Research Article

Received: 16 October 2022 / Accepted: 26 December 2022 / Published: 5 January 2023

Obstacles Facing Female Students of Practical Education at the University of Petra during Field Training

Asma'a AlHjoujj

Faculty of Arts and Sciences,
Petra University,
Amman, Jordan

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2023-0007

Abstract

The study aimed to reveal the obstacles facing female students' classroom teachers of practical education at the University of Petra during field training. To achieve the objective of the study, the descriptive analytical approach was used, and a questionnaire consisting of five fields was designed, comprising. The results showed that all the obstacles faced by students of practical education came to a medium degree, with a mean score as a whole (3.02). The results also showed that there were statistically significant differences attributed to the school ownership variable on the axis of obstacles related to the supervisor of practical education in favor of private schools, with a mean score of 3.26, which was higher than the mean score of 2.69% in the government schools. Moreover, the results showed no statistically significant differences in the total score of the questionnaire. The findings also revealed statistically significant variations due to the average variable on each of the domains of obstacles related to the practical education program, the domains of obstacles related to the school administration, the domains of obstacles related to the student teacher, and the overall score of the tool. Results also showed that there are no statistically significant differences in the domains of obstacles related to the supervisor of practical education and the domains of obstacles related to the cooperating teacher due to the variable of the rate.

Keywords: *Obstacles, practical education program, student-teacher, classroom teacher, school ownership, Jordan, University of Petra*

1. Introduction

The teacher is an important pillar for the development of the educational system, and educators from different directions agree on her role in increasing the effectiveness of education. Attention to the teacher and his training is still at the forefront of the priorities of leaders and officials.

Practical education is also considered the cornerstone and backbone of teacher preparation programs, through which the student-teacher applies what she has learned about ideas, information, and experiences during her university studies in the practical application under the supervision of professors specializing in education. Therefore, linking the practical application with theoretical numbers is a basic necessity to produce qualified teachers who can perform their future roles. (Al-Miqdadi, 2003).

Practical education is the most important axis in preparing the student/teacher and acquiring

the professional and behavioral competencies he needs to become an effective leadership teacher in the future. The general objective of practical education is centered around the qualities and skills necessary for the teacher of tomorrow through a functional framework based on a clear view of the educational process and the role of the teacher in it (Marei and Sherif, 2014).

The importance of practical education is highlighted as it represents the real field that helps the student/teacher to know the tasks and responsibilities of the teacher during the teaching process and to realize the developmental characteristics of learners and their needs to take this into account during the organization of education to provide them with appropriate adaptation opportunities and help them understand the uses of multiple learning resources and their role in classroom situations and develop positive attitudes towards The process of learning and displaying the ethics of the profession based on the system of values of society and the nation as a whole; identifying the difficulties facing the educational process and the proposed solutions to confront these difficulties, and acquiring the necessary educational competencies necessary in the education process. It also helps the student/teacher to know the various teaching methods, patterns, strategies, and techniques and how to use them with the learners (Amer, 2008).

The student teacher also gains motivation and experience in the field of the teaching profession through her direct contact and interaction with mutual educational situations between her and the students and teaching strategies and methods, all of which help in facing the urgent problems that she faces during field training. It is correct according to different situations during the teaching process (Abu Jadu, 2001).

Practical education is defined as a purposeful and organized educational process that allows the student teacher to participate in a set of activities and events that apply most of the educational concepts and theories behaviorally in a way that leads to the student's acquisition of the educational competencies required after graduation, through real experience and training in direct interactive teaching (Almutlaq, 2010). Practical education is also defined as the practical aspect of the teacher preparation, rehabilitation, and training program that takes place in and outside the classroom by the teacher and under the supervision of the Preparatory, Rehabilitation, and Training Authority at the university and the cooperating teacher (Marei and Sherif, 2014).

The practical education program passes during the field application in several stages as follows (preparation, school observation, specialized classroom observation, the stage of partial application, and then the total application) to train students to perform their roles as teachers during the period of practical education with accuracy (Atiya and Al-Hashimi, 2007).

Practical education is one of the most important basic elements in preparing a teacher to practice the profession of education because it represents a field application of educational experiences, including the values, trends, skills, and knowledge required for the teaching profession (Hamid, 2011). Practical education is an essential element that cannot be dispensed with. If she does not gain practical field experience in school, the student teacher will be unable to perform his job and complete the educational tasks in the classroom (Harb, 2009). It is also an invaluable opportunity for the student teacher in which she practices the teaching process and applies everything she has learned and is followed up by an academic supervisor, the school director, and the cooperating teacher at various levels (Doxey, 1996). Practical education is a cornerstone of the teacher preparation program, especially concerning the basic stage, as it represents the practical side of all the principles and theories that the student-teacher has learned. Students (Ali, 2009).

