Clinical Supervision Model to Improve Supervisory Skills of Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors during Teaching Practice[*]

Öğretmenlik Deneyimi Dersi Sırasında Uygulama Öğretmeni ve Öğretim Elemanlarının Danışmanlık Becerilerini Geliştirmek İçin Klinik Danışmanlık Modeli

Esim GÜRSOY[**], Nermin BULUNUZ[***], Sehnaz BALTACI GOKTALAY[****], Mızrap BULUNUZ[*****]

John KESNER[******], Umut SALİHOĞLU[*******]

ABSTRACT: Despite the renovation of the curriculum in education faculties in 1997, research has revealed some problems in School Experience and Teaching Practice courses. Specifically, problems were related to the quality, frequency, and type of feedback received (oral/written), lack of training for cooperating teachers and supervisors, an inadequate number of observations, and a lack of opportunities for feedback. This paper reports the preliminary results of a TUBITAK-Evrena project to help teacher trainees develop basic teaching skills while they are continuing their education in the education faculties. The project uses a "Clinical Supervision Model" (CSM) as a solution. To improve the quality of supervisory skills of cooperating teachers and university supervisors, the project researchers provided training to university supervisors and cooperating teachers about the CSM. The present research assesses the effectiveness of this training on the quality of supervision, feedback, communication skills, and professional behavior (punctuality, professional attire) of the university supervisors. The data for the study was collected from cooperating teachers and teacher trainees via questionnaires and an interview. Results indicated that there are statistically significant differences between supervisors who took CSM training and those who did not receive training. Teacher trainees and cooperating teachers had more positive opinions of CSM-trained supervisors. These results suggest that CSM techniques can increase the quality of supervisory skills.

Keywords: Teaching Practice, Teacher Trainee, Supervision, Clinical Supervision Model.

ÖZ: 1997 yılında Eğitim Fakültelerinin programlarının yenilenmesinden sonra yapılan araştırmalar okul deneyimi ve öğretmenlik uygulaması derslerinin uygulamalarında bazı problemler olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu problemler özellikle, alınan dönütün kalitesi, sıklığı, ne tür dönüt verildiği (sözlü/yazılı),uygulama öğretmeni ve uygulama öğretim elemanın ihtiyaç duyduğu eğitimin eksikliği, gözlem sayılarının ve dönüt vermek için fırsatların yetersizliği ile ilgilidir. Bu çalışma, amacı öğretmen adaylarının temel öğretmenlik becerilerini eğitim fakültelerindeyken geliştirmek olan bir TÜBİTAK-Evrena projesinin öncül sonuçlarını sunmaktadır. Proje "Klinik Danışmanlık Modeli"ni (KDM) çözüm olarak önermektedir. Uygulama Öğretmenlerinin ve Uygulama Öğretim Elemanlarının danışmanlık becerilerini geliştirmek için onlara KDM hakkında bir eğitim verilmiştir. Çalışma, bu eğitimin danışmanlık becerilerine, verilen dönütlere, iletişim becerilerine ve profesyonel davranışa (dakiklik, uygun giyim, v.b)etkilerini değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Veriler Uygulama Öğretmenlerinden ve Öğretmen Adaylarından

---

[**] Esim GÜRSOY, PhD. is currently an Assistant Professor at the Department of English Language Teaching. Contact: Uludag University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching. Email: egursoy@yahoo.com. Phone: 90-224-2942266.

[***] Nermin BULUNUZ, PhD. Contact: Uludag University, Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education. Email: nermin.bulunuz@gmail.com.

[****] Sehnaz BALTACI GOKTALAY, PhD. Contact: Uludag University, Faculty of Education, Department of CEIT, Nilufer, Bursa, Turkey. Email: sehnazbg@uludag.edu.tr.

[*****] Mızrap BULUNUZ, PhD. Contact: Uludag University, Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education. Email: mbulunuz@gmail.com.

[******] John KESNER, PhD. Contact: Georgia State University, College of Education, Department of Early Childhood Education, Atlanta, Georgia, USA. Email: jkesner@gsu.edu.

[*******] Umut SALİHOĞLU, PhD. Contact: Uludag University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching. Email: umutms@gmail.com.

anket ve görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar KDM eğitimi alan ve almayan Uygulama Öğretim Elemanları arasında istatistiksel farklar olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Öğretmen Adayları ve Uygulama Öğretmenleri KDM eğitimi alan Uygulama Öğretim Elemanları hakkında daha olumlu görüş bildirmişlerdir. Bulgular KDM tekniklerinin danışmanlık becerilerini geliştirebileceği yönündedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Öğretmelik Uygulaması, Öğretmen Adayı, Danışmanlık, Klinik Danışmanlık Modeli

1. INTRODUCTION

Previous education reform in 1997 triggered many renovations in the curriculum of education faculties in Turkey. Cooperation between the Higher Education Council (HEC) and the World Bank between 1994 and 1998 via "The Development of National Education Project" produced some changes in teacher education programs. Thus, "Competency-based Teacher Education Model" was put into practice (HEC 1999). This program not only increased the number of methodological courses but also required a balance between theory and practice (Topkaya & Yalın 2006). Moreover, the teaching practice (TP) course was extended to two semesters and a new course called "School Experience" was added to the curriculum.

The purpose of these changes in the teacher education curricula was to standardize teacher education (Seferoğlu 2006), which, prior to these changes, was random and vague. There was variation among different universities, departments and even supervisors within a single education faculty. As a result of this restructuring, the nature and the content of the TP course was clearly defined and the roles and the responsibilities of the participants were identified for the first time.

