

PROBLEMS FACING FIELD TRAINING STUDENTS IN JORDANIAN UNIVERSITIES

MOHAMMED ALI ABDALLAH MOMANI ^{1*} and FERYAL AL-KHATIB ²

^{1,2} Faculty Education Sciences, Irbid National Universities, Irbid, Jordan.

Email: ¹ dr-momani82@hotmail.com (*Corresponding Author), ² fofyousef2014@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study aimed to identify the problems facing field training students in Jordanian universities in light of some variables, and the study sample consisted of (278) male and female students. The results of the study showed that the level of problems with their dimensions came to a medium degree, and there were statistically significant differences in the problems and their dimensions according to the university variable in favor of the public university and the specialization variable except for two dimensions (the trainee student and the cooperating school) in favor of the class teacher; in the variable GPA except for my dimension (academic supervisor) in favor of the GPA more than 76; and the absence of differences in problems and their dimensions according to the gender variable (keywords: problems, field training, Jordanian universities).

Keywords: Problems, Field Training, Jordanian Universities.

INTRODUCTION

Field training is the first experience for students in educational institutions, as it begins by applying what they have learned and allows them to deal with the various pressures they may face in the labor market; it also represents the procedures through which fieldwork is carried out to assist in acquiring technical knowledge and skills and modifying their traits and behaviors.

Field training is an essential aspect of the education process that provides students with the opportunity to apply the theoretical foundations of the profession in the field of practice and is a central aspect of teaching models and applied techniques in the field of work (Altmaier & Hansen, 2012). Field training is an experiential form of teaching and learning that takes place in the work environment, and fieldwork practices have provided the most incredible opportunity to understand the requirements of individuals against the background of prevailing cultural traditions and values (Tippa & Mane, 2018). Field training is also the practical and applied aspect of preparing them and providing them with knowledge, information, skills, and trends, which is the actual professional preparation for students to work in education, training, and skills development within the school (Salem, 2018).

The university student acquires skills, experiences, teaching procedures, and practical interaction during field training and learns and acquires the basic elements of practical life and the most important ways of communicating and interacting with others; Field training is the professional aspect of training the student trainee (Masoud, 2004). Furthermore, training is an essential requirement for the student to graduate from the university through which he possesses the necessary educational competencies related to different teaching strategies and assessment strategies, the use of teaching aids in the classroom, classroom leadership, and

management, as well as how to deal with students regardless of their educational levels (Al-Huaymel and Al-Soub, 2012).

Training students through actual situations to modify attitudes and develop the skills of trainees can only be achieved through cooperation between trainee students, school principals, educational supervisors, academics, and parents of students in schools; training programs help increase the professionalism of teachers in the field of special education. Most teachers in both developed and developing countries agree on the importance of developing special education teacher training systems (Al-Zoubi & Bani Abdel Rahman, 2011), and that the training helps students to apply the theoretical knowledge acquired during the study period in practice and helps students to identify the nature and needs of the labor market; Practical training is just an introduction to a job after graduation. The internship gives a first impression of the nature of the people he will deal with after graduation. Those working in the labor market will be radically different from those dealt with during their studies, making them succeed in their future work (Zheng, 2015). Therefore, fieldwork training is the most critical component of their professional education. Practice and knowledge (theory) are integral components of the curriculum, and training and practice take place in the same place and are unique features of field training (Tippa & Mane, 2018).

Field training is defined as gaining experience by utilizing knowledge and developing skills to deal with individuals' problems, and it is an interactive process directed between the trainee student and the state of social life (Ayasreh, 2017). It is also defined as a set of consciously planned experiences in a practice environment designed to transfer the trainee from the first level of their understanding, skills, and attitudes to the levels associated with independent professional practice (Musingafi, Mapuranga, Chiwanza & Zebron, 2015).

Vuran, Ergenekon & Ünlü (2015) point out the importance of field training and its role in shaping the trainee's personality in the profession; And that the importance of practical training, defining the skills that characterize the university supervisor, defining the responsibilities of the student teacher, the need to provide advisory services to students from the supervisors, and that university supervisors be experienced, and describing practical applications of study theories, are of the importance of the basic axes of field training.

The field training aims to: develop professional skills by learning to use knowledge to study and analyze problems and choose appropriate means to solve them; develop skills in solving problems at the macro and micro levels; integrating classroom learning with field practice; In addition to developing the skills required for professional practice at a certain level of training; developing professional conduct, values and commitment; Developing self-awareness and professional idea (Shaikh & Kazi, 2014). As (Tippa & Mane, 2018) indicates, the objective of field training is to develop the trainee student's competency in professional work practice. The field training also aims to link direct experiences in field training with the academic understanding of the concept that helps students integrate their professional experience. Students realize that education requires understanding, feeling, action, and practice (Shepard & Perry, 2022).

The field training provides the student teacher with the competencies and skills necessary for the teacher's roles in the teaching profession and helps build self-confidence, develop the student's professional and social personality, organize and respect time, and practice various tasks (Al-Halibi and Salem, 2004). The objectives of the field training can be summarized as follows: allowing students to acquire knowledge, translate it into practical and applied practices and theoretical test concepts in the light of realistic situations; Providing students with technical skills for field work; Providing students with the behavioral trends that the trainee student must possess to ensure his success in his work; Providing students with professional work habits that will constrain them in their future professional work; Providing students with professional values and professional ethics through field practice and professional self-development; Providing students with field experiences related to professional practice such as study, diagnosis, treatment, and assessment; Providing students with knowledge, experience and teamwork skills with colleagues or other professionals in other professions (Harvey & Struzziero, 2008).

According to Ralph, Walker & Wimmer, 2010, fieldwork appears to be based on the premise that students will explore the link between classroom instruction and practice in the real world of work and apply relevant knowledge and skills to solve "real-life problems faced by actual practitioners" in the field depending on the specific needs of the practitioner's organizations and training institutions.

