

# Australian Journal of Teacher Education

---

Volume 41 | Issue 11

Article 5

---

2016

## Clinical Supervision Model in Teaching Practice: Does it Make a Difference in Supervisors' Performance?

Esim Gürsoy

*Uludag University*, [esimgursoy@yahoo.com](mailto:esimgursoy@yahoo.com)

John Edward Kesner

*Georgia State University*, [jkesner@gsu.edu](mailto:jkesner@gsu.edu)

Umut Muharrem Salihoglu

*Uludag University*, [umutms@gmail.com](mailto:umutms@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Gürsoy, E., Kesner, J. E., & Salihoglu, U. M. (2016). Clinical Supervision Model in Teaching Practice: Does it Make a Difference in Supervisors' Performance?. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(11). <https://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n11.5>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.  
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol41/iss11/5>

## **Clinical Supervision Model in Teaching Practice: Does it make a Difference in Supervisors' Performance?<sup>1</sup>**

Esim Gürsoy  
Umut M. Salihoğlu  
Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey  
John Kesner  
Georgia State University, Georgia, USA

*Abstract: In search for better practices there has been a plethora of research in preservice teacher training. To contribute to the literature, the current study aims at investigating teacher trainees' and cooperating teachers' views about the performance and contribution of supervisors during teaching practice after using Clinical Supervision Model. Experimental in design, the study gathered both qualitative and quantitative data from participants in the experimental (n= 108 CT; n= 191 TT) and control (n=32 CT; n=100TT) groups. The findings revealed that there are statistically significant differences in participants' evaluations of their university supervisor in favor of the experimental group, suggesting the implementation of Clinical Supervision Model for teaching practice.*

### **Introduction**

A considerable body of research has been devoted to the concept of supervision in teacher training institutions in the last fifty years. Supervision of teacher trainees (TTs) by the university supervisors (USs) is an inseparable part of a valuable practicum period where the TTs seize the opportunity to reflect on their personal beliefs about teaching and education and further refine those beliefs through active participation in teacher training.

According to Jones (1970, pp.433-435) "the US assumes not one but many principal roles ranging on a spectrum of: "leadership, interpretative, cooperative, observational, counseling, analysis, evaluative, clinical, and humanistic" during the practicum period." Supervisors are also expected to act as active agents in conflict resolution and problem solving in the practicum. Proper supervision requires the establishment of mutual understanding among all stakeholders involved in the practicum; hence it "...cannot be a mechanistically routinized series of actions" (Jones, 1970, p.436) and so it has to be shaped and reshaped constantly through the contribution of the participants. The USs are usually deemed as the responsible bodies and proper authorities in establishing strong links between the higher education institutions and the practicum schools to ensure high quality educational programs for teacher education. (Boz & Boz, 2006; Horton & Harvey, 1979; Jones, 1970; Slick, 1998). Horton and

---

<sup>1</sup> The present study reports on one of the research questions of a larger TÜBİTAK EVRENA Project 111K162 titled "Best Practices for Classroom Teacher Training Programs: Clinical Supervision Model" funded by TÜBİTAK. Detailed information about the project can be found at <http://uludagkdm.home.uludag.edu.tr>

Harvey (1979, p. 58) exemplify this view by stating that “University supervisors stand in the position, to use specialized knowledge of teacher education to aid classroom teachers to work more effectively with student teachers”.

Effective supervision requires that the supervisor has the necessary skills and knowledge to support the trainee during the very difficult job of becoming a reflective practitioner. However, interestingly little has been done in terms of the preparation of supervisors (Elfer, 2012). Thus, supervisors are mostly left alone with little or no training and are left to their own devices in their efforts to establish their pedagogical perspectives (Cuenca, 2010a). In a quest to improve supervisory skills, research assessing the views and expectations of teacher trainees’ related to their supervisors in Turkish practicum settings has increased considerably over the last two decades (Gürsoy, et al., 2013; Paker, 2003; Sağ, 2008; Yılmaz, 2011). One such research was the preliminary work of the current research that endeavored to systematize and standardize the teaching practice program at a primary teacher training department in a Turkish university.

Through the use of Clinical Supervision Model (CSM). Gürsoy, et al. (2013) explored the differences between USs who received the CSM training and those who did not in terms of their feedback and interaction with TTs and their overall professional behavior towards and cooperating teachers (CT). The data, collected through questionnaires and interviews from the TTs in the control and experimental groups, indicated that the USs who received training on CSM received statistically significant higher ratings on the variables preciously mentioned than did USs who received the traditional training.

Specifically, USs who did not receive the CSM training tended to visit the school sites less and provided less and merely directive feedback to TTs in comparison to the USs who received the CSM training. According to Cuenca (2012) the success of clinical supervision comes from its “interactive and collaborative nature talking together about the work of teaching and learning” (p. 21).