Although the standardization efforts of this reform for TP were remarkable, researchers studying the first group of prospective teachers to graduate since the reform (2001-2002) found many problems. Some of these reported problems were related to the supervisors (S) (Eraslan 2008, 2009;Paker 2005)and some related to the cooperating teachers (CT) (Boz & Boz 2006; Kent 2001; Kuter & Koç 2009).One of the most significant problems identified was related to the quality of feedback provided by the Ss and CTs (Eraslan2009; Kuter & Koç 2009; Paker 2005). Research results indicated that these participants were not carrying out their pre-identified roles as stated in the Faculty-School Cooperation Booklet (Boz & Boz 2006; Eraslan 2009; Gürsoy & Damar 2011; Sağ 2008).

Feedback is one of the essential components of teacher education. The effectiveness of teaching practice is dependent upon the quality of feedback as well as its implementation by the stakeholders, supervisors, cooperating teachers, and teacher trainees (S, CT, and TT) (Keçik & Aydın 2009).The amount, quality, and content of feedback is important for the development of the TT. Although the roles and responsibilities of TTs and CTs are determined by the HEC, there is little guidance on the type, content, and nature of feedback. In a meeting organized by the Ministry of National Education (Teacher Training Coordination and Cooperation Meeting – Öğretmen Yetiştirme Koordinasyon ve İşbirliği Toplantısı) the lack of in-service training in the TP and the need for such training for supervisors and CTs was emphasized (Sıdal 1996 cited in Özkılıç, Bilgin, & Kartal 2008). It was stated that the TP course should not be carried out in a random manner (Carter & Francis 2000). In the literature, it has been argued that in a well-structured TP course, CTs should be trained so that they possess certain qualifications and skills necessary to carry out the processes (Coulon 2000; Gaston & Jackson 1998; Kiraz 2002; Zachary 2002). In addition, such training will no doubt improve the quality of guidance and feedback provided by the supervisors and CTs. Kiraz &Yıldırım (2007) point out the importance of transforming the CTs role so that they can be a "model, mentor, colleague, and coach" (p. 250) and become a "school-based teacher educator" (p. 250) rather than just an evaluator.

In addition to the quality, amount, and type of feedback, the active participation of the TT affects the quality of pre-service teacher education (Beck & Kosnik 2000; Dallmer 2004; Gökçe & Demirhan 2005).In effective teacher training, collaboration of CTs and supervisors is necessary

to provide the TTs with the help, guidance, theoretical and methodological support as well as the opportunities for reflection. Although the "Faculty-School Cooperation Booklet" emphasizes the collaboration of HEC and National Ministry of Education as well as the schools and universities at the macro level, it does not clearly identify the features of the cooperation between CTs and TTs. This creates a need to organize a more collaborative framework to enhance teacher development during TTs' teaching practice.

One such model that may provide the necessary structures for a more effective TP is the "Clinical Supervision Model" (CSM). This model provides all stakeholders (CT, S, and TT) with a clear delineation of the roles and responsibilities of each. The next section discusses the CSM and how it can provide a solution to current problems faced during TP.

1.1. Clinical Supervision Model

The idea of "clinical supervision" was first developed by Goldhammer (1969) (cited in Hopkins, Scott, Moore & Kenneth 1993) in 1960's. The basic idea of clinical supervision was to focus on data collection process during observations. Cogan (1973) developed and supported clinical supervision and took attention to the importance of professional interactions between stakeholders (in this case, teacher and observer) to help teacher's professional development. Originally, Cogan (1973) defined eight stages of clinical supervision, which focused on planning, observation, and feedback.

The purpose of clinical supervision is "to help teachers develop and improve through cooperative planning, observation, and feedback" (Acheson & Gall 2003, p. 85). However, Hopkins and Moore (1993) point out that most TTs have negative expectations regarding supervision. They see it as adversarial and designed to only point out deficient areas in their teaching practice. The clinical supervision model is designed to involve the student and make them a part of the evaluative process, which is as much formative as it is summative in its assessment of a TTs teaching.

The term clinical supervision was adopted from the medical profession as it describes a process in which the skills and knowledge of trainees are developed in practice. Essentially, the CSM alters the roles of S, CT and TT into more of a collegial relationship where the TT can use the S and CT for both reflection and as a resource for improvement (Pajek 2003).

The CSM cycle has five stages. Each is an indispensable part of the cycle (see Figure1). This model is not always readily accepted by the various stakeholders as it requires a realignment of attitudes towards supervision from each and a serious commitment of resources and time by all parties.

Although each of the stake holders is essential, the S has the responsibility for the organization and successful implementation of the CSM. Accordingly, the supervisor:

1-Should organize a meeting with the TT and CT prior to teaching to provide a plan for future observations,

2- Should conduct a systematic and non-judgmental observation and data collection of the TT teaching (video taping if possible).

3- Should spend time analyzing the data collected prior to the post teaching 3-way conference.

4- Should organize a meeting after the teaching to analyze the TT's teaching performance, provide supportive feedback and make plans for improvement for future teaching (Acheson & Gall 2003).

5- Should reflect on their performance as an S and may ask a colleague to reflect on their performance throughout the previous stages of the CSM. This provides the S with data to help them understand how their role in the CSM can be improved.

Figure 1. Clinical Supervision Model Cycle

1.1.1. Pre-Conference

During pre-conference the TT shares his/her detailed lesson plan with the S and discusses issues related to teaching strategies, classroom management, selection of materials etc. TT makes necessary changes on the plan and prepares for teaching. If possible, the CT should be a part of the pre-conference, as their knowledge of the students, classroom and curricular requirements is critical to a successful teaching experience for the TT.