There is no doubt that the student teacher when she begins actual teaching in the cooperating schools, realizes the great gap between what she studies in theory in college and what she implements in practice in the practical education program. Knowing the obstacles that the student teacher faces and the reasons for them, as well as finding appropriate solutions to them. Perhaps these obstacles hinder the performance of the student teacher from the correct practice of teaching skills, and she may have negative attitudes toward the teaching profession later. Therefore, the continuous evaluation must be done from time to time to ensure the achievement of the set educational goals and follow up on all that is new in the field of educational and technological

development in preparing the student teacher.

Since practical education is of great importance in promoting student-teacher performance and developing positive attitudes towards the teaching profession, and as an essential and indispensable element, the thought in this study was to identify the obstacles facing students of practical education at the University of Petra during field training.

1.1 The Problem of the Study

The problem in this study lies in the obstacles faced by students of practical education at the University of Petra during field training after their enrollment in the cooperating schools, and with all that the Department of Educational Sciences at the University of Petra provides for the means of appropriate preparation for the student-teacher that contribute to their being distinguished teachers in those schools, but that there are still some obstacles that they encounter during the practical application in the cooperating schools, and from here the idea of the current study emerged, which prompted the researcher to address this problem based on her field experience in academic supervision of student teachers in the specialty of the classroom teacher, and what she touched from the complaint of female students that they faced many of the many obstacles during field training, and thus the problem in this study is determined by answering the following two questions:

1. What are the most important obstacles that face the students of practical education "classroom teachers" at the University of Petra during field training?
2. Are there statistically significant differences in the obstacles facing practical education students during field training due to school ownership and the cumulative average?

1.2 The Importance of Study

This study is significant because it sheds light on the biggest challenges that University of Petra students pursuing practical education encounter while participating in fieldwork and thus helps in addressing and reducing obstacles, as the results of this study contribute to developing and achieving quality in the field training program at the University of Petra and avoiding problems that are expected to occur. It also improves the roles of principals and teachers of cooperating schools and paves the way for researchers to conduct other studies in light of other variables.

1.3 The Terminology of the Study

Obstacles: they are a set of problems and difficulties that occur during the implementation of the practical education program and are represented in five areas: related to practical education, the supervisor of practical education, the school administration, the cooperating teacher, and obstacles related to the student teacher.

Practical Education Program: an applied program that is implemented through the Department of Educational Sciences at the University of Petra for 12 hours a week and during an entire semester, after completing the study of most of the specialized subjects within the study plan. On the ground and under the guidance of the academic supervisor.

Student-teacher: a student who studies in the Department of Educational Sciences, specializing in class teaching at the University of Petra, and who has met the criteria for field training to practice teaching in cooperating schools under the supervision and direction of an academic supervisor.

School Ownership: it refers to the type of school building. There are buildings owned by the Ministry of Education that were built according to school specifications; there are rented buildings that are not suitable for the educational process in terms of location, design, and area; and there are buildings belonging to private schools established by private entities that are distinguished by their facilities and various technological means.

1.4 The Limitations of the Study

The sample of the study was comprised of (162) students from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in the specialty of the classroom teacher. A questionnaire consisting of five areas that include the most prominent problems facing students of practical education during their field training. After that, the questionnaire was applied to field training students who were registered for the second semester of the academic year 2021–2021.

2. Previous Studies

Al-Mustarihi and Tashman (2019) did a study to determine the challenges encountered by Al-Isra University students pursuing practical education in the areas of classroom teaching and child education. The findings indicated that the type of practical education program, the collaborating teacher, the cooperating school, the classroom teaching procedures, and the academic supervisor are related to the most significant issues that students in practical education face.

To understand the challenges of practical education as perceived by the students of the Faculty of Educational Sciences at An-Najah National University, Bethlehem University, the Faculty of Educational Sciences, and Ramallah, Habayeb (2016) performed a study. To accomplish the study's objectives, a stratified random sample of 207 male and female students was chosen. The 73 items on the questionnaire were divided into five categories. The study's findings also revealed statistically significant disparities in favor of Bethlehem University and An-Najah University.

Harb (2009) carried out research to identify the issues the student teacher faces from his perspective, offering some answers to those issues, and providing some alternatives. 100 students from Rafah governorate, both male and female, made up the study sample. The descriptive method was used by the researcher. Analysis and a questionnaire were used to track the issues that student teachers encountered while completing their fieldwork, and one of the most significant findings was that 64% of the issues were related to the training school, followed by 56% to the university, and 71% to the supervisor.

The issues faced by female field training students at Al-Balqa Applied University were investigated by Khazali and Momani (2009) from the perspective of the students themselves. The study sample was made up of participants in a study that sought to understand the difficulties faced by female field training students at Al-Balqa Applied University from their perspectives. The study sample included 131 students, and it concluded that the trainees failure to account for the individual differences among the students. The academic program, the cooperating school, or the interactions between them have no statistically significant impact on the severity of problems among the trainee students.