In a study that sought to investigate the beliefs and attitudes of prospective mathematics teachers on the school practice course at a Turkish institution; Eraslan (2008) worked with 47 TTs on a similar issue, TTs discontentment with the lack of concern shown by their USs. These TTs reported that their USs were almost always absent on the days they were supposed to supervise in the program. Some of the TTs stated that they had seen their supervisors only on the first and the last weeks of the course to receive and submit class observation forms. Eraslan noted that there were exceptions to the generally low ratings of USs by TTs. These exceptions occurred when the TTs had a CT and US who showed genuine interest and concern for helping the TT improve his/her practice. This concern manifest itself in opportunities to regularly discuss and analyze their observations with their USs and CTs. Cuenca (2010b), emphasizes the role of the US as a “teacher pedagogue” in which the US helps establish and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship with the TT. Byrd and Fogleman (2012) argue that problems with the CT or TT damage the triadic relationship in the teaching practice, with the inevitable loser being the TT. Eraslan (2008) claimed that standards of quality and training must be enforced on cooperating schools and teachers with the most current research and theory coming from the universities. He adds that amore professional cadre of CTs that have a close connection with the USs and the universities are prerequisites for the success of effective teacher training.

Another study by Paker (2003) carried out to study whether the USs at a public Turkish university provided sufficient and appropriate feedback to teacher trainees during the practicum. The data were obtained from 80 TTs in 10 schools through questionnaires and interviews. The

primary finding from the study indicated that almost all (91 %) of the TTs in the group consistently emphasized the inadequacy and insufficiency of the feedback they received. They were dissatisfied with the quality and the amount of the feedback given by their USs. A second concern of the majority of the TTs was that they were unable to receive enough support during lesson planning. This was compounded by the low number of teaching observations carried out by the USs and the poor quality of feedback received when they were observed.

In Sağ's (2008) study 106 TTs from a Turkish university shared their beliefs about the pros, cons and the essential and indispensable features of teaching practice through group discussions. The researcher then asked the TTs to write down their expectations of the CTs, USs and the practice schools. The results revealed, in order of importance; the TTs valued the USs' efforts for the negotiation of uninterrupted communication between the TTs and practicum schools; second, they valued USs' competence to offer professional guidance; third, the USs' ability to build a relaxed free-speaking environment for a mutual exchange of ideas and the fourth was the way the USs check the TTs work and provide feedback on their performance. It was quite clear that the TTs value the amount and quality of feedback. Yet, some TTs, in a study by Slick (1998), articulated their serious concerns about the qualifications of USs whose expertise was in another field of study and questioned their effectiveness in giving field specific feedback. Additionally, the USs also admitted their insecurity and uncertainty in supervising TTs from different majors. The message from this study is that TTs expect to be given feedback on their performance with field-specific comments.

Another study that confirmed the dissatisfaction of TTs on the performance of USs in a Turkish university setting was conducted by Yılmaz (2011). The 75 TTs reported that the USs did not visit their school, they did not read TTs observation reports and that TTs were graded by USs without reading observation reports made by the CT or conducting any classroom observations. .

The lack of a good relationship between a TT and US may result in a growing feeling of alienation by the TT which may result in diminished communication and profound insecurity from the TTs point of view. The role of USs as evaluators and gatekeepers forces them to assume roles which might inhibit the fostering of harmonious relationships with TTs. Hence, this may increase disparities between the expected and experienced supervisory styles from the perspective of TTs (Ibrahim, 2013).

Drawing from a similar concern, Cuenca (2010b) proposes a responsive pedagogy which underscores the importance of developing a caring attitude that TTs need during the practicum. The support (technical, methodological, practical, and affective) that the TTs receive throughout the process would not only contribute to their teaching skills and development of their own teaching philosophy but also reduce the emotional burden they carry during their endeavors to relate theory to practice.

A case study by Ünver (2003) collected information about the duties and responsibilities of primary stakeholders in the teaching practice. Data were collected from university faculty, USs, TTs, CTs and practice school administrators. Data analysis revealed all stakeholders had high expectations for the US. They expected him/her to provide information, guidance and maintain the university-school connection

Based on an exhaustive analysis of archival documents from the Ministry of National Education, and the Higher Education Council as well as reports from TTs; Yaman (2013) was able to describe the current status of USs in practicum courses. The study found that none of the documents included any information related to the role of USs. Data from the TTs' indicate that

they assigned USs various roles from guide and collaborator to motivator and an assessor Yaman concluded that TTs expected the USs to provide support in both the cognitive and affective domains.

Boz and Boz (2006, p.366) speculate that "... in Turkey, there is no close contact with the mentors in high schools and tutors in the universities during school placement" and call for increased communication and more collaborative work between the practice schools and universities for outstanding practicum experiences and school practices. "... for real change to occur, collegial relationships will need to become a reality..." (Slick, 1998, p.833).