According to Boylan & Scott (2011), fieldwork aims to provide students with many opportunities, including learning by doing, transferring their classroom knowledge to actual work, and creating essential networks with professionals in the field. Fieldwork also helps students hone their skills in the classroom, give them a meaningful professional education, develops their human relations and communication skills, increase their career options through exposure, and simplifies their prospects for future employment (Radovan & Koscielniak, 2013).

Practical training as part of any comprehensive curriculum allows one to put theoretical knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values into a natural work environment; The most challenging aspect of hands-on training is how it is organized to be successful and beneficial to all parties. These two issues are crucial from the point of view of the learner, the university, and the supervisor. Therefore, a key element in organizing and implementing the hands-on process is appropriate preparation, including expectations, a shared understanding of purpose and learning outcomes, and awareness of challenges and perceptions (Pill & Pilli, 2013).

Training problems relate to questions about educational settings, awareness of individual differences, and differences in social and cultural roles; Persistent problems are also associated with dealing with daily work: confidentiality, ethics, openness, tolerance, professional behavior, and attentiveness. In addition, training problems relate to student roles (self-awareness and inclusion in decision-making), competencies (balance between task and skills), supervision (teaching methods used, problem-solving ability, and communication), and placement (qualitative contracts and facilities) (Corey, Corey & Callanan, 2014).

Al-Hawarna (2017) indicates that the most significant difficulties and problems facing psychological counseling students during field training are: Assigning the trained counselor to fill the vacant classes; lack of mastery of individual counseling methods; lack of objectivity, and tendency to bias in supervisor evaluation; And that the school administration sees the trainee counselors as a burden. Alsabeelah (2021) indicates the lack of available materials, the schools' lack of interest in cooperating with the trainee student, the academic supervisor's negative view of the trainee's abilities, and the absence of any assistant for the trainee student by the field training parties.

Previous Studies

Shubeita and Abu Elba (2002) conducted a study to identify the obstacles facing field training students at Al-Quds Open University in Qalqilya. The study sample consisted of (30) male and female students. The results showed an average level of obstacles, and they were as follows: the institutional obstacles facing the field training students and the training obstacles associated with the field training students.

The study of Al- Fraihat, Al-Ghazzo, and Jarwan (2019) aimed to evaluate the field training program in psychological counseling at Yarmouk University from the point of view of the trained counselors in the light of some variables. As a result, (142) male and female students participated in this study. The study's results indicated that four axes obtained a high degree of effectiveness, namely: supervision, evaluation, educational competencies, and personal competencies, and the organization's axes obtained a medium degree of effectiveness. The results also showed no statistically significant differences in estimating the degree of effectiveness of the field training program according to gender, cumulative average, and the school in which the trainee counselor was applied.

The study of Tashman and Al-Mustarihi (2019) dealt with the problems facing Al-Isra University students during the field training period. It was applied to a sample of (71) male and female students. The results showed that the most prominent problems facing field training students, in order, are related to the nature of the training program, the cooperating teacher, the cooperating school, the classroom teaching processes, and the academic supervisor. And classroom teaching operations in favor of the class teacher specialization, while the differences in the problems related to the cooperating school were in favor of the specialty of child education, and the results also showed that there were statistically significant differences attributed to the cumulative average in the problems related to the teaching processes, and in favor of the students whose cumulative average reached: very good on the students whose average was excellent and acceptable, and there were differences in the problems related to the cooperating teacher, the cooperating school, and in favor of the cumulative average is very good over the acceptable, while the results showed that there were no statistically significant differences due to gender.

Al-Hawarna (2017) studied the difficulties and problems facing psychological counseling students in field training from their point of view in Jordan, and the study sample consisted of (46) male and female students from Mutah University. The results of the study showed many

problems, the most important of which is the assignment of the trainee mentor to other work, the lack of guiding methods, and the bias in the supervisor's evaluation; The results did not show a statistically significant difference in difficulties due to the gender variable. The results of the study showed that the field training problems were of a medium degree in the student dimension, while the problems were of a slight degree in the dimensions of the academic supervisor and the school in the training place. It showed differences in the problems among students according to the gender variable in the dimensions of the supervisor, the school and the scale as a whole, and no differences in the field training problems according to the cumulative average variable.

Aqilan (2016) conducted a study to reveal the most prominent field training problems facing students at Hadramout University. The study sample consisted of (108) male and female students who undertook field training in cooperating schools. The organizational and supervisory aspects are their feeling that the trainees' discussion sessions with the supervisors are insufficient, their feeling of embarrassment when assigning them to teach a course that is not related to their specializations, the school principal's failure to provide an idea of the school's rules and regulations and their belief that the cooperating teacher does not pay attention to the trainees' daily preparation book, and their suffering from Scarcity of guidance and advice from a cooperating teacher.

Al-Enezi study (2015) dealt with the problems facing practical education students at Shaqra University from the student teachers' perspective. The study sample consisted of (136) student teachers. The study results concluded that administrative problems are the most problems student teachers face. The nature of the program and school students and the study results concluded that there were no statistically significant differences for the variables of specialization and gender, while statistically significant differences were found for the cumulative average variable.

The study of Hamarsha and Al-Rimawi (2013) aimed to know the obstacles facing field training students at Al-Quds University from the student's point of view, and the study sample consisted of (70) male and female students. The study results showed an average level of obstacles; the most critical obstacles were capabilities and the field training program. The results also showed no statistically significant differences in the obstacles according to gender, academic level, and place of field training.

Thaver (2012) conducted a study aimed at knowing the problems facing social service students in the field of field training in Durban, KwaZulu-Natal province, and the study sample consisted of (18) supervisors. The results showed that students are not subject to strict scrutiny of the profession, are not prepared for fieldwork, and lack the basic skills necessary for practice.

