

**The Extent to which students-teachers at Al-Quds Open University
Practise technical, administrative and social skills while teaching from
the viewpoint of cooperating teachers.**

Abstract

This study aimed at identifying the extent to which Al-Quds Open University students of Practical Education practiced technical, administrative and social skills while teaching from the viewpoint of cooperating school teachers.

A questionnaire comprising three sections was devised for this purpose. The first section dealt with technical skills; the second with the administrative skills, while the third dealt with the social ones. The study was conducted on all individuals of the population consisting of 113 male and female teachers.

....

Then the questionnaire which adopted a five-level scale was distributed. Among the results concluded by the study was the following:

There were differences in the extent of practising technical, administrative and social skills by the students –teachers while demonstrating teaching from the viewpoint of cooperating teachers attributed to the variables of:

- Gender, in favuor of females;
- Qualification, in favour of the Bachelor's degree and higher diploma.
- Experience, in favour of (5-10) years of experience;
- Specialization, in favour of natural sciences,

The study recommended assigning supervision of Practical Education to well-qualified and competent teachers in addition to efficiently involving the students-teachers in the discussions and meetings at schools to deal with the educational problems so as to practise the administrative skills successfully while teaching.

:

.

(1 :2005).

1991

"

(2005)

2012

.

"

.

(2 :2005)

(253 :2002) .

/

/

(517 :1990) .

/

/

(2003) .

/

):

(.....

(.....

)

.() :

/

()

) .

.

/

(14 - 12 :2012

:

....

/

/

(2 :2011)

/

(2 :2008) .

/

/

(272 :2002).

/

1998)

(Slick

/

(2000) .

/

/

(120)

/

.

:

/

2012

.

)

/

(

/

/

.

:

/

.1

:

/

:

/

:

/

:

/

.2

/

.3

/

.4

/

-5

....

:

:

/

/

/

/

.

:

/

.1

.

(

)

.2

/

.

:

)

/

:

.(

.2012 – 2011

1111

:

:

.

2012

.

:

:

:

.1

"99 "

"

"

.

/

:

.2

)

.(

:

.3

/

.

/

(

)

:

.4

:

.

:

/

/

....

.

(2001)

(40)

(30)

/

(70)

:

.

(2002)

:

/ (60)

/

(3)

(36)

/

:

2012

.

(2003)

"2"

)

(44)

(30)

(

(3.86)

(3.81)

/

0.83-61

(2004)

:

/

—

/

:

(221)

(50)

/

/

/

/

/

/

....

.

(2005)

(1119)

:

(936)

(183)

(53)

):

/

(

(75)

(90)

/

/

2012

.

(2007)

(438)

2006 /2005

/

(67)

/

:

/

/

/

/

(2007)

(25)

(13)

(88)

(66)

(50)

:

/

....

() () ()
()

.

(2008)

-

-

2008 -2007

%60

(128)

(92)

(52)

(13)

:

:

2012

.

:

(2008)

(93)

(28)

(7)

(7)

(7)

(7)

.

(2010)

(133)

(73)

(60)

2008 -2007

:

(26)

/

:

....

.

(Helen ,1994)

/

.

(Slick ,1995)

()

/

(Ilatov,1998)

2012

.

:

/

.1994)

(2002)

(Helen

(Ilatov1998)

(Slick.1995)

(2008)

(2008)

(2010)

(2007) (2007)

.(2005)

(2003)

"2"

/

" "

:

:

:

2012/2011

(1111)

....

(113)

:(1)

19.47	22		
80.53	91		
100	113		
14.16	16		
56.64	64		
22.12	25	+	
7.08	8		
100	113		
20.35	23	5	
39.82	45	10 -5	
39.82	45	10	
100.00	113		
79.65	90		
20.35	23		
100.00	113		

:

(2003)

()

(40)

2012

.

()

:

(1,2,3,4,5) (

:

" "

(41)

: ()

: ()

:

(40)

-1: ()

()

-1:

: ()

-2

)

-2

-1: (

-1 : ()

-2

-2

()

-1

-1: ()

-2 : ()

-2

....

(%80)

:

(0.945)

(Cronbach Alpha)

:(2)

:(2)

0.936	
0.847	
0.859	
0.945	

:

.1

.2

.3

.(SPSS)

:

:(Independent variables) :

.1

.2

.3

2012

10 . 10 – 5 . 5 .1
: .4

(Dependent variable) :

)

(

:

:

/

/

:

%84

% %84 68

%68 52

%52 36

36

....

()

: (3)

	81.4	0.64	4.07	.	1
	91.6	0.50	4.58	.()	2
	80.6	0.92	4.03	" "	3
	80.6	0.84	4.03	.	4
	81.2	0.83	4.06	.	5
	83.8	0.71	4.19	" "	6
	80.4	0.89	4.02	.	7
	82.2	0.84	4.11	.	8
	80.8	0.71	4.04	.	9
	80.2	0.71	4.01	.	10
	87.2	0.54	4.36	.	11
	82.0	0.63	4.10	" "	12
	81.4	0.87	4.07	.	13
	81.6	0.77	4.08	.	14
	79.0	0.68	3.95	.	15
	82.2	0.54	4.11	.	

5

/

(%82.2)

(%91.6) ()

2012

.

/

)

)

(

(2007)

(

/

/

(Helen ,1994)

.