In a study investigating USs beliefs defined as their attitude and philosophy about teacher training; Bates, Drits and Ramirez (2011) were able to demonstrate that USs were well aware of the influence of their beliefs on their practice as a US. Further data analysis revealed a link between USs' beliefs and the TT feelings of professionalism. They also claimed that "... supervisors can have a powerful effect on the identity, self-perception, and quality of future teachers" (Bates, Drits and Ramirez, 2011, p.85).

Many USs believe that commitment to supervision may require sacrifices in other areas of academic life. Thus, few university faculty are inclined to accept this responsibility and concomitant. Sometimes, the responsibilities are seen as burdens that keep one away from highly valued academic work. Bullough and Draper (2004, p.419) say that "Mentoring and supervision ought not to be only about an intern or student teacher's growth and development but about the mentor's and supervisor's professional development as well". Nevertheless, it is not always possible for USs to allocate their time and efforts to the teaching practice. Many USs have a heavy workload and are not exempted from other teaching or departmental duties because of their supervisory responsibilities (Bullough, 2005; Paker, 2003; Zeichner, 2005). The tight schedule of the USs usually results in fewer contact hours with TTs and less time spent at the practicum schools. A number of studies have reported that USs do not visit the practice schools very frequently except for the orientation and grading reasons (Eraslan, 2008; Paker, 2003; Slick, 1998). As Horton and Harvey (1979, p. 57) pointed out "Supervisors cannot adequately help student teachers with continuous development of appropriate teaching styles when supervisors observe only, small segments of teaching performances in relatively unfamiliar classrooms."

It is clear from the studies described above, that in Turkey, the teaching practice is somewhat haphazard and is falling short in providing the necessary support and guidance for all stakeholders. Kuter and Koç (2009) recommended that there is a heightened need for definitions and role assignments for all stakeholders in the teaching practice. Slick (1998) suggested that in order to have beneficial and rewarding practicum experiences in teacher training programs; it is necessary to delineate agendas and codes of conduct that for all participants.

As can be seen, the problems regarding the practicum process are not only at the local level as in the context of this study, but also reflect global issues in teacher training.

## **Methodology**

This study sought to study the implementation of a specialized CSM used for the first time in the Turkish context to determine the extent the model can ameliorate the problems with clinical supervision of TTs as noted by many researchers in and out of Turkey. This report

focuses on an analysis of the satisfaction levels of the CTs and TTs with the quality of supervision by the USs in a large state university in Turkey.

The evaluation of the use of the CSM involved an experimental design in which TTs, CTs and USs who utilized the CSM, comprised the experimental group. TTs, CTs and USs utilizing the model currently in use in Turkey comprised the control group.

Satisfaction levels of the experimental and control group were assessed and compared.

The following research questions were examined:

- (1) Are there significant differences between the experimental and control group in the TTs' level of satisfaction with the university supervisor?
- (2) Are there any significant differences between the experimental and control group in the CTs' level of satisfaction with the USs?

The CSM used by the experimental group was based on one currently in use by a major university in the southeastern United States. The CSM is a collaborative program involving the teacher trainee (TT), the cooperating teacher (CT) and university supervisor (US). These stakeholders work in collaboration to improve the teaching performance of the TT. The voice of each is an essential component of the model in which the CT and US observe and provide systematic feedback to the TT, and opportunities for TT self-reflection in an effort to improve the TTs' performance in the classroom.

The CTs and USs in the experimental group received training about the CSM, which involved information about their roles and responsibilities during the process and the importance of collaboration. More specifically, they received information about observation techniques, the language of feedback, how to organize a three-way conference, data collection techniques during observations, how to implement reflective techniques, and how to help TTs develop action plans. The communication between the stakeholders is an important feature of the CSM. After the training and throughout the teaching practice the CTs and USs implemented the CSM techniques kept in touch with the coordinators, which strengthened the triadic relationships and increased communication between the parties.

As per the usual procedure in place at this university, the control group did not receive any formal training in being a supervisor and there was no training for the CTs. Supervisors were to follow the "Faculty-School Cooperation Manual"; however, this manual provided no guidance to the supervisors other than procedural.

## **Participants**

Participants were randomly placed in either the experimental or control group. TTs were randomly placed in one of 9 schools selected for this study. These schools were selected due to their geographic location in three different regions of the city of Bursa, Turkey and their willingness to participate. TTs were in the classroom of these schools for one day per week.

The satisfaction level of the TT and CT with the US was collected at the end of each semester over a period of two years. This resulted in data from 108 CTs and 191 TTs in the experimental group and 32 CTs and 100 TTs in the control group. The majority of CTs in both groups held a Bachelor's degree with only 2% at the Master's degree level. TTs in both groups were predominantly female and between 21-24 years old.

Interviews were conducted in fall of 2013 and spring 2014 with a total of 39 TTs (18 from the control and 20 from the experimental group). At the end of each semester 9-10 TTs from each group were interviewed regarding their satisfaction from their US.