The study of Al-Momani and Khazali (2010) dealt with the most prominent problems of the field training course for female students at Al-Balqa Applied University in Jordan, and the study sample consisted of (131) trainee students. The results showed that the most prominent problems facing the female trainees from their point of view are: non-compliance with the instructions of the academic supervisor, the trainee's inability to consider the individual

differences between the school students, the student's lack of interest in the duties and tasks assigned to them by the trainee, and the cooperating teacher's failure to guide the trainee before entering the class, and the trainee's inability to do the teaching methods. The study's results revealed no statistically significant differences in the degree of problems among the trainee students due to the academic program, the cooperating school, or the interaction between them.

The Study Problem

Students may often fail during fieldwork as they view practical training from theoretical aspects. There must be a link between the objectives of the fieldwork and the role of faculty members and agency supervisors in guiding them, and the student's interests and learning initiatives. Therefore, identifying the problems that students face during field training enables field trainees to identify, categorize and arrange these problems according to their importance so that they can reconsider the planning and organization of training programs to achieve compatibility between university programs and plans and the needs of the labor market. The study problem also stems from the researcher's feelings stemming from his work as an academic supervisor for field training students at the university. They noticed that there are problems, difficulties, and obstacles facing field training students, as he felt that there are several technical and administrative problems that field training students suffer from, which pose difficulties, this prevents the achievement of the desired goals of the field training course, in addition to the presence of many reactions and opinions about the feasibility and effectiveness of the field training program by the main elements participating in the field training.

The Study Questions

1. What is the level of problems facing field students in Jordanian universities?
2. Are there statistically significant differences in the problems faced by field training students due to the difference in the type of university (public, private)?
3. Are there statistically significant differences in the problems faced by field training students due to the difference in the gender variable (male, female)?
4. Are there statistically significant differences in the problems faced by field training students due to the variable of specialization (psychological counseling, class teacher)?
5. Are there statistically significant differences in the problems faced by field training students due to the cumulative average variable?

The Study Objectives

The current study aims to achieve the following objectives:

- Disclosure of the problems faced by field training students among undergraduate students.
- Detect the differences in the level of problems faced by field training students according to gender, specialization, and cumulative average variables.

The Study Terms

Problems facing students: It is a set of difficulties and challenges that occur to the trainee student during the implementation of the field training (Tashman and Al-Mustarihi, 2019).

Field training: It is a set of field procedures and practices that are presented consciously and intentionally to help the student obtain knowledge, field experience, and technical skills that advance him to higher levels that enable him to practice his work independently and effectively after graduation (Al-Rantisi, 2018).

Study limits and limitations

Human limits: the current study was limited to trainee students at the first university level (bachelor's) and did not include postgraduate students.

Time limits: The current study was limited to students of the second semester of the academic year 2021/2022.

Spatial limits: The current study was conducted in the universities of Irbid, northern Jordan.

Objective limits: The objective limitations of the study are limited to the problems facing field training students in Jordanian universities in the light of some variables.

Method and Procedure

Study Approach

The current study followed the descriptive approach, as it examined the level of problems facing field training students in Jordanian universities among undergraduate students in the light of some variables.

The population of the study

The study population consisted of all undergraduate students (bachelors) at Irbid Private University, Jabara Private University, and Yarmouk university, whose number is approximately (3,939) male and female students studying in the second semester of the academic year 2021/2022.

The Study Sample

The study sample consisted of (278) male and female students from Irbid Private University, Jadara Private University, and Yarmouk University; Table (1) shows the frequencies and percentages of the demographic and functional characteristics of the study sample members.

Table 1: Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Variables

Variable	Level	N	Ratio %	Variable	Level	N	Ratio %
Gender	Male	105	38%	The University	Governmental	105	63%
	Female	173	62%		Private	63	38%
	Total	160	100%		Total	168	100%
Specialization	psychological counseling	160	58%	GPA	less than 68	75	27%
	Class teacher	118	42%		76 – 68	116	42%
					more than 76	87	31%
	Total	278	100%		Total	278	100%

Table (1) shows a description of the primary data, as the gender variable reached the highest frequency for females (173) at a rate of (62%), while the variable of specialization (psychological counseling) had the highest frequency (160) at a rate of (58%), and the cumulative rate variable (68) - 76) the highest frequency (116) by (42%), while the university variable was (governmental) the highest frequency (105) by (63%).

The Study Tool

Questionnaire about the problems that students face

The researchers referred to the topics related to the problems facing the students of field training in universities in Arabic and English, such as the Shubeita and Abu Elba study (2002), Al- Sharaa study (2019), the Tashman and Al-Mastrihi study (2019), the study of Al-Qattan, Al-Kandari and Al-Shammari (2019), and (Salem, 2018), and the study of (Shaikh & Kazi, 2014) where the scale consists of (21) items in its initial form.

The tool validity

The researchers verified the validity of the content by presenting the tool in its final form to a group of (8) arbitrators with specialization in education and psychology at the National University of Irbid, to ensure the appropriateness of the paragraphs of the scale for this category to which the study will be applied, the arbitrators agreed on the paragraphs by (72%), this percentage can be relied upon to conduct the study, as the researcher conducted a construction validity procedure by applying the tool to a survey sample that consisted of (39) male and female students from the private University of Irbid. Corrected correlation coefficients were calculated for the tool items, and Table (2) shows the corrected correlation coefficient values for the tool.

