5)	(2.5	(0.43)	(0.69 0.20)		
	(5 4.5)	(4.5	3.5)				

(1)

	57	0.84	3.48		
	67	0.63	4.03		
	41	0.56	3.73		
	51	0.90	3.52		
	216	0.78	3.71		
	57	0.51	4.46		
	67	0.41	4.59		
	41	0.42	4.44		
	51	0.51	4.48		
	216	0.47	4.50		
	57	0.88	3.93		
	67	0.57	4.40		
	41	0.55	4.29		
	51	0.66	4.21		
	216	0.70	4.21		
	57	0.72	3.65		
	67	0.47	4.04		
	41	0.68	3.82		
	51	0.59	3.77		
	216	0.63	3.83		
	57	0.78	3.80		
	67	0.64	4.20		
	41	0.69	3.99		
	51	0.74	3.89		
	216	0.72	3.98		

(2)

*				-		
		21	3.99	216	3.71	
		21	4.61	216	4.51	
		21	4.42	216	4.21	
		21	4.65	216	3.83	
		21	4.01	216	3.98	

.(5 4.5) (4.5 3.5) *

(3)

0.98	0.09	* 0.000	7.02	3.95	3	11.84	
0.30	0.016	0.343	1.17	0.24	3	0.73	
0.92	0.016	* 0.002	5.23	2.43	3	7.78	
0.78	0.059	* 0.005	4.45	1.66	3	4.98	
0.79	0.049	* 0.014	3.62	1.83	3	5.48	

.($\alpha = 0.05$) *

(4)

0.000	0.135	* 0.555	-
0.001	0.139	* 0.509	-
0.168	0.149	0.298	-
0.989	0.145	0.045 -	-
0.34	0.154	0.256 -	-
0.536	0.157	0.211	-

.($\alpha = 0.05$) *

(5)

0.001	0.123	* 0.474	-
0.415	0.127	0.195	-
0.855	0.135	0.108	-
0.146	0.131	0.279 -	-
0.043	0.140	0.366 -	-
0.930	0.143	0.087 -	-

.($\alpha = 0.05$) *

(1)

-

(4.048)

			(1)			
.(4.21)						
				(4.05)	(4.25)	:
(4.40)		:			.(3.86)	(3.97)
.(3.93)	(4.21)		(4.29)			
			(1)			
.(3.83)						
						(1)
				.(3.71)		
(4.04)		:				
.(3.65)	(3.77)		(3.82)			
				(4.03)	:	
				.(3.48)	(3.52)	(3.73)
			(1)			
.(3.98)						
(4.20)		:				(1)
.(3.80)	(3.89)		(3.99)	.(4.5)		
				(4.59)	:	
				.(4.44)	(4.46)	(4.48)
	(3.99)	:				
	(4.42)		(4.61)			

MANOVA

.(4.01)

(4.65)

.

:

Wilks Lambda

)
(0.84)
(P =0.002)

(

(2)

(2)

:

MANOVA

:

(3)

(3)

(7.02)
(P =0.000)

Tukey

(4)

(4)

(6)

0.002	0.110	* 0.389	-
0.076	0.114	0.273	-
0.261	0.121	0.221	-
0.759	0.118	0.116 -	-
0.538	0.125	0.168 -	-
0.978	0.128	0.052-	-

.($\alpha = 0.05$)

(7)

0.01	0.128	* 0.400	-
0.089	0.132	0.309	-
0.410	0.141	0.218	-
0.911	0.137	0.096 -	-
0.595	0.145	0.182 -	-
0.928	0.149	0.091	-

.($\alpha = 0.05$)

*

(8)

-

*			
18.75	30		1
17.50	28		2
28.13	45		3
43.13	69	-	4
**52.5	21		5
45.63	73	-	6
20.63	33		7

.*100

*

**

.*100

(P =0.343)

:

(1.17)

(3)

(P =0.014)

:

Tukey

(5.23)
(P = 0.002)

(3)

(7)

(7)

Tukey

(5)

(5)

(130)

(8)

(%60.2)

(8)

(%52.5)

(%45.63)

(3)

(4.45)

(%43.13)

(P = 0.005)

(%28.13)

(%20.63)

(%18.75)

Tukey

(%17.50)

(6)

(6)

(3)

(3.62)

:

(1)

(2))
(Jerish,

(Kent, 2001 2000
1990)

(3)

(4)

(Jerish, 1990)

(5)

(6)

(7)

:

- ...
-
- Daresh, J. and Playko, M. 1995. *Supervision as Proactive Process: Concepts and Cases*, (2nd.ed.) NY: Waveland Press. 1998
- Glickman, C., Gordon, S., and Gordon, J. 1998. *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach*, (4th.ed.), MA: A Viacom Company. 1980
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R., and Krajewski, R. 1993. *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers*, (3rd.ed.). FL:Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 2000
- Jerish, K. 1990. *An Analysis of a Staff Development Program in Clinical Supervision and Realities of the K-12 Instructional Supervision: Evaluating its Impact for Special Groups and the Usefulness in the Supervisory Process*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329516). 1993
- Kent, S. 2001. Supervision of Student Teachers: Practices of Cooperating Teachers Prepared in a Clinical Supervision Course. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 16 (3): 228-244. 1986
- Lunenburg, F. 1998. Teachers-Discipline; Teacher-Principal Relationships. *Education*, 118 (4): 521-526. 2000
- Ovando, M. and Harris, B. 1993. Teacher's Perceptions of the Post-Observation Conference: Implications for Formative Evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7: 301-310. 1992
- Pajak, E. 2002. Clinical Supervision: A New Direction for Theory and Practice. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 17 (3): 189-205. 2
- Peterson, D., Kromrey, J., Lewis, A. and Borg, J. 1992. Clinical Pedagogy: Defining and Measuring the Teaching of the Essential and Higher Order Thinking Skills. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 6: 57-70.
- Reiman, A. and Sprinthal, L. 1998. *Mentoring and Supervision for Teacher Development*. NY: Longman.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., and Starrat, R. J. 1993. *Supervision: A Redefinition*. N Y: McGraw-Hill.
- Sullivan, R. and Wircenki, J. 1988. Clinical Supervision: The Role of the Principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 34-39.
- Wiedmer, T. 1995. Instructional Improvement: The Goal of Clinical Supervision. *Teacher Educator*, 30: 6-18.
- Acheson, K., and Gall, M. 1997. *Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of the Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications*, (4th ed.) NY: Longman.
- Blocker, L. and Swetnam, L. 1995. The Selection and Evaluation of Cooperating Teachers: A Status Report. *Teacher Educator*, 30: 19-25.
- Brawdy, P. and Byra, M. 1995. Supervision of Preservice Teachers During an Early Field Teaching Experience. *Physical Educator*, 52 (3): 147-160.
- Buckly, P., Williamson J., and Elliott, T. 1991. *Four Models of Clinical Supervision in Virginia*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348336).
- Cogan, M. L. 1973. *Clinical Supervision*. Boston, Houghton: Mifflin.
- Cogan, M. L. 1976. Rational for Clinical Supervision. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 9(21): 3-19.
- Cook, G. 1996. Using Clinical Supervision to Promote Inquiry. *Journal of Staff Development*, 17 (4): 46-50.
- Cramer, S. and Koskela, R. 1992. *The Clinical Supervision Cycle: A Component of Staff Development Programs*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 361284).

Evaluating the Supervisors' Practices of the Practicum Courses for the Clinical Supervision Stages at the University of Jordan

*Hani Weshah and Younes Al Younes**

ABSTRACT

The study aimed at evaluating the supervisors' practices in the practicum courses at the University of Jordan concerning the clinical supervision stages. The sample of the study consisted of (216) student-teachers distributed according to the following specializations: scientific, science and math (41); humanities, social studies and Islamic education (67); languages, English and Arabic (57); and classroom teacher (51), in addition to (16) supervisors. An instrument was designed to cover the clinical supervision stages which are the following: planning conference, observation, analysis, supervision conference, and evaluation and re-planning conference. Evidences of reliability and validity were established.

In order to answer the questions of the study, the percentages, frequencies, means, and MANOVA test were used. According to the student-teachers and the supervisors, the results showed that, in general, the degree of practising the clinical supervision stages proved to be relatively high in both the observation and analysis stages. However, the results showed that, the degree of practising the planning and the evaluation stages proved to be relatively low. Furthermore, the results showed a contradiction between the student-teachers' perceptions and their supervisors concerning the practices of the supervision conference stage. The results also showed a difference in the degree of supervisors practising the clinical supervision stages according to the student-teachers' specializations. Finally, the results pointed out the problems that encountered the student teachers. In the light of these findings, some recommendations were made to improve the practices of the student teachers' supervisors in practical education programs.

* Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Jordan. Received on 17/9/2003 and Accepted for Publication on 2/6/2004.