### **Instruments**

The data for the study was collected via surveys and interviews. The surveys used in evaluating the US by TTs and CTs were adapted versions of ones used at the institution from which the experimental CSM was adapted. Each survey (one for TTs and one for CTs) contained 12 items scored on a Likert-type scale (1-5), where 1 indicated that the respondent strongly disagreed with the statement and 5 indicated that the respondent strongly agreed with the statement. Survey items focused on the professional behavior of the supervisor in his/her interactions with the TT, CT as well as school administration. Scores were summed so that a higher score indicated greater satisfaction with the supervisor's performance. Cronbach's alphas for the 12 items measuring university supervisor satisfaction for CTs and TTs were .98 and .97, respectively.

The survey that was completed by the TTs also had four open-ended questions in which the TTs were asked to report on their USs' weaknesses and strengths as well as their suggestions regarding whether or not the US should continue to supervise. Data from 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years were analyzed. There were a total of 191 TTs in the experimental group (n=96 in 2012-2013; n=95 in 2013-2014) and 100 TTs in the control group (n=52 in 2012-2013; n=48 in 2013-2014).

The interview questions mostly focused on the amount, time, and type of feedback provided by the USs as well as their contribution to the process. Interviews with the TTs were recorded and then transcribed. The data is used to support the findings gathered from the quantitative data.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

CTs and TTs completed the evaluation of the US at the end of each term over the course of the three year data collection period. Responses were coded to identify the source of the evaluation (CT or TT) and the term of the evaluation.

An examination of the standardized skewness and kurtosis coefficient indicated that these data were not normally distributed and the variance was not homogenous (CTS and TTs). Because the score distribution for the experimental and control group were not normally distributed, a nonparametric (Mann-Whitney's *U*) independent samples t-test was computed to compare the scores of the experimental and control group. These nonparametric independent samples t-test were repeated for the CTs and TTs responses.

A content analysis was conducted on the open-ended questions and the transcribed interview data. The answers to the open-ended questions were first read, grouped, and coded by the researchers. In addition, frequency distributions of response categories were computed and the answers to the interview questions were tallied and quantified. In addition, TTs explanations or examples for certain questions were listed to identify the nature of feedback.

## Results

The study yielded qualitative and quantitative data. Below are presented first the quantitative results and then the qualitative results gathered both from the open-ended part of the questionnaire as well as the interviews.

### Quantitative Results

The Mann-Whitney *U* test for the TTs evaluations of the US revealed statistically significant differences in the overall rating of the US,  $U = 6958.00, p < .001$ . TTs who were in the experimental group had higher scores on their evaluation of their US.

Similarly, the Mann-Whitney *U* test for the CTs evaluations of the US revealed statistically significant differences in the overall rating of the US,  $U=774.500, p < .001$ . Cooperating teachers who were a part of the experimental group had on average, a higher evaluation score of the US. (See Table 1.)

	Group	US Satisfaction Score
CT	Experimental	52.15
	Control	43.06
TT	Experimental	54.23
	Control	43.81

**Table 1: University Supervisor Satisfaction Scores by Cooperating Teacher and Teacher Trainee**

### Qualitative Results

In this section first the results from the open ended questionnaire and then the interview will be presented. The open-ended questions were answered both by the experimental (n=191) and control group (n=100).

#### Analysis of the Open-ended Questions in the Questionnaire

The TTs' responses indicate differences in terms of their perception of the US and the process itself. In the first question, the TTs were asked to list the strengths of their USs. In both groups, strengths were categorized as professional and personal. In the responses of both groups, the professional and personal categories there were some similarities; however, the experimental group mentioned professional qualifications of the USs more than did the control group (Table 2).



	Experimental	Control
Regular constructive feedback	43%	8%
Strong interactional skills and accessibility	38%	44%
Having good content knowledge	21%	14%
Supportive	32%	9%
Systematic	17%	-
Good Observant	7%	-
Manages time well	5%	-
Professionalism	5%	-
Helped me become reflective	4%	-

**Table 2: Professional Qualifications of USs as described by the TTs**

Only a few people from each group mentioned about personal qualifications of the US (Table 3). Although the question asked for the strengths, 14% of the TTs in the control group also mentioned about the negative qualifications of their USs such as no strengths (I didn't see him throughout the process/never observed by my US) (9%), weak critical thinking skills (1%), and emotional when criticized (1%), had no interaction (1%), no support (2%).

	Experimental	Control
Friendly/kind/sincere	15%	12%
Smiling	6%	-
Patient	4%	-
Understanding + Respectful	-	9%
Relaxed (puts no pressure)	-	6%
Confident	-	5%

**Table 3: Personal Qualifications of USs as described by the TTs**

The second question asked TTs for suggestions of areas of professional development for the USs'. Teacher trainees in the control group mentioned more areas for professional development for the US than did the experimental group. Table 4 shows the areas of development for the USs and the percentages for each group.