Table 2: values of the corrected correlation coefficients for the study tool items

ρ	Academic Supervisor	ρ	Cooperating teacher/mentor	ρ	Trainee student	ρ	Cooperating school
1	0.55	1	0.57	1	0.73	1	0.53
2	0.63	2	0.73	2	0.69	2	0.70
3	0.62	3	0.71	3	0.61	3	0.84
4	0.58	4	0.62	4	0.54	4	0.68
5	0.67	5	0.76	5	0.62	5	0.79
				6	0.81		

It is noted from Table (2) that the corrected correlation coefficients ranged between (0.53-0.84) for the scale as a whole, and the correlation coefficients for problems related to the academic supervisor were between (0.55-0.67), while the cooperating teacher/counselor was between (0.57-0.76), and in the trainee student it was between (0.54-0.81), and finally, the cooperating school was between (0.53-0.84). This indicates that the tool has high constructive validity, and the researcher has kept the scale on its paragraphs as they are (21) items.

The tool reliability

To demonstrate that the questionnaire measures the factors to be measured and the reliability of its validity, the researcher conducted a test of the internal consistency of the tool items, where the coherence of the tool was evaluated by the Cronbach Alpha calculation, as Cronbach's alpha method depends on the consistency of the individual's performance from one paragraph to another. It indicates the strength of the correlation and cohesion between the items measured. In addition, the alpha coefficient provides a good estimate of stability. To verify the reliability of the study in this way, Cronbach's Alpha equation was applied to the scores of the stability sample members. Although there are no standard rules regarding appropriate alpha values for each in practice, alpha (< alpha- 0.60) is reasonable in management and the humanities research.

Table 3: Cronbach's alpha test values for the study levels

	Study levels	Alpha value
Field training problems	Academic Supervisor	0.83
	Cooperating teacher/mentor	0.88
	trainee student	0.78
	cooperating school	0.77
	Practical education program	0.79
The resolution as a whole		0.92

These reliability coefficients indicate that the tool, in general, has a high stability coefficient (0.92) on the tool's ability to achieve the purposes of the study, as it is clear from the Table that the highest stability coefficient of the resolution was achieved by the level of the teacher/cooperating counselor which is (0.88). At the same time, it is noted that the lowest stability coefficient is (0.77) achieved by the cooperating school level. This indicates the possibility of stability of the results obtained from the questionnaire due to its application.

Scale correction

The scale consists of (21) items, consisting of a five-point scale, which is (1 = always, 2 = often, 3 = sometimes, 4 = rarely, 5 = never), and the scores for the scale range between (21-105) degrees. To judge the levels of problems, these degrees were converted to be limited to (1-5) degrees, and the arithmetic averages were distributed as follows: the low level ranged between (1-2.33), the medium level ranged between (2.34-3.67), the high-level ranges between (3.68-5).

Statistical Methods

After collecting the study data, the study questions were examined through the following statistical tests:

1. To answer the level of problems facing the trainee students, the arithmetic means and standard deviations are used.
2. To answer the differences in the level of problems faced by field training students due to university, gender and specialization variables, the T-Test was used.
3. To answer the differences in the level of problems faced by field training students due to the cumulative average variable, the One-Way ANOVA test was used.

RESULTS

Below is a presentation of the results related to each question the study attempted to answer.

The first question: What are the problems facing field training students in Jordanian universities?

To answer this question, the arithmetic averages and standard deviations were found for each paragraph of the questionnaire, as shown in the following tables:

The first problem: the academic supervisor

Table 4: Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the academic supervisor's level

N	Item	Mean	STD	Arrange the importance of the item
1	The lack of time the academic supervisor spends with the trainee student.	3.20	1.19	1
2	Lack of guidance and counseling by the supervisor for the trainee student.	2.91	1.29	2
3	Decreased number of class visits to the supervisor.	2.73	1.08	3
4	The supervisor does not have the necessary competencies to evaluate the trainee student.	2.51	1.28	4
5	The supervisor does not assist the trainee in solving the problems he faces.	2.30	1.16	5
	Level as a whole	2.73	0.93	

The previous Table indicates the level of the academic supervisor's problem, where the arithmetic averages ranged between (2.30 - 3.20) compared to the general arithmetic average of the level of (2.73), the paragraph that states "the lack of time spent by the supervisor with the trainee student" came in the first place with arithmetic mean (3.20) and a standard deviation (1.19) compared to the general arithmetic mean and the general standard deviation. The paragraph that states, "the supervisor does not assist the trainee student in solving the problems he faces," came in the fifth and last place with arithmetic mean (2.30) and a standard deviation (1.16).

The second problem: the teacher/cooperating guide

Table 5: Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the level of the cooperating teacher/counselor

N	Item	Mean	STD	Arrange the importance of the paragraph
1	The unwillingness of the cooperating teacher to provide advice and guidance to the trainee student.	2.88	1.25	5
2	The cooperating teacher/counselor does not implement classroom teaching situations effectively.	2.94	1.19	3
3	The cooperating teacher/counselor does not use effective teaching strategies.	2.94	1.18	4
4	The cooperating teacher/counselor lacks knowledge about the practical education program.	3.01	1.18	2
5	The cooperating teacher/counselor does not contribute to the follow-up evaluation of the trainee's work.	3.01	1.23	1
	Level as a whole	2.96	1.00	

The previous Table indicates the level of the problem of the teacher/cooperating counselor, where the arithmetic averages ranged between (2.88 - 3.01) compared to the general arithmetic mean of the level of (2.96). The paragraph that states "the teacher/cooperating counselor's leniency in following up the evaluation of the student teacher's work" came in the first place with arithmetic mean (3.01) and a standard deviation (1.23) compared to the general arithmetic mean and the general standard deviation. The paragraph that states "the teacher/cooperating counselor is unwilling to provide advice and guidance to the trainee student" came in the fifth and last place, with arithmetic mean (2.88) and a standard deviation (1.25).