1.1.2. Observation and Data Collection

The S and CT conduct nonjudgmental and systematic observations on the TT's teaching and his/her performance is video recorded for later analysis. In addition, the supervisor and CT take careful notes for later use in the analysis of the video data of the TT's performance (Hopkins & Moore 1993). During this phase of the cycle, it is important that the S and CT keep their notes as objective as possible.

They should avoid making judgments or subjective comments about the TT's performance. It is during the next stage of the cycle when each will provide the TT with formative and summative feedback.

1.1.3. Analysis

The supervisor analyses the video data gathered which is supplemented by his/her notes taken during the observation to identify the strengths of the lesson as well as the areas for improvement. It is advisable that the CT also joins this process of data analysis to provide another lens of information on the TT's performance and to help identify strategies for improvement.

1.1.4. Post Conference and Reflection

This stage of the CSM is conducted via a three-way conference during which the S, CT, and TT each contribute their feedback on the trainee's teaching. It is essential to the success of the CSM that during the conferences the S and the CT provide constructive feedback, support, and guidance. The feedback should in no way seem overly negative to the TT, as this can put him/her on the defensive and increase the sense that this is an adversarial process. The TT is provided with the opportunity to reflect on his/her teaching and this reflection is given equal

consideration to the feedback provided by the S and CT. From this feedback and discussion, an action plan for the next observation is also created. This action plan provides a structure for the next observation as the S and CT will pay special attention to the points identified in the action plan. Finally, if this is the final meeting after the last observation the S and the CT make their joint evaluation on TT's performance. However, grading is only a small component of this process.

The CSM is designed to compensate and ameliorate the difficulties identified in the current TP by providing a structure for regular observations and systematic feedback. Moreover, the two-way and three-way conferences encourage cooperation and engender a feeling of collegiality among all the stakeholders. Moreover, the reliance on objective data collection and observation facilitates reflection and increases the TT's awareness on his/her weaknesses and strengths. This model requires active involvement of the stakeholders by giving equal responsibilities to the S and CT in TT's professional development. With the use of appropriate conferencing techniques, TTs are given the guidance and support they need in a professional and a positive environment.

2. METHOD

The current study reports on one of the research questions of a larger study conducted as part of a joint TUBITAK-Evrena project between the Faculty of Education at Uludağ University and the College of Education at Georgia State University in the U.S. during the fall term of 2012-2013 academic year. The overall aim of the project is to develop a "teaching practice program" which helps TTs develop basic teaching skills while they are continuing their education in the education faculties and to continue their professional development even after they start their professional life. The larger study utilizes a true experimental research design where students were randomly placed in either the experimental or control group for the upcoming academic year. In this two-group posttest-only randomized experiment the experimental group was to be mentored using the CSM and placed with university supervisors and cooperating teachers who had received training in the use of the CSM. The control group students received the traditional mentoring method currently in use in the Faculty of Education. Thus, grounded on problems and issues identified in the research literature, this project implemented a modified CSM based on the model currently in use in the Department of Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University in the U.S.

Three researchers received training in the CSM from faculty at Georgia State University in the Fall of 2011. This training involved learning about the basic structure of the CSM as well as how it might be modified for use in Uludağ University's teacher training programs. Faculty from Uludağ University then provided training to Ss and CTs in the use of the modified CSM. The goal of this training was to improve the quality of supervisory skills for both stakeholders. Specifically, they were trained in methods of effective observation techniques, how to provide appropriate feedback, and how to organize the pre- and post-conferences. In addition, the number of observations (3 times for each TT per term) was also standardized.

Thus, the present research aims to find out the effects of this training on the quality of supervision and feedback, interaction and cooperation with the stakeholders, and professional behavior of the university Ss. Data were gathered from both TTs and CTs in order to triangulate perspectives on the Ss' performance. The present study reports on some of the results of this study and aims to answer the following research questions:

1-Are there any statistically significant differences between Ss who were trained and used the CSM (Experimental Group) and those who did not (Control Group), in terms of their feedback to TTs and CTs?

2-Are there any statistically significant differences between Ss who were trained and used the CSM (Experimental Group) and those who did not (Control Group), in terms of the quality of their interaction with TTs and CTs?

3-Are there any statistically significant differences between Ss who were trained and used the CSM (Experimental Group) and those who did not (Control Group), in terms of their professional behavior towards TTs and CTs?

2.1. Participants

At the end of the pilot term, both the TTs and CTs were asked to evaluate the supervisors who are in the experimental and control groups. A total of 81 TTs participated in the study, 48 from experimental group and 33 from the control group. Only CTs from the experimental group completed their questionnaire (n=21). Finally, 11 TTs from the control and 10 TTs from the experimental group participated in a structured interview. All of the participants were selected randomly for the interview.

2.2. Instruments

The data for the study is collected via two questionnaires and an interview. The questionnaires were adapted from the ones that are already being used by the project partner, the Department of Early Childhood Education at Georgia State University. The first questionnaire was given to TTs in the control and experimental groups, in which they were asked to evaluate their S's supervisory skills. In the second questionnaire CTs were asked to evaluate the Ss in terms of their supervisory skills and cooperativeness. Both forms had 12 items and responses were given on a five-point Likert scale where 1 indicated definitely disagree and 5 definitely agree. The questionnaires were found highly reliable with Cronbach's alphas of .960 (control), .961 (experimental) for the first questionnaire, the second questionnaire, completed by only experimental group had a Cronbach alpha value of .919.The interviews were conducted with 20 TTs randomly selected from the experimental and control group(10 from control and 10 from experimental group). The questions in the structured interviews were prepared by the researchers to supplement the findings from the questionnaires. TTs were asked about the amount and type of feedback they received from their S and CTs, S and CTs interaction with the stakeholders, the positive and negative sides of the process, their suggestions to improve the process as well as their ideas about how well the process contributed to their professional development. The interviews were conducted at the university in a comfortable and a friendly atmosphere with researchers unfamiliar to the TTs.