A study by Al-Tarawneh and Hoymel (2008) sought to understand the challenges faced by student teachers at Mutah University during the field application period for the specialty of the classroom teacher. 134 students, both male, and female made up the study sample. The findings demonstrated the existence of issues about the educational supervisor, as well as those about the cooperative teacher, cooperative school director, and practical education methods.

To understand the issues that graduate students in the Hashemite University Faculty of Educational Sciences are facing, Mahafza (2008) performed a study. 139 students, both male, and female made up the study sample. The study's findings showed that the academic supervisor's reliance on the evaluation of the cooperating teacher and the school principal presents the most issues. The way the school principal treats trainee students, the absence of educational aids and their non-availability in the cooperating school, and the high student-to-teacher ratio in the cooperating school are all unacceptable.

Alimat (2008) conducted a study aimed at revealing the problems facing students of practical education at the Faculty of Educational Sciences at Al-Bayt University from their point of view. The sample of the study consisted of 92 male and female students. The results of the after-school far away

from the place of residence of the practical education students and the university, and the school's lack of appreciation for the efficiency of the students of practical education

The goal of Al-study Abadi's from 2004 was to pinpoint the issues with a practical education as perceived by aspiring classroom teachers and how those issues relate to their views toward the teaching profession. The purpose of the study was to determine the issues with a practical education as perceived by student teachers in the area of classroom teaching and how these issues related to their attitudes toward the teaching profession. At Yarmouk University, the study involved 128 male and female students. The study's findings showed that the lack of educational aids, the difficulty in providing them in partner schools, the lack of full-time commitment to practical application, the preoccupation of practical education students with non-teaching duties like class work, and a large number of students in one class are the five main issues that student-teachers face. Student's difficulties in practical education and attitudes toward teaching are inversely correlated.

To identify the issues practical education students at the UNRWA-affiliated College of Educational Sciences face, Abu Nimra (2003) performed a study. The research sample was comprised of studies designed to provide light on the challenges faced by students pursuing practical education at the UNRWA-affiliated College of Educational Sciences. 89 students, both male, and female made up the study sample. The questionnaire was utilized by the researcher to gather his data. The study's findings showed that there are issues with cooperating teachers, including conflict between practicum students and cooperating teachers and practicum students embarrassing themselves in front of other students as a result of cooperating teachers' involvement in their instruction. This is one of the major issues that students must deal with.

2.1 Concluding Remarks

It has been noted that there are studies that confirm the existence of problems related to the practical education program prepared for the student teacher, such as the study of Habayeb (2016) and Al-Mustarihi and Tashman (2019), and others that refer to problems related to the educational supervisor, such as the study of Al-Abadi (2004) and Mahafza (2008). Other studies indicated problems related to the cooperating teacher, as in the study by Abu Nimra (2003).

The current study agrees with previous studies in identifying and reducing the most significant obstacles confronting student-teachers. The process at the University of Petra, by presenting a clear vision of it and highlighting the importance of the expected results resulting from this study, adds and contributes to building a proposed vision for the future practical education program.

3. Method and Procedure

This part provides a presentation of the method and procedures followed, describing the study methodology, the population, and the sample, in addition to the study instrument, methods for verifying its validity and reliability, study variables, and statistical methods. Given the nature of the current study and to achieve its objectives, the descriptive analytical method was followed in answering the study questions, as it is considered the most appropriate for this type of study.

3.1 The Population of the Study

The study population consists of all students in the classroom teacher specialization at the University of Petra who are registered in the field training course in the second semester of 2021–2022. Their number is 250 students, according to the statistics of the Department of Admission and Registration at the university for the year 2021/2022.

3.2 *Sample of the Study*

To achieve the objectives of the study, the study instrument was applied to a sample of female classroom teacher students at the University of Petra, which consisted of 162 female students during the summer semester of the year 2021–202 AD. They were chosen in a simple random way. The instrument was distributed to them electronically, and all the questionnaires were coded and analyzed. Table (1) shows the distribution of the study sample members according to demographic variables.

Table 1: Distribution of the sample members according to their demographic variables

Study variables	Categories	Frequencies	Percentage
School Ownership	Public	26	**16.0**
	Private	136	**84.0**
	Total	162	**100.0%**
Average	Good or less	38	**23.5**
	Very good	102	**63.0**
	Excellent	22	**13.6**
	Total	162	**100.0%**

3.3 *The Instrument of the Study*

After reading the theoretical works and making reference to earlier research on the topic, such as the study (Khazali and Momani, 2009). To achieve the objectives of the study, the study instrument was developed in the form of a questionnaire to reveal the obstacles that face the students of practical education at the University of Petra during field training. The questionnaire consisted of 55 items distributed in five domains: It contains (10) items; the "obstacles related to the practical education supervisor" domain, which includes (10) items; the "obstacles related to school management" domain, which includes (12) items; the "obstacles related to the cooperating teacher" domain, which includes (13) items; and the "obstacles related to the student/teacher" domain, which includes (10) items, in addition to the demographic variables. The five-point Likert scale was