The third problem: the trainee student

Table 6: Arithmetic averages and standard deviations for the level of the trainee student

N	Item	Mean	STD	Arrange the importance of the item
1	Increase the study load for the trainee student during the implementation of the practical education program.	3.48	1.19	1
2	Weakness of the trainee student in formulating educational outcomes.	3.16	1.13	3
3	Weakness of the trainee student in the application of modern evaluation strategies.	3.23	1.15	2
4	The trainee student's weakness in employing the information he took in the theoretical educational courses during the implementation of classroom situations.	3.16	1.08	4
5	The trainee student suffers from weakness in classroom discipline.	3.03	1.19	5
6	Lack of awareness of the trainee student with school regulations, laws, and instructions.	3.02	1.09	6
	Level as a whole	3.18	0.79	

The previous Table indicates the level of the trainee's problem, where the arithmetic averages ranged between (3.02 - 3.48) and the general arithmetic mean of (3.18). The paragraph that

states "increasing the student's academic load during the implementation of the practical education program" came in the first place with arithmetic mean (3.48) and a standard deviation (1.19) compared to the general arithmetic mean and the general standard deviation. The paragraph that states "the trainee student's lack of awareness of school regulations, laws and instructions" came in the fifth and last place, with a mean (3.02) and a standard deviation (1.09).

The fourth problem: the cooperating school

Table 7: Arithmetic averages and standard deviations for the level of the cooperating school

N	Item	Mean	STD	Arrange the importance of the item
1	Cooperating schools are far from the residential areas of some trainee students.	3.56	1.17	2
2	The school administration does not follow up on the parties involved in practical education (the trainee student, the teacher/cooperating trainee).	3.28	1.10	5
3	Lack of tools, devices, and means in cooperative schools.	3.49	1.17	4
4	Failure to consider the interests and desires of the trainee student when distributing it to the classrooms.	3.52	1.11	3
5	Classrooms are crowded.	3.58	1.24	1
	Level as a whole	3.49	0.84	

The previous Table indicates the level of the problem of the cooperating school, where the arithmetic averages ranged between (3.28 - 3.58) compared to the general arithmetic mean of the level of (3.49). The paragraph that states "classroom crowding" came in first place with arithmetic mean (3.58) and a standard deviation (1.24) compared to the general arithmetic mean and the general standard deviation. The paragraph that states, "the school administration does not follow up on the parties participating in the practical education (the trainee student, the teacher/cooperating guide)" came in the fifth and last place, with an arithmetic mean (3.28) and a standard deviation (1.10).

The fifth problem: the practical education program

Table 8: Arithmetic averages and standard deviations for the level of the practical education program

N	Item	Mean	STD	Arrange the importance of the item
1	A short period of time allocated for field application in schools.	3.30	1.26	5
2	Lack of incentives for principals and teachers of cooperating schools.	3.66	0.95	1
3	Increase the number of trainee students assigned to the practical education supervisor.	3.43	1.17	2
4	Lack of awareness of some trainee students about the evaluation aspects of the program.	3.43	1.01	3
5	Lack of the program's provision of the training requirements of the program (books, stationery...).	3.42	1.20	4
	Level as a whole	3.45	0.84	

The previous Table indicates the level of the problem of the practical education program, where the arithmetic averages ranged between (3.30 - 3.66) compared to the general arithmetic mean of the level of (3.45). The paragraph that states "the lack of incentives for the principals and teachers of cooperating schools" came in the first place with arithmetic mean (3.66) and a standard deviation (0.95) compared to the general arithmetic mean and the general standard deviation. The paragraph that states "the short period allocated for field application in schools" came in fifth and last place, with arithmetic mean (3.30) and a standard deviation (1.26).

The second question: Are there statistically significant differences in the problems faced by field training students due to the difference in the type of university (public, private)?

To answer this question, a t-test was used to determine the differences attributable to the different types of universities.

Table 9: Statistical differences in the problems faced by field training students are due to the different types of university

The problem	university type	N	Mean	STD	T	Sig
Academic Supervisor	Governmental	105	2.88	0.87	3.98	0.008
	Private	63	2.59	0.96		
Teacher/cooperating mentor	Governmental	105	3.19	0.99	2.97	0.003
	Private	63	2.73	0.97		
Trainee student	Governmental	105	3.41	0.71	3.77	0.000
	Private	63	2.95	0.81		
Cooperating school	Governmental	105	3.77	0.70	4.51	0.000
	Private	63	3.20	0.88		
Practical education program	Governmental	105	3.82	0.59	6.19	0.000
	Private	63	3.08	0.87		

Table (9) shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha < 0.05$) due to the variable of the type of university on the problem of the academic supervisor, where the value of (t) is equal to (1.99) and with statistical significance (0.008); In the problem of the teacher/cooperating counselor, where the value of (t) was equal to (2.97) and with a statistical significance (0.003) in the problem of the trainee student, where the value of (T) was equal to (3.77) and with a statistical significance of (0.000); In the problem of the cooperating school, where the value of (T) was equal to (4.51) and with a statistical significance (0.000); And in the problem of the practical education program, where the value of (T) was equal to (6.19), with a statistical significance (0.000). All were in favor of the governmental university.

The third question: Are there statistically significant differences in the problems faced by field training students due to the gender difference?

To answer this question, a t-test was used to find out the differences attributable to gender.