2.2. Data Analysis

In addition to means and standard deviations from the questionnaires, control and experimental groups' responses were compared via an independent samples t-test. The interviews were transcribed and then coded. The answers were used to supplement the results from the questionnaire.

3. FINDINGS

When we look at the t-test results (Table 1) for questionnaire 1 there are statistically significant differences between the experimental and the control group in all items with the exception of items 8 and 11. Except for item 8 and 11 the experimental group rated their Ss performance more positively than the TTs in the control group.

Table 1:T-test Results Related to the Performance of the Supervisor by the TTs

	Items		N	Mean	SD	Sig (2-tailed)
1	General performance of the Supervisor (S).	Exper.	48	4,29	,874	,016
		Control	33	3,73	1,180	
2	S can identify problems and offers choices.	Exper.	48	4,60	,818	,000
		Control	33	3,64	1,475	
3	S expressed his/her ideas clearly.	Exper.	48	4,77	,692	,100
		Control	33	3,88	1,495	
4	S had plans and objectives and shared these with ST & CT.	Exper.	48	4,19	1,179	,001
		Control	33	3,18	1,424	
5	S created a comfortable and positive atmosphere during our meetings.	Exper.	48	4,73	,736	,003
		Control	33	4,03	1,311	
6	S helped me understand his/her feedback.	Exper.	48	4,54	,849	,000
		Control	33	3,42	1,437	
7	S provided regular feedback.	Exper.	48	4,65	,785	,000
		Control	33	3,27	1,353	
8	S possessed adequate knowledge on the program and child development.	Exper.	48	4,21	,944	,537
		Control	33	4,06	1,197	
9	S provided examples about the implementation of theoretical issues.	Exper.	48	4,44	,873	,000
		Control	33	3,30	1,510	
10	S was a good model in terms of professional look and punctuality.	Exper.	48	4,65	,785	,020
		Control	33	4,00	1,639	
11	S had positive relationships with the CT, principal and vice principal.	Exper.	48	4,58	,794	,260
		Control	33	4,33	1,190	
12	S was accessible and provided timely answers to my questions.	Exper.	48	4,52	,922	,040
		Control	33	4,03	1,185	

There were no significant differences between TTs in the experimental and control group on item 8 and 11. Both expressed positive opinions of their S's professional knowledge regarding the program and child development (item 8) and their S's relations with the CT, Principal, and vice principal.

Because only the CT's from the experimental group completed their questionnaire, no analysis of differences between the experimental and control group was possible. Means and standard deviations of responses for the CT'S in the experimental group shown in table 2.

When we look at the descriptive statistics (Table 2) for questionnaire 2,CTs also indicated positive views when evaluating the Ss' performance during the TP. Thus, they reported that the S organized an informative meeting at the beginning of the process, observed the TT more than once, worked cooperatively with the CTs and the school directors, were open for communication, respected CTs opinions, and they were kind, respectful, punctual, had a careful and effective language and contributed to the TT's performance positively.

Table 2:Cooperating Teachers' Evaluation of the Supervisors' Performance

	Items	N	Mean	SD
1	S organized an introductory meeting.	21	4,90	,301
2	S conducted enough ST observations.	21	4,86	,478
3	S observed the TT more than once.	21	5,00	,000
4	I am happy about S's cooperation with the CT and directors.	21	5,00	,000
5	S had an effective language during interaction.	21	5,00	,000
6	S was kind and respectful to me.	21	5,00	,000
7	S was respectful to the TT.	21	5,00	,000
8	S was punctual.	21	5,00	,000
9	S provided her/his contact information.	21	5,00	,000
10	I could consult the S when there was a problem.	21	5,00	,000
11	S took my opinion related to the TTs development.	21	5,00	,000
12	S's feedback to the TT contributed to TT's professional development.	21	5,00	,000

To supplement the findings gathered from the questionnaires, a structured interview was conducted with 11 TTs from the control group and 10 TTs from the experimental group. A content analysis indicated that TTs from the experimental group used more positive adjectives when describing the performance of their Ss. Most TT form the control group reported that they were observed only once as compared to three times in the experimental group. Moreover, one of the control group TTs indicated that he has never been observed. Most of the control group participants found that this number of observations was inadequate. For example one of them said "It would have been better if my S observed me four times during the semester – once for each grade level from 1-4." Another stated that "It would be better if my S could have observed my performance more than once in a semester. I think it is because of his/her work load" Only one TT from the control group found this number adequate stating that: "I think being observed once is enough when compared to those who have never been observed at all."

During the pre-observation conference all of the TTs in the experimental group indicated that they received oral and/or written feedback from their S on their planned teaching. All TTs in the experimental group stated that they found this level of feedback adequate. However, four of the TTs in the control group stated that they have never received any form of feedback.

All of the participants in the experimental group stated that they received feedback from their S after their teaching a lesson, which they found very helpful and adequate. Similarly, all but one of the TT in the control group also received feedback; however, since they were only supervised once during the semester most of them also stated that they felt this level of feedback was inadequate.