	Experimental	Control
More knowledge on child development	4%	2%
Up-to-date in methods and techniques	5%	-
Spend more time on pre-conferences	2%	-
More motivating + understanding + be a guide	1%	6%
More detailed feedback	2%	<b>13%</b>
Use Facebook more effectively for feedback	1%	5%
Considerate	2%	-
Be systematic	-	5%
Systematic, effective and timely feedback	-	<b>15%</b>
Be involved in the process	-	<b>28%</b>
Set up meetings	-	9%
Accessible	-	2%

**Table 4: USs areas of development**

As can be seen from the table, only a minority in the experimental group identified weaknesses in their US. One of the most striking results is that almost one third of TTs in the control group indicated that they expect greater involvement (28%), 13% asked for detailed feedback and 15% asked for systematic and effective feedback. The amount and efficiency of feedback and the USs contribution to the process seem to be the most striking claims of the control group.

The third question asked whether or not the TTs would recommend their US to other TTs. Although both the overwhelming majority in both groups answered “yes”, nearly all of the control group did so (98%). Moreover, the control group had a greater percentage of their respondents who were “undecided”. The results are shown in table 5.

	Yes	No	Undecided
Experimental	98%	1,5%	0,5%
Control	82%	8%	10%

**Table 5: Whether or not the TTs advise their US to other TTs**

When TTs were asked why, the participants in the experimental group were better able to provide reasons. Additionally, although it is stated as a positive reason, one of control group’s reasons is actually indicating a lack of systematicity (“Our US was very flexible.”, “S/he didn’t comment on what we were doing.”, “He left us on our own.”). Results from this question can be seen in Table 6.

	Experimental	Control
Supportive	26%	7%
Timely+systematic+effective feedback	20%	5%
Competent (has theoretical+practical knowledge)	18%	7%
Strong interactional skills+accessible	15%	8%
Professionalism (punctual, systematic, responsible)	13%	-
Attitude: sincere, friendly, understanding, motivating)	4%	4%
Role model	4%	-
<b>Flexible (left us on our own)</b>	-	<b>8%</b>

**Table 6: TTs reasons for suggesting their US**

One of the TTs in the control group who said she would suggest her US stated that: “My US didn’t observe us, but if he did he would give valuable feedback.” This response suggests that the control group may not have been as critical of their US as needed. Or they lacked the knowledge to adequately evaluate them. It could be said that, they didn’t know what they didn’t know. Consciousness about the process is one of the most important issues when evaluating it. Therefore, the results should be interpreted accordingly.

TT’s in the experimental group, on the other hand, focused on the support and feedback they received. The following quotation gives an example of their views: “During pre- and post-conferences she always gave feedback that leads you forward. S/he always had a “better” idea, which makes you feel unsatisfied with what you do, but at the same time encourage you to find that “better”. And all of this happens in a room full of laughter.” Another TT stated that: “S/he is a life saver! When you don’t know what to do or how to teach a certain topic she proposes solutions, provides lots of examples and shows you the way out. When you move one step, s/he moves 10 steps toward you.”

As for the negative views regarding the US one TT in the experimental group indicated that s/he would prefer a more experienced person with new ideas, suggesting that his/her US was rather inexperienced. On the other hand, the TTs in the control group had more critical reasons for not suggesting their US. For example two of them claimed that their US never answered their questions, one stated that his/her US didn’t know much about the practicum process, three argued that their US didn’t contribute to their development, and finally three of them declared that their US had limited field knowledge. The following quotation summarizes their views: “Practicum is very important for a TT during which we need guidance and support. Our US didn’t provide any.” Similarly, another TT stated that: “S/he has no contribution to our development”

Some of the claims of those who were undecided about the issue points out the weaknesses and strengths. For instance, two of the participants claimed that their US was open for communication, yet they didn’t give any feedback to them; one stated that although his/her US has a positive attitude he never visited the practice school, finally, one complained about the fact that the US was accessible, however, s/he didn’t know the process at all.

Finally, the TTs were asked to make any additional comments regarding the process and/or US. Responses to this question did not vary much from previous ones. However, those

in the experimental group focused on the number of observations, more frequent use of Facebook for feedback and time of pre-conferences. Some asked to be observed more than three times and some asked to conduct pre-conferences long before teaching. However, those in the control group complained mostly about the lack of observations or US's visit to the cooperating school, lack of or limited time spent with the TT and the need for regular weekly meetings.

### **Analysis of the Interview**

The interview results support the findings received from the questionnaire. The first interview question inquired about the number of observations they had and whether or not they find that number adequate for their development. All of the participants (n=20) in the experimental group claimed that they were observed three times throughout the semester and one said that s/he was observed four times, whereas, the number of observations varied in the control group. Eight (out of 18) TTs stated that they were *never* observed during practicum.

Five claimed that they were observed only once and five were observed twice. 13 of the TTs in the experimental group thought that being observed three times was enough for their development ("Three is enough, because we meet the US before and after teaching, we send our lesson plans and receive feedback. Moreover, the CT is always there to observe us."), yet seven stated that they would like to be observed even more ("More frequent observations would increase our responsibility. It wouldn't be enough if it was five times. The more the better.")