Table 10: Statistical differences in the problems faced by field training students that are due to gender differences

The problem	Gender	N	Mean	STD	T	Sig
Academic Supervisor	Male	105	2.75	0.88	0.04-	0.096
	Female	173	2.73	0.95		
Teacher/cooperating mentor	Male	105	2.98	0.97	0.98	0.097
	Female	173	2.96	1.13		
Trainee student	Male	105	3.20	0.67	0.23	0.081
	Female	173	3.17	0.85		
Cooperating school	Male	105	3.46	0.77	0.28-	0.078
	Female	173	3.50	0.88		
Practical education program	Male	105	3.34	0.67	1.15-	0.248
	Female	173	3.50	0.91		

Table (10) shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha < 0.05$) due to the gender variable on the academic supervisor's problem, where the (t) value was (-0.04), with a statistical significance (0.096); in the problem of the cooperating teacher/mentor, where the value of (t) was (0.98) and with a statistical significance (0.097); In the problem of the trainee student, where the value of (T) was equal to (0.23) and with a statistical significance (0.081); In the problem of the cooperating school, where the value of (t) was (-0.28) and with statistical significance (0.078); And in the problem of the practical education program, where the value of (t) was equal to (-1.15), with a statistical significance (0.248).

The fourth question: Are there statistically significant differences in the problems faced by field training students due to the difference in specialization?

To answer this question, a t-test was used to determine the differences attributable to the difference in the specialization.

Table 11: Statistical differences in the problems faced by field training students are due to the difference in the specialization

The problem	Gender	N	Mean	STD	T	Sig
Academic Supervisor	Psychological counseling	160	2.98	0.87	3.01	0.001
	Class teacher	118	3.21	0.81		
Teacher/cooperating mentor	Psychological counseling	160	3.06	0.97	2.98	0.000
	Class teacher	118	3.38	0.88		
Trainee student	Psychological counseling	160	3.19	0.81	0.79	0.067
	Class teacher	118	3.26	0.69		
Cooperating school	Psychological counseling	160	3.16	0.76	1.02	0.084
	Class teacher	118	3.18	0.74		
Practical education program	Psychological counseling	160	3.28	0.79	3.15	0.000
	Class teacher	118	3.45	0.72		

Table (11) shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha < 0.05$) due to the variable of specialization on the problem of the academic supervisor, where the value of (t) is equal to (3.01) and with statistical significance (0.001); In the problem

of the cooperating teacher/mentor, where the value of (t) was equal to (2.98) and with a statistical significance (0.000); and in the problem of the practical education program, where the value of (t) was equal to (3.15), with a statistical significance (0.000). They were all for the benefit of the class teacher. At the same time, the Table shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha < 0.05$) due to the variable of specialization on the problem of the trainee student, where the value of (t) is equal to (0.79) and with statistical significance (0.067); In the problem of the cooperating school, where the value of (t) was equal to (1.02) and with a statistical significance (0.084).

The fifth question: Are there statistically significant differences in the problems faced by field training students due to the cumulative average?

In order to answer this question, the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the students' scores were calculated on the dimensions of the problem questionnaire, which is evident in Table (12).

Table 12: averages and standard deviations of students' scores on the dimensions of the problem questionnaire according to the cumulative average variable

GPA		Less than 68	68-76	
Dimensions of the problem questionnaire		n = 75	n = 116	n = 87
		27%	42%	31%
Academic Supervisor	Mean	2.96	2.68	2.67
	STD	0.82	0.97	0.92
Teacher/cooperating mentor	Mean	3.02	2.84	3.07
	STD	0.89	0.92	1.14
Trainee student	Mean	3.26	3.10	3.54
	STD	0.72	0.70	0.94
Cooperating school	Mean	3.38	3.49	3.54
	STD	0.79	0.80	0.93
Practical education program	Mean	3.26	3.40	3.61
	STD	0.94	0.80	0.81

Table (12) shows apparent differences between the arithmetic means due to the cumulative average variable. To check whether these differences are statistically significant at the level ($\alpha = 0.05$), the one-way analysis of variance test was used. Table (13) shows the one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) results.

Table 13: The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for the differences between the average grades of the cumulative average on the dimensions of the problem questionnaire

Dimensions	Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean of squares	F	Sig
Academic Supervisor Teacher/cooperating mentor	Between groups	3.423	2	1.712	3.300	0.138
	Within groups	254.698	275	0.926		
	Total	258.122	277			
Trainee student	Between groups	2.558	2	1.279	4.322	0.001
	Within groups	270.387	275	0.983		
	Total	272.944	277			
Cooperating school Practical education program	Between groups	5.664	2	2.832	4.498	0.012
	Within groups	309.097	275	1.123		
	Total	314.761	277			
Academic Supervisor	Between groups	4.499	2	2.249	3.321	0.003
	Within groups	332.529	275	1.209		
	Total	337.028	277			
Teacher/cooperating mentor	Between groups	5.691	2	2.845	5.820	0.003
	Within groups	240.024	275	0.873		
	Total	245.715	277			

It is evident from Table (13) that there are statistically significant differences at the level ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the degree of problem questionnaire dimensions due to the cumulative average variable. To find the source of these differences, we will use the Scheffe Test for dimensional comparisons of the differences in the degree of problem questionnaire dimensions due to the cumulative average variable, as shown in Table (14).

Table 14: post comparisons using (Scheffe) method for the degree of problems questionnaire dimensions due to the cumulative average variable

Dimensions	GPA	Mean	less than 68	68-76	more than 76
			3.02	2.84	3.07
Cooperating teacher/mentor	less than 68	3.02			
	76-68	2.84	0.08		
	more than 76	3.07	*0.37	0.06	
Trainee student			3.26	3.10	3.35
	less than 68	3.26			
	76-68	3.10	0.11		
Cooperating school	more than 76	3.35	0.29*	0.07	
			3.38	3.49	3.54
	less than 68	3.38			
Practical education program	76-68	3.49	0.09		
	more than 76	3.54	*0.32	0.02	
			3.26	3.40	3.61
Practical education program	less than 68	3.26			
	76-68	3.40	0.10		
	more than 76	3.61	0.34*	0.00	