Another difference was seen in the TTs views related to Ss contribution to the process. All participants in the experimental group found it positive yet, only six in the control group were happy with their Ss contribution. The experimental group shared positive views about Ss interaction with the TTs in terms of the quality of feedback and the number of visits. However, less than half of the participants in the control group stated positive remarks related to the issue.

4. DISCUSSION and RESULTS

As shown from the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data, a systematic organization such as the CSM can improve trainees' satisfaction with the process. The CSM increased the number of observations and the quality of feedback. Moreover, TTs participation in the process also increases, as the CSM provides opportunities for reflective practice with two and three-way conferences.

The analysis of the qualitative data also provided some detailed information about TTs' understanding of the process. Although the majority of the control group stated that they have received feedback after their teaching, they also stated that these were not given in the form of meetings with adequate time for reflection. The feedback was given during unorganized impromptu meetings.

For example, one control group TT stated that "I received oral feedback. During break time my S evaluated my teaching and told me my weaknesses and strengths". Another mentioned that "My S told me that I was successful. S/he said he liked my method." A TT also stated that he asked for a feedback and the S said that s/he liked his/her performance. These examples illustrate that although the majority of untrained Ss provide feedback, the amount is limited. Moreover, since this feedback is given in an impromptu meeting there is no opportunity for the TT to reflect on his/her own performance. In these meetings the S either gives a positive remark or simply provides a list of weaknesses and strengths.

It can be understood from the TTs statements of the TTs in the control group that the feedback they received was directive rather than reflective. However, as Schön (1987)

emphasized "reflection on-action" is important for TT's development. The process requires the practitioner to think back about his/her teaching and try to reflect on what s/he has done and how s/he has done it. The result of this reflection is learning from the experiences. The process requires critical thinking, thus it is more effective than hearing it from others. According to Galea (2012), reflective teaching is a tool to enhance a more democratic teaching-learning process. Such process requires the active involvement of the practitioner by self-assessment via critical thinking and by developing an action plan to be used in the future (Farrel 2012).Yet, feedback as it was given in the control group is one-way and more controlled by the S. This doesn't allow involvement of the TT. Such a procedure, no doubt limits learning opportunities as the S's role is only that of an evaluator. According to Acheson & Gall (2003) "an evaluator can either value or devalue something", whereas a S can "oversee, inspect, and look for what is wrong, or have "super vision" to perceive what will make things better and even better" (p. 83). Therefore, considering the S's role as an evaluator is not satisfactory in teacher development process. An S has to be qualified to support the TT rather than dictating what to do or what not to do.

In CSM the Ss are trained about conferencing techniques, which pave the way for reflectivity. TT in this model, are given the opportunity to work with the CT and the S as a professional development group and to reflect on their teaching. One of the TTs in the experimental group stated that, "My S asked for my reflection and asked me to make a self-assessment. This was very important for me. This helped me to identify my progress." Here the role of the S is to guide, provide data of ST teaching, and help him/her develop an action plan to implement in the next observation. Some TTs in the experimental group mentioned in the interviews that their meetings with the S were sometimes even longer than an hour. Some others mentioned that they had detailed feedback sessions after their teaching during which they watched their video recordings and reflected on it.

The analysis of the interviews also showed that the TTs in the experimental group had a broader perspective on their teaching practice. In the CSM, TTs are treated as equals, thus when asked they provided detailed answers, reflecting on their practice. TTs in the control group were given limited or no opportunities to express opinions about their teaching performance, thus even if given the opportunity to reflect, TTs in the control group did not possess the knowledge with which to adequately reflect on their practice. In other words, control group TTs "did not know what they did not know". For instance; for some TTs in the control group, being observed once is not adequate, for others it is enough. As an explanation one indicated that s/he received positive feedback (TT: "My S said s/he liked my lesson, therefore, I think being observed once is enough for me). Thus, the feedback received from the S to be used for future development is restricted to a "well done", which is uttered during the break time. Moreover, the definition of "adequate" varies from one TT to another. The TTs in the control group who received only one observation felt this level of supervision was inadequate. However, TTs who were not observed at all would find even one observation adequate. In addition to the number of observations TTs in the control group were not aware of what comprised qualified, systematic, and detailed feedback. Thus, the CSM not only has the potential to improve the quality of feedback and enhance intense communication between the S and the CT but also helps TTs develop higher expectations, positive attitudes, and greater awareness.

In terms of S's interaction with the TTs and CTs, some TTs in the control group complained that S was not accessible, while others claimed that the S had insufficient interaction with the CT. However, most of the TTs in the experimental group noted that they could reach their S whenever they wished to, either face to face or sometimes via e-mails. These statements support responses given on the questionnaire completed by the TTs rating their S's performance.

One limitation of the research was related to the lack of data from the control group CTs about the S's performance. Although they were asked to contribute to the research, none of them

completed the questionnaire. Aside from the methodological difficulties this presents in terms of data analysis, it also indicative of the lack of cooperation between S, CT, and TT. Limited interaction with the S may make the CTs reluctant to commit the time and resources necessary to complete the questionnaires. In addition, limited interaction with the S may also limit their ability to comment on the S's performance. Thus, they may not consider themselves as participants in the process and may not even be aware of their own roles and responsibilities. Whatever the reason is, this fact emphasized the importance of a more systematic organization of TP in which all stakeholders are aware of their roles and contribute to TTs' development.

5. CONCLUSION

The results of this pilot study indicate the benefit of training both for Ss and CTs to carry out a more systematic and reflective teaching practice. The experimental group (both the Ss and the TTs) who received training on the CSM, were able to carry out the process in a more productive way, which increased TTs' gains from TP.