In the control group six of the participants indicated that being observed once or twice was adequate ("Normally being observed only once is inadequate, but when compared to those who weren't observed at all I think it was adequate."), but the majority (12 TTs) believed the opposite, however, they were not able to give a reason why they think that was an inadequate number of observations.

In the second interview question the TTs were asked whether they received oral/written feedback while planning their lessons. All of the participants in the experimental group agreed that they had feedback during pre-conferences and/or via Facebook. The majority (n=19) stated that they benefitted from the feedback and that it was adequate. Only one claimed the feedback was sometimes beneficial. Moreover, half the TTs stated that they received oral and the other half received both written and oral feedback. In the control group on the other hand, 12 TTs indicated that they never received feedback while planning their lessons. This situation is stated by one of the TTs as follows: "I wish we did receive some feedback. It is because of this we couldn't develop ourselves." Six of the participants said they received some feedback, one claimed that s/he rarely had feedback. Similarly, 13 TTs stated that the feedback was not adequate only five were happy with the quality of feedback they received. However, some of the TTs who said they received feedback and found it adequate said that: "I received feedback only in the first week. This was adequate because it prevented stress. I was inexperienced."

The interviewees were also asked about the feedback they received after presenting their lessons. The entire experimental group claimed that they received mostly verbal feedback after teaching and some said they received both oral and written feedback. All of the TTs in the experimental group were happy with the quality of feedback as can be seen from these quotations: "Our feedback sessions (four-way conferences) lasted almost an hour. They were detailed and effective. These sessions helped me to identify my weaknesses and strengths (TT3)." "I liked the feedback sessions because it enabled me to analyze my lessons from many perspectives. I was able to make self-evaluations and action plans (TT12)." Although 10 of the

participants in the control group also claimed that they received feedback, only half of them thought that the feedback was adequate. Some of them who found this feedback inadequate stated: "I received oral feedback but it was inadequate. It was all negative feedback. I didn't receive positive feedback."

Another participant commented on the quantity of feedback: "My US gave feedback once. It was good in quality but not in quantity." Some of the TTs who claimed that the feedback was adequate commented on the only one time they received it: "Yes, I received feedback once. It was adequate, because it helped me see my weaknesses. Eight of the TTs in the control group stated that they haven't received feedback at all. One of the TTs complained that their US had never visited the cooperating school once and another was unhappy about the quality of feedback: "I don't think I received feedback because s/he only said 'You're good', but didn't explain why. S/he didn't give detailed feedback. At the end of the term I received a low grade and she didn't explain why I was not good enough."

Finally, TTs were asked about their USs contribution to the process in terms of his/her interaction with the TT and CT and the quality of his/her visits. All of the participants in the experimental group thought that their US fully contributed to the process. All, but one, found this contribution adequate. They claimed that their US had good interaction with the TTs and CTs as stated by one: "We had a positive and frequent interaction. I always received effective and scientific feedback, which depended on quantifiable data. But, I wish I was observed more than three times." Only one described his/her USs contribution as partly adequate suggesting that the USs interaction with the CT could have been better.

In the control group the majority of the participants (n=14) claimed that their USs contribution was inadequate as could be seen in the following quotations: "The first day s/he took us to the school and never showed up again (TT17)." "Our US didn't visit our school at all (TT5)." Three of the TTs found the USs contribution adequate, but one also indicated that the visits were limited and s/he would ask for more. The TTs were asked whether the US spent time with them individually. All in the experimental group claimed that they did and all TTs found this time effective and beneficial..

All of the participants mentioned about the time they spent with their US which was about one class hour (45 mins) or even longer: "S/he spent one hour a week face-to-face. I'm not even mentioning the phone calls, e-mails, and Facebook (TT11)." "She spent about two-hours a week. Her/his visits were very important for us. At first I was scared about the process. I had concerns: Will I manage the class? Can I take students attention? etc. at the end, I was able to develop myself in all of these areas with the help of my supervisor (TT16)." In the control group only four TTs stated that their US spent time with them individually, 13 claimed their US spent almost no time and one said s/he didn't spend any time with him/her. One of the four who argued that their US spent time with them also stated that this time was about 15 minutes and not enough for her/him to discuss and understand his/her weaknesses and strengths.

## Discussion

The findings of the study revealed the benefits of having a structured teaching practice during which triadic relationships between the TTs, CTs, and USs are emphasized. Our findings extend and support the previous research on the importance of cooperation between all participants of teaching practice (see, Boz & Boz, 2006; Eraslan, 2008; Kuter & Koç, 2009). Both the qualitative and quantitative results indicated that the TTs and CTs in the experimental group had greater satisfaction levels with the USs. Qualitative results gave some insights about why TTs and CTs were more satisfied with the USs performance throughout the process.