*Significant at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Table (14) shows that there are statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the dimensions of the teacher/cooperating guide, the trainee student, the cooperating school, and the practical education program between the average GPA of less than 68 on the one hand and the average GPA of more than 76 on the other hand, The differences came in favor of a cumulative average of more than 76.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The results of the first question showed that the level of problems for university students came to a medium degree, as this result can be attributed to some shortcomings in the follow-up of students' training in schools on how to deal with professional records despite the universities' interest in developing the skills of training students sufficiently to complete the requirements of the field training course. The researcher also attributes this to the insufficient number of credit hours for the practical education course before going out for field training, which was reflected in the student teacher's lack of knowledge of the objectives of field education and his possession of the competencies and skills necessary to work. Consequently, the process of facing the problems faced by students of practical education requires those in charge of training programs to develop the content of the course of practical education and to train students on it in the programs of the specialization departments before going out to cooperating schools during the period of practical training. It can also be attributed to the feeling of these problems to the existence of a conflict between the notes provided by the academic supervisor and the notes of the teacher/cooperating advisor, in some situations that are reflected on the trainee students and appear in the low degree of coordination between them, especially when evaluating the performance of trainee students. The result of this study is consistent with the study of Al-Ali (2017), which indicated that the problems of field training were of a medium degree.

The results of the second question indicated differences in the level of problems according to the university variable and in favor of public universities. The researcher attributes this result to the ability of public universities and their possession of all facilities and requirements for theoretical study and practical and field application for students, in addition to their interest in developing their infrastructure, buildings, and laboratories, to obtain A prominent position in the world university rankings. Furthermore, the cultural and cognitive diversity available in public universities is more than that in private universities, as most private university students have low averages in secondary school and low incomes.

The results of the third question showed that there are no differences in the level of problems according to the gender variable, as the researcher attributes this result to the fact that students of both sexes are subject to the same procedures and exercises followed in universities, so the training problems are not affected by the gender variable. It is also due to the fact that the two genders received the same field training of activities and exercises. The students received the same learning, including concepts and skills, in the same manner, which led to all students possessing applications and skills at the same level.

The result of this study agrees with the study of Tashman and Al-Mustarihi (2019), the study of Al-Enezi (2015), and the study of Hamasheh and Al-Rimawi (2013), who indicated that there are no statistically significant differences due to gender. However, this result differs from the Al-Hawarna study (2017) and the Al-Ali study (2017), which indicated statistically significant differences in the problems due to the gender variable.

The results of the fourth question revealed that there were differences in the level of problems according to the variable of specialization and in favor of the students of the class teacher, except for the dimensions of the trainee student and the cooperating school; this may be due to the students' keenness and follow-up to field training, their regularity, and their desire to commit to field training and the time required for preparation, preparation and follow-up after the end of official working hours. The reason for this may be attributed to the school administration's lack of confidence in the capabilities of the trainee student. Some directors and teachers of training schools consider these students to have attended the school for training, and they still lack the educational and educational experience which enables them to manage in deal with students effectively. Their presence in the school may cause confusion to the school management plans, and they should not be relied upon to perform their assigned tasks; and this may be due to the school not being informed of the instructions and requirements of practical education for the trainee student, and this is related to the school administration's failure to play a sufficient role to familiarize the trainee student with the school's regulations. The result of this study agrees with the study of Tashman and Al-Mustarihi (2019), which indicated that there are statistically significant differences attributable to specialization. This result differs from the study of Al-Enezi (2015), which indicated no statistically significant differences for the variable of specialization.

The reason for this is due to the cooperating school's lack of interest in the objectives of the practical education program and its various stages, and some of them may not have the desire to cooperate in training the trainee students, or they may have a shortcoming in possessing the evaluation knowledge of evaluating the performance of the trainee student; Thus, the cooperating school's contribution to the development of the trainee's experiences is weak. As well as the weakness of the cooperating teachers/counselors' assistance to the trainee students in managing and controlling the classroom, in addition to the fact that some of them may interfere in the course of the educational situation during the student teacher's implementation of it, or be strict in the directions of the trainee students; Which causes them embarrassment in those educational situations, and big problems.

The results of the fifth question revealed that there were differences in the level of problems according to the cumulative grade point average and in favor of students with an average of more than 76, except for the dimension of the academic supervisor; this may be due to the academic supervisors' interest, regardless of the supervisor's specialization in permanent visits, providing guidance and feedback to the trainee students, and the supervisors' high skill in giving notes and guiding trainees to what is best for trainees to provide guidance and educational services. In addition, the keenness of students with high rates to achieve a higher level in the field training course helps them achieve the required rate to obtain the desired goal

after graduation. This can be attributed to the fact that the academic supervisors make their directions to the trainee students in the form of orders and instructions that are not subject to discussion and that the supervisor does not accept the trainee's point of view. The supervisor focuses on the negatives in performance and criticizes them without mentioning the positives or correcting them, as the academic supervisor does not provide developmental feedback on the trainee student's performance during training. The trainee students are not given good training models that can be used and simulated, as they may not be specialized in the subject he supervises, and the supervisor may visit the student once or twice and judge the student's performance level. The study with study of Tashman and Al-Mustarihi (2019), the study of Al-Ali (2017), and Al-Enezi study (2015) indicated that there are statistically significant differences due to the cumulative average.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher recommends the following recommendations:

- Increasing interest in field training programs by their college supervisors to prepare the teacher/mentor capable of practice and application in the labor market.
- Work to standardize the procedures and steps of field training programs by universities.
- Choose suitable places for field training students to apply, considering the trainee's need to understand the labor market.
- Hold periodic meetings between school principals and academic supervisors during and after the training period to find out the problems facing the training and ways to address them.
- Conducting studies examining field training problems and ways to confront university students in light of other variables and in different environments.