A model like the CSM seems to fill in the gaps and overcomes the problems of the current TP due to its organized structure, which provides systematic feedback to the teacher trainee. However, the TT is not the only one to benefit from use of the CSM. Its structure enables both S and CT to reflect on their performance further improving TP. Such a change in the TP requires a greater investment of time and resources from the S. The current TP utilizes a two-hour time period per week in which the S is able provide TTs with feedback on past performance and assistance in planning future teaching. Thus, it is impossible to give feedback in the pre- and post-conference as specified in the CSM. So, to use the CSM effectively the current curriculum of the Education Faculties must be modified. Moreover, for effective use of the CSM the number of TTs for each S should be reduced. One solution might be to train in-service teachers in schools to be supervisors. These in-service teachers already have the knowledge of the classroom and with appropriate training they can develop the skills to help the TTs professionally.

It is no doubt that the quality of teacher education is heavily influenced by the skills and experiences of the Ss. So, their knowledge, understanding, willingness, and contribution to the process are very important. In order to standardize TP using the CSM, a more systematic implementation of this model is necessary in the curriculums of the faculties of education. Therefore, it is suggested that training in the use of the CSM as used in this study should be given to all Ss and CTs.

6. REFERENCES

Acheson, K. A. & Gall, M. D. (2003). Clinical supervision and teacher development: Preservice and inservice applications. John Wiley and Sons: USA.

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2000). Associate teachers in pre-service education: clarifying and enhancing their role. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 26*, 207–224.

Boz, N., & Boz,Y. (2006). Do prospective teachers get enough experience in school placements? *Journal of Education for Teaching, 32,* 353–368.

Carter, M., & Francis, R. (2000). Mentoring and beginning teachers' workplace learning. Paper presented at the Australian Association of Research in Education (AARE) Conference, Sydney, Australia.

Coulon, S. C. (2000).The impact of cooperating teachers' task statement on student teachers' pedagogical behaviors. *College Student Journal, 34,* 284-297.

Dallmer, D. (2004). Collaborative relationships in teacher education: A personal narrative of conflicting role*s. Curriculum Inquiry, 34(1),* 29-45.

Eraslan, A. (2008). Fakülte-okul işbirliği programı: Matematik öğretmeni adaylarının okul uygulama dersi üzerine görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 34,* 95-105.

Eraslan, A. (2009). İlköğretim matematik öğretmen adaylarının "öğretmenlik uygulaması" üzerine görüşleri. *Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi Elektronik Fen ve Matematik Eğitimi Dergisi, 3(1),* 207–221.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2012). Reflecting on Reflective Practice: (Re) Visiting Dewey and Schön. *TESOL Journal, 3:* 7-16.

Galea, S. (2012). Reflecting Reflective Practice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44:* 245–258.

Gaston, J. S., & Jackson, J. F. (1998). Mentoring and its implications. Idaha, US, ERIC Clearing-house (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 426 990).

Gürsoy, E., & Damar, E. (2011). Cooperating Teachers' Awareness About Their Role During The Teaching Practice Course: The Turkish Context. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 6(1),* 54–65.

HEC (1999).*Standards and accreditation in teacher education in Turkey. HEC_World Bank The Development of National Education Project In-service Teacher Training.* Ankara.[YÖK (1999) Türkiye'de Öğretmen Eğitiminde Standartlar ve Akreditasyon. YÖK-Dünya Bankası Milli Eğitimi Geliştirme Projesi Hizmet Öncesi Öğretmen Eğitimi, Ankara.]

Hopkins, W.S.& Moore, K.D. (1993). Models of supervision. In *Clinical supervision: A practical guide to student teacher supervision* (Ch. 6, pp. 75-96). Madison, Wis.: Brown &Benchmark.

Keçik, I. &Aydin, B. (2009). *Açık Öğretim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Lisans Programı: Okul Deneyimi ve Öğretmenlik Uygulaması Öğretmen Adayı Kitabı.* Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Kent, S.I., (2001). Supervision of student teachers: practices of cooperating teachers prepared in a clinical supervision course. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 16 (3),* 228–244.

Kiraz, E. &Yıldırım, S. (2007). Enthusiasm vs. experience in mentoring: A comparison of Turkish novice and experienced teachers in fulfilling supervisory roles. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 8,* 250-261.

Kiraz, E. (2002).Öğretmen adaylarının hizmet öncesi mesleki gelişiminde uygulama öğretmenlerinin işlevi. *Educational Sciences and Practice, 1,* 183-196.

Kuter, S., &Koc, S. (2009).A multi-level analysis of the teacher education internship in terms of its collaborative dimension in Northern Cyprus. *International Journal of Educational Development, 29,* 415–425.

Özkılıç, R., Bilgin, A., & Kartal, H. (2008).Evaluation of teaching practice course according to opinions of teacher candidates. *Elementary Education Online, 7,* 726-737.

Pajek, E. (2003). Honoring Diverse Teaching Styles. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Paker, T. (2005, Eylül). Öğretmenlik uygulamasında öğretmen adaylarının uygulama öğretmeni ve uygulama öğretim elemanının yönlendirmesiyle ilgili karşılaştıkları sorunlar. XIV. Ulusal Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Kongresi, Denizli.

Sağ, R. (2008).The expectations of student teachers about cooperating teachers, supervisors, and practice schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 32,* 117–132.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Seferoğlu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service English teacher education programme in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 32,* 369-378.

Topkaya, E.Z. & Yalın, M. (2006). Uygulama Öğretmenliğine ilişkin Tutum Ölçeği Geliştirilmesi. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama. 1(1-2):*14-24.

Zachary, L. J. (2002). The role of teacher as mentor. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 93,*27-38.

Uzun Özet

1997'de gerçekleşen eğitim reformu Türkiye'deki Eğitim Fakültelerinin de programlarının yenilenmesi gerekliliğini ortaya çıkardı. 1994-1998 yılları arasında YÖK ve Dünya Bankası'nın işbirliği ile yürütülen "Milli Eğitimi Geliştirme Projesi"nin sonucu olarak yeterliliklere dayalı bir öğretmen eğitimi modeli kullanılmaya başlandı. Yenilenen Eğitim Fakültesi Programlarında sadece yöntem dersleri artmakla kalmayıp teori ve pratik dersler arasında da bir denge kurulmaya çalışıldı. Buna bağlı olarak da daha önceleri belli bir standarda bağlı kalmaksızın uygulama öğretim elemanına, bölümlere ve fakültelere bağlı olarak değişiklik gösteren "Öğretmenlik Uygulaması" dersi daha sistematik bir hale getirildi. Böylelikle dersin içeriği, nasıl yürütüleceği ve süreç içerisinde yer alan paydaşların görev ve sorumlulukları da tanımlandı. Ne var ki, 2001-2002 yılından itibaren sistemin ilk mezunlarıyla birlikte Türkiye'de değişik il ve üniversitelerde yapılmaya başlayan ve yeni uygulamanın ne denli işlediğini araştıran çalışmalar farklı problemlerin ortaya çıktığını gösterdi. Bu sorunların bir kısmının Uygulama Öğretim Elemanından (UÖE) ve Uygulama Öğretmeninden (UÖ) kaynaklandığı belirlendi. Alan yazında bahsedilen problemlerin önemli bir bölümünü Öğretmen Adayına (ÖA) verilen dönütün niteliği, sıklığı ve şekli oluşturmaktadır. Aynı zamanda paydaşların kendileri için belirlenen görev ve sorumlulukları taşımadıkları da ortaya çıkan sonuçlar arasındadır. Kaliteli bir öğretmen eğitiminde adayın süreç içerisinde aldığı dönüt kadar paydaşların sürece katılımı ve işbirliği de önemlidir. Standart hale getirilmiş öğretmen eğitiminde dönütlerin rastgele ve düzensiz olarak verilmesi düşünülemez. Böylesi bir durum ÖA'larının farklı bilgi ve donanımla mesleğe başlamalarına sebep olacaktır. Ayrıca, iyi düzenlenmiş bir sistemde sistemin kendi kendisini denetleyerek ortaya çıkabilecek farklılıkların önüne geçilmesi beklenir. Bu yüzden hâlihazırda kullanılmakta olan bu sistemdeki problemlerin giderilmesi öğretmen yetiştirmede kaliteyi arttırabilmek açısından çok önemlidir. Amacı öğretmenlik uygulaması dersini ve işleyişini daha sistematik bir hale getirerek öğretmen eğitimini standartlaştırmak olan bir TUBİTAK-Evrena projesinin pilot döneminde elde edilen öncül sonuçları rapor eden bu çalışma, alan yazında belirtilen sorunların "Klinik Danışmanlık Modeli"nin (KDM) Türkiye şartlarında uygulanmasıyla çözülebileceğini önermektedir. Klinik danışmanlık öğretmenlerin ve öğretmen adaylarının planlama, gözlem ve dönüt yoluyla kendilerini yetiştirmelerine ve geliştirmelerine yardım etmeyi amaçlar. Adayları değerlendirme sürecinin bir parçası olarak görür. Bu modelde UÖE ve UÖ'ler işbirliği içerisinde çalışarak geleneksel danışman rollerinin dışına çıkarlar. Aday, UÖE ve UÖ'yi yansıtma ve kendini geliştirmek için bir kaynak olarak kullanır. Döngüsel bir yapısı olan KDM beş aşamada uygulanır. Ön görüşme bunların ilkidir. Bu aşamada ÖA ve UÖE adayın ders anlatımından önce hazırladığı ders planı üzerinde çalışır. UÖE adayın planını geliştirmesi, uygun materyal ve etkinlik seçebilmesi için dönüt verir. İkinci aşama gözlem ve veri toplama olarak adlandırılır. Bu aşamada UÖE ve UÖ belirli KDM tekniklerini kullanarak nesnel bir şekilde aday ders anlatırken veri toplar. Daha sonra üçüncü aşamada UÖE ve UÖ topladıkları veriler üzerinden adayın eksik ve kuvvetli yönlerini tespit ederler. Son görüşme döngünün dördüncü basamağını oluşturur. Bunlar UÖE, UÖ ve ÖA'nın aynı anda katıldığı üçlü görüşmeler şeklinde gerçekleştirilir. Son aşama yansıtmadır ve adayın anlattığı ders üzerinde kendini değerlendirmesi beklenir. Bu süreci kolaylaştırmak için UÖE ve UÖ KDM'ye ait belirli görüşme tekniklerini kullanırlar. UÖ ve UÖE'leri rastgele seçilerek kontrol ve deney gruplarına ayrılmışlardır. Son testlerin karşılaştırıldığı bu iki-gruplu bu deneysel çalışmada deney grubundaki UÖE'lerine KDM'yi tanıtan ve tekniklerini öğreten bir eğitim verilmiştir. Kontrol grubundaki UÖE'leri ise bu eğitimi almamış ve süreci yapmakta oldukları şekilde sürdürmüşlerdir. Çalışmanın amacı verilen eğitimin UÖE'nin danışmanlıklarına ve dönütlerinin kalitesine, paydaşlarla (UÖ, okul müdürü, müdür yardımcısı ve ÖA) iletişimlerine, işbirliklerine ve profesyonel davranışlarına olan etkilerini araştırmaktır. Öğretmenlik uygulamasının sonunda deney ve kontrol gruplarında yer alan ÖA'lar ve UÖ'den UÖE'yi değerlendirmeleri istenmiştir. Veriler anket ve görüşmeler şeklinde toplanmıştır. Çalışmaya 48'i deney 33'ü kontrol grubundan olmak üzere 81 ÖA ve deney grubunda bulunan 21 UÖ

katılmıştır. Kontrol grubundaki UÖ'den de çalışmaya katılmaları istenmişse de bu gruptan veri elde edilememiştir. Son olarak rastgele seçilen kontrol grubundaki 11 ÖA ve deney grubundaki 10 ÖA ile görüşmeler yapılarak anket yoluyla elde edilen veriler desteklenmiştir. Kullanılan anketler 12 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Beşli Likert tipi hazırlanan anketler de 1 kesinlikle katılmıyorum 5 ise kesinlikle katılıyorum düşüncesini ifade etmektedir. Her iki anketin de güvenirliği Cronbach Alpha katsayısı hesaplanarak bulunmuştur. ÖA'lara uygulanan ilk anketin güvenirliği kontrol grubunda .960 deney grubunda ise .961 olarak hesaplanmıştır. UÖ'ye uygulanan anketin güvenirliği ise .919'dur.Ortalama ve standart sapmalara ek olarak kontrol ve deney gruplarının yanıtları t-test yolu ile karşılaştırılmıştır. Bulgular iki madde hariç gruplar arasında istatistiksel olarak farklılıklar olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu iki madde haricinde deney grubu UÖE'lerinin performansını kontrol grubundakilere oranla daha pozitif olarak değerlendirmişlerdir. Aynı şekilde deney grubundaki UÖ de aynı UÖE'leri ile ilgili olarak olumlu görüş bildirmişlerdir. Buna göre UÖ, UÖE'nin dönem başında bir bilgilendirme toplantısı düzenlediklerini, ÖA'yı bir kereden fazla gözlemlediklerini, kendileriyle, okul müdürü, ve yardımcılarıyla işbirliği ile çalıştıklarını, iletişime açık olduklarını, UÖ'nin fikirlerine saygı gösterdiklerini, nazik, saygılı ve dakik olduklarını, özenli ve etkili bir üslupla ÖA'ların performanslarına katkıda bulunduklarını ifade etmişlerdir. Görüşme sonuçları da nicel verileri destekler durumdadır. Deney grubu ÖA'ları UÖE'lerinin performanslarını değerlendirirken daha olumlu ifadeler kullanmışlardır. Gözlem sıklıkları deney grubunda her bir aday için üç olarak belirtilirken, kontrol grubunda bu sayı genellikle bir kez olarak ifade edilmiştir. Kontrol grubundan bir öğrenci UÖE tarafından hiç gözlemlenmediğini belirtmiştir. Deney grubu öğrencileri ön ve son görüşmelerin düzenli ve sistemli bir şekilde yapılıp dönüt aldıklarını ifade ederken kontrol grubu öğrencileri çoğunlukla bir kez dönüt aldıklarını söylemişlerdir. ÖA, UÖE'nin sürece katılımını değerlendirirken deney grubu UÖE'nin verdiği dönütlerin kalitesi, içeriği ve gözlemlerinin sıklığı ile ilgili olumlu görüş bildirmişlerdir. Ancak kontrol grubunun hemen hemen yarısı bu konudaki memnuniyetsizliklerini dile getirmişlerdir. Kontrol grubundaki UÖ'den veri toplanamaması yöntemsel bir eksiklik olarak görülebilse de, KDM sisteminin uygulanmadığı öğretmenlik uygulamasında UÖ'lerinin işbirliğinden ve iletişimden uzak olarak sürecin parçası olduklarına da işaret etmektedir. KDM'nin amaçlarından bir tanesinin de paydaşlar arasındaki etkileşimin güçlendirilmesi olduğu düşünüldüğünde araştırmadaki bu sınırlılık KDM gibi bir modele duyulan ihtiyaca işaret etmektedir. Nitel ve nicel verilerin analizi KDM gibi sistematik bir model uygulandığında ÖA'nın süreçten duydukları memnuniyetin arttığını göstermiştir. KDM, gözlemlerin sayısının da verilen dönütün kalitesinin de artmasına olanak sağlamıştır. Buna ek olarak ÖA'nın ve UÖ'nün de sürece katılımları artmıştır. KDM üçlü toplantılarla yansıtmacı eğitimin gerçekleştirilebilmesi için fırsat tanımıştır. Nicel veriler adayların süreç algısı hakkında da bilgiler vermektedir. Kontrol grubundaki adaylar bir kez gözlemlenmenin yeterli olduğu kanısına varmış ve kendilerini bu anlamda hiç gözlemlenmeyen diğer ÖA'ları ile kıyaslamışlardır. Bu da bu gruptaki adayların beklentilerinin ne denli düşük olduğunu ve süreçten edinebilecekleri bilgilerin neler olabileceği konusundaki farkındalıklarının sınırlılığına işaret etmektedir. Sonuç olarak, öğretmen eğitiminde kaliteyi arttırabilmek için KDM gibi daha sistemli bir modelin uygulanması yararlı olabilir. Bu yüzden bu çalışmada olduğu gibi tüm UÖ ve UÖE'larına bir eğitim verilmesinin gerekli olduğu düşünülmektedir.