In the open ended questions TTs were asked to list the strengths of their US. Although both groups mentioned professional and personal qualifications of their US the experimental group focused more on the professional aspect of their US and identified more qualifications. In addition, the number of the TTs who agreed with these strengths was greater in the experimental group. However, the emergence of a “personal qualifications” category is consonant with Cuenca’s (2010b) emphasis on the important role of the supervisor as a “teacher pedagogue”, emphasizing the TTs’ need for an emotional support. It is likely that the reason the experimental group was better able to identify professional qualifications of the US was because of their familiarity with the entire supervision process due to the influence of the CSM. Thus they had expectations of the US that were in line with the basic precepts of the CSM. Further illustrating the beneficial effects of the CSM was the findings that although, asked to report positive characteristics of their USs, 14% were only able to write negative ones.

The majority of their complaints centered on the lack of observations by the US, which is worth mentioning because observations are the critical components of the teaching practice. Similar previous research (see Yılmaz, 2011) also identified that Turkish USs rarely visit the cooperating schools or do not visit them at all. As one of the major functions of CSM is to systematize the teaching practice with regular feedback and observations and to strengthen the interaction between the parties, this finding might be interpreted as an indication of a need to implement the CSM throughout Turkey. The differences between USs in the experimental and control group in this one teacher education program, in terms of number of observations and the amount and quality of feedback has a tremendous effect on teacher qualifications. As the graduates of these institutions will possess varying degrees of experience and knowledge based on the type of supervision they received, it will become very difficult to talk about the quality of teacher education.

Therefore, a model that internally (by the participants of the process through collaboration and three-way conferences) and externally (by the coordinators of the process with process assessment tools) controls the teaching practice can help providing a structured and organized practicum. Results from this research can also have implications beyond one teacher training program. A recent study by Yaman (2013) revealed that neither Turkey’s Ministry of National Education nor the Higher Education Council have documents that identify clearly the roles of the USs. Thus, a comprehensive guide and/or a model that identifies the teaching practice and the contribution of the participants could reduce the problems that are caused due to this lack of clarity. Hence, the current study proposes CSM as a solution.

The development and implementation of these documents would address another area identified by the control group in this study. Twenty-eight percent of the control group mentioned about the need for detailed, systematic, effective and timely feedback. Similar results were also found in earlier studies by Paker (2003) and Ünver (2003). Moreover, 28 % stated that they

would like their US to be more involved in the process, which is also stated in earlier studies as well (for example, Paker, 2003). The CSM, by nature, is primarily all about effective, systematic feedback and requires the involvement of the parties in a triadic partnership; hence the control group's need for systematic and effective feedback points to the importance of using a more structured model for teaching practice.

Although most of the participants in both groups (98% experimental and 82% control) claimed that they would suggest their US to other TTs, the control group was inefficient when justifying their claim. The experimental group gave specific reasons to explain why they would recommend their US. However, it was also interesting that a few of the TTs in the control group considered "being left alone" and not receiving feedback as a kind of flexibility on the part of the US and identified this so called "flexibility" as a reason for recommending their US to other TTs.

It is clear from these findings that through the use of the CSM the experimental group had the requisite knowledge to develop high expectations of their USs, identify their own needs and evaluate the necessary qualifications of a US and develop a more critical stance in making judgments about the teaching practice. Ten percent of the control group was undecided whether or not to recommend their US to other TTs. This uncertainty most likely had its roots in their both negative and positive perceptions of their USs. However, as mentioned previously, this ambivalence may have been rooted in their lack of knowledge regarding a quality teaching practice experience. This suggests that there is a need for training the USs for the supervision process to enable similar opportunities for the development of the TTs.

It is interesting to note that many in the experimental group asked for more observations than the three that were required. Again, this speaks to the benefits of the CSM. Once exposed to a model that includes quality observation and feedback, the TTs wanted more. They recognized the benefit of having well trained eyes observing and giving feedback on their teaching performance. The CSM can provide a systematic process with regular, comprehensive, effective and detailed feedback; however, the current system used with the control group, does not provide the US, CT or TT with this necessary training and leaves the process haphazard. The interview results were very similar to the responses from the open-ended questions. They allowed students to further expand their feelings about their supervision and teaching practice in general.

## Conclusions

The results of this study clearly identify problems with the current supervision system in the teaching practice courses in place in Turkey. Our results also identify a solution, the CSM which can alleviate many of the identified problems. This can be accomplished by systematizing the teaching practice and increase the contribution of the USs, CTs and TTs. The results of this study show that the CSM can be successfully implemented in the Turkish context as evidenced by the satisfaction of the TTs and the CTs. The CSM clearly increased the TTs expectations and helped them develop a critical understanding in their professional development. The use of the model ameliorates the many weaknesses of teaching practice identified in the Turkish context and elsewhere as stated in the above mentioned literature. The traditional system of supervision in the teaching practice, as it is currently implemented, may cause the TTs start their profession with varying qualifications, experiences and knowledge. To improve the teacher training process and to positively affect the future teaching career of the TT,

standardization of the teaching practice and all its components is more than necessary. In conclusion, the CSM can be a good alternative for other structured models (Bulunuz, Gürsoy, Kesner, Göktalay, Salihoğlu, 2014) to improve teacher development and to bring about qualified teachers.