References

- 1) Al- Momani, A. & Khazali, Q. (2010). Problems of female field training students at Al-Balqa Applied University from the student's perspective. *University of Sharjah Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7 (1), 59-91.
- 2) Al-Ali, W. (2017). Problems of the field training program for special education students at Najran University from the student's point of view. *Specialized International Educational Journal*, 6 (5), 193-200.
- 3) Al-Enezi, S. (2015). The problems facing the students of practical education at the University of Shaqra from the point of view of the students and teachers themselves. *Journal of the College of Basic Education for Educational and Human Sciences*, 2, 3-21.
- 4) Al-Fraihat, B., Ghazzo, A. & Jarwan, A. (2019). The field training program in psychological counseling at Yarmouk University from the point of view of the trained counselors: an evaluation study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 43(1), 13-30.
- 5) Al-Halibi, A. & Salem, M. (2004). Field education and the basics of teaching. Riyadh: Obeikan Library.
- 6) Al-Hawarna, I. (2017). Difficulties facing psychological counseling students in field training from their point of view. *Mutah for Research and Studies: Human and Social Sciences Series*, 32 (5), 119-144.

- 7) Al-Huaymel, O. & Al-Soub, M. (2012). Obstacles facing field training students at Mutah University. *Journal of the College of Education*, 36 (3), 239-266.
- 8) Al-Qattan, H., Al-Kandari, K. & Al-Shammari, O. (2019). The difficulties facing practical education students at the College of Basic Education in its two branches (boys - girls) in the State of Kuwait from their point of view. *Journal of the Faculty of Education in Mansoura*, 106 (1), 533-570.
- 9) Al-Rantisi, A. (2018). Obstacles to social service students benefiting from field training in social institutions from the student's point of view. *Al-Quds Open University Journal for Human and Social Research*, 1 (46), 59-91.
- 10) Alsabeelah, A. (2021). The difficulties and challenges facing field training students of child education in light of the corona pandemic among princess Alia university college students. *Journal of Positive Psychology and Wellbeing*, 5 (3), 175-184.
- 11) Al-Sharaa, A. (2019). Field training problems for students of the Department of Special Education at the University of Hail. *Al-Quds Open University Journal of Educational and Psychological Research and Studies*, 10 (28), 39-49.
- 12) Altmaier, E. & Hansen, J. (2012). *The oxford handbook of counseling psychology*. New York: Oxford university press.
- 13) Al-Zoubi, S. & Bani Abdel Rahman, S. (2011). The effects of a training program in improving instructional competencies for special education teachers in Jordan. *Educational Research*, 2 (3), 1021-1030.
- 14) Aqilan, O. (2016). Field training problems are facing fourth-level students in the Faculties of Education and Girls Seiyun - Hadhramout University. *Andalusia Journal - Humanities and Social Sciences*, 13 (1), 165-197.
- 15) Ayasreh, M. (2017). The problems trainee students face in special education specialization during their field training. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8 (33), 89-93.
- 16) Boylan, J. & Scott, J. (2011). *Practicum and Internship: Textbook and resource guide for counseling and psychotherapy*. New York: Psychology Press.
- 17) Corey, G., Corey, M. & Callanan, P. (2014). *Issues and ethics in the helping professions*. Wales: Cengage Learning
- 18) Harvey, V. & Struzziero, J. (2008). *Professional development and supervision of school psychologists: From intern to expert*. California: Corwin press.
- 19) Masoud, W. (2004). The importance of field training and its impact on the growth of professional personality and educational competencies for the Department of Special Education at King Saud University students. *The Arab Journal of Special Education*, 5, 97-144.
- 20) Musingafi, M., Mapuranga, B., Chiwanza, K. & Zebron, S. (2015). Challenges for open and distance learning (ODL) students: Experiences from the Zimbabwe open university students. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6 (18), 59-66.
- 21) Pill, K. & Pilli, E. (2013). Challenges and opportunities in practical training – perceptions of clinical education. *Acta Kinesiologiae Universitatis Tartuensis*, 19, 63-72.
- 22) Radovan, M. & Koscielniak, M. (2013). *Lifelong learning today: New areas, Contexts, Practices*. Kazimierz: Jagiellonian university press.
- 23) Ralph, E., Walker, K. & Wimmer, R. (2010). *The practicum in professional education: Canadian perspectives*. Detselig: Calgary, AB.
- 24) Salem, A. (2018). The problems of field training facing the students of the special education department at

- Majmaah university and how to confront them. *Shaqra University Journal*, 10, 1-17.
- 25) Shaikh, P. & Kazi, S. (2014). Problems encountered by the students of MSW during their fieldwork training: a case study of the III semester MSW students. *International Research Journal of Management Sociology & Humanity (IRJMSH)*, 5 (6), 280-284.
 - 26) Shepard, V. & Perry, A. (2022). *A practitioner's guide to supporting graduate and professional students*. New York: Getty images.
 - 27) Shubeita, Z. & Abu Elba, M. (2002). Training Obstacles Facing Field Training Students in Social Work/Qalqilya Branch at Al-Quds Open University. *The Arab Journal for Scientific Publishing*, 39 (2), 237-257.
 - 28) Tashman, G. & Al-Mustarihi, H. (2019). Problems facing practical education students at Al-Isra University during the field training period. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Sciences*, 5(2), 56-74.
 - 29) Thaver, W. (2012). *The experiences of social workers as supervisors of social work students' field placements*. M.A degree, University of Kwazulu Natal. South Africa.
 - 30) Tippa, N. & Mane, S. (2018). Problems and prospects of fieldwork training in social work education: A review. *Innovare Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (1), 1-2.
 - 31) Vuran, S., Ergenekon, Y., Ünlü, E. (2015). Training process cycles for special education teachers and university supervisors: A Turkish context. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14 (1), 282-295.
 - 32) Zheng, D. (2015). *Education management and management science*. London: CRC Press.