(2008)

(2001)

(2004)

.

/

:(4)

()

	87.0	0.53	4.35) (.... .	1
	81.2	0.49	4.06	.. " "	2
	83.8	0.60	4.19		3

....

	75.8	0.92	3.79		4
	67.0	0.82	3.35		5
	67.2	1.00	3.36		6
	77.2	0.81	3.86		7
	76.4	0.75	3.82		8
	74.0	0.81	3.70		9
	76.8	0.51	3.84		

5

/

(%76.8)

(....))

(87.0) (

/

/

/

/

(2005)

,1994)

/

(Helen

(2002)

2012

.

(2003)

/

(2008)

.()

(2007)

(2001)

):

) () (% 67.0) (/ (% 67.2

/

.

:

/

:(5)

()

	90.2	0.60	4.51	.	1
	85.6	0.60	4.28	.	2
	78.0	0.77	3.90	.	3
	73.4	0.87	3.67)	4

....

				.(.....	
	75.0	0.75	3.75		5
	81.8	0.56	4.09		6
	79.6	0.50	3.98		7
	79.6	0.67	3.98		8
	66.0	0.86	3.30		9
	79.6	0.71	3.98		10
	70.8	0.98	3.54		11
	85.6	0.60	4.28		12
	82.4	0.62	4.12		13
	82.4	0.52	4.12		14
	79.0	0.94	3.95		15
	76.0	0.83	3.80) (16
	79.4	0.41	3.97		

5

/

(%79.4)

(%90.2) ():

/

2012

.

(2007)

(2002)

/

/

(2003)

()

/

(Helen ,1994)

(2001)

.

): . /

(%66.0) (

.

/

:(6)

	82.2	0.54	4.11	
	76.8	0.51	3.84	
	79.4	0.41	3.97	
	80.0	0.42	4.00	

(6)

(4.00)

(%80.0)

/

:_____

....

/ : (7)

:

	81.6	0.42	4.08		
	82.4	0.57	4.12		
	75.8	0.35	3.79		
	77.0	0.55	3.85		
	80.2	0.29	4.01		
	79.2	0.44	3.96		
	79.8	0.27	3.99		
	80.0	0.45	4.00		

(7)

/

.

()

(2008)

(2007)

/

(2002)

.

2012

: _____
/

/ : (8)

	83.6	0.43	4.18		
	81.4	0.57	4.07		
	86.0	0.51	4.30	+	
	75.2	0.48	3.76		
	75.6	0.44	3.78		
	77.6	0.49	3.88		
	77.8	0.57	3.89	+	
	69.2	0.56	3.46		
	79.4	0.32	3.97		
	79.2	0.42	3.96		
	81.0	0.41	4.05	+	
	76.4	0.55	3.82		
	80.0	0.31	4.00		
	79.6	0.43	3.98		
	82.2	0.40	4.11	+	
	74.4	0.50	3.72		

(8)

/

(+)

....

(+) .

:

.

/ :_____

/ :**(9)**

	80.2	0.53	4.01	5	
	82.6	0.52	4.13	10 -5	
	83.0	0.58	4.15	10	
	78.4	0.44	3.92	5	
	77.2	0.54	3.86	10 -5	
	75.6	0.52	3.78	10	
	80.8	0.39	4.04	5	
	79.4	0.44	3.97	10 -5	
	78.8	0.40	3.94	10	
	80.0	0.41	4.00	5	
	80.2	0.43	4.01	10 -5	
	79.6	0.42	3.98	10	

(9)

/

.(10 -5)

/

2012

.

/

/

(2008)

.

(2002)

.

/

:_____

/

:(10)

	81.6	0.53	4.08		
	84.8	0.58	4.24		
	76.2	0.52	3.81		
	79.2	0.49	3.96		
	79.4	0.42	3.97		
	79.8	0.38	3.99		
	79.4	0.42	3.97		
	81.6	0.42	4.08		

(10)

/

....

.

:

:

.

-1

-2

.

/

-3

.

(

)

/

-4

.

/

/

-5

.

-6

.

-7

.

:

2004 :

-1

.65 : /

"

2008 :

-2

. _ :

2010 :

-3

.:7 ()

2012

.

:2005 -4

)

.(

:1990 -5

.

"<http://hdl.handle.net/10576/9219>."

:2002 -6

.

2005 : -7

"

-

. _ :

:2011 . -8

.2011 /12/19

-

.2003 : -9

..160 :

/

2007 : -10

.

.130 :

"2"

2003: -11

"

.

2001: -12

225. :17

-

"

3

:2008

-13

....

	2002 :	-14
/		
	.18-17:	
	2000:	-15
.488 :16	-	
2007 :	" "	-16
	.186:	
	2008:	--17
	.194:	
	:	

1. Ilatov, Z. and Shamaï, S. 1998:. Teacher student classroom interaction. Ther Infience of gender, academic dominance and teacher. Adolescence, Vol.33 issue 130,pp,269- 279.
2. Helen,P.1994: Four- way supervision : weaving the voices, un weaving the stand, paper presented at the Annual conference of the American Education Research Asociation, New Orleans, L A, April, 4-8, 1994. ED369748.
3. Silck , S. 1995: Living in two worlds, the university supervisor s role in the student teaching experience, Dissertation abstract international, p. 1321.