## References

- Bates, A.J., Drits, D. & Ramirez, L. (2011). Self-awareness and enactment of supervisory stances: Influences on responsiveness toward student teacher learning. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(3), 69-87.
- Beck, C. & Kosnik, C. (2002). Professors and the practicum: Involvement of university faculty in preservice practicum supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 6-19.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001002>
- Boz, N. & Boz, Y. (2006). Do prospective teachers get enough experience in school placement. *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 32(4), 353-368.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470600981912>
- Bullough, R. V., & Draper, R. J. (2004). Making sense of a failed triad: mentors, university supervisors, and positioning theory. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(5), 407-420.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487104269804>
- Bullough, R.V. (2005). Being and becoming a mentor: School-based teacher educators and teacher educator identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 143-155.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.12.002>
- Bulunuz, N., Gürsoy, E., Kesner, J., Göktalay, Ş.B., & Salihoğlu, U.M. (2014). The implementation and evaluation of a clinical supervision model in teacher education in Turkey: Is it an effective method? *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14 (5), 1-11.
- Byrd, D. & Fogleman, J. (2012). The role of supervision in teacher development. In A. Cuenca (Ed.), *Supervising Student Teachers: Issues, Perspectives and Future Directions* (pp. 191-210). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Cuenca, A. (2010a). In loco paedagogus: The pedagogy of a novice university supervisor. *Studying Teacher Education: A Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, 6(1), 29-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17425961003669086>
- Cuenca, A. (2010b). Care, thoughtfulness, and tact: A conceptual framework for university supervisors. *Teaching Education*, 21(3), 263-278.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210903505807>
- Cuenca, A. (2012). The problematology of supervising student teachers. In A. Cuenca (Ed.), *Supervising Student Teachers: Issues, Perspectives and Future Directions* (pp. 21-32). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-095-8>
- Elfer, C.J. (2012). Becoming a university supervisor: Troubles, travails, and opportunities. In A. Cuenca (Ed.), *Supervising Student Teachers: Issues, Perspectives and Future Directions* (pp. 3-19). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-095-8\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-095-8_1)
- Eraslan, A. (2008). A faculty-school partnership program: prospective mathematics teachers' reflections on school practice course. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 34, 95-105.



- Gürsoy, E., Bulunuz, N., Göktalay, Ş. B., Bulunuz, M., Kesner, J., & Salihoğlu, U.M. (2013). Clinical supervision model to improve supervisory skills of cooperating teachers and university supervisors during teaching practice. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, Special issue 1*, 191-203.
- İbrahim, A. S. (2013). Approaches to supervision of student teachers in one UAE teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 34*, 38-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.04.002>
- Horton, L., & Harvey, K. (1979). Preparing cooperating teachers: The role of the university supervisor. *Peabody Journal of Education, 57*(1), 56-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01619567909538267>
- Jones, R. C. (1970). University supervisor: A student teacher's best friend. *The Clearing House, 44* (7), 433-436 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.1970.11478417>
- Kuter, S., & Koç, 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 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2008.09.016>
- Paker, T. (2008). Öğretmenlik uygulamasında öğretmen adaylarının uygulama öğretmeni ve uygulama öğretim elemanının yönlendirmesiyle ilgili karşılaştıkları sorunlar [Problems of student teachers regarding the feedback of university supervisors and mentors during teaching practice]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 23*, 132-139.
- Sağ, R. (2008). The expectations of student teachers about cooperating teachers, supervisors and practice schools. *Eğitim Araştırmaları- Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 32*, 117-132.
- Slick, S. K. (1997). Assessing versus assisting: The supervisor's roles in the complex dynamics of the student teaching triad. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*, 713-726. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(97\)00016-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(97)00016-4)
- Slick, S. K. (1998). The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*, 821-834. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(98\)00028-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00028-6)
- Ünver, G. (2003). Öğretmenlik uygulamasında işbirliği: Bir durum çalışması [Collaboration on teaching practice: A case study]. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 23* (1), 87-100.
- Yaman, S. (2013). Supervision and the roles of supervisors within the context of preservice teacher education in Turkey. *International Journal of Academic Research, 5*(5), 227-232. <https://doi.org/10.7813/2075-4124.2013/5-5/B.34>
- Yılmaz, M. (2011). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmenlik uygulaması dersini yürüten öğretim elemanlarına ilişkin görüşleri [The opinions of primary school teacher candidates about the teaching staff lecturing the teaching practice course]. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 10* (4), 1377-1387.
- Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 117-124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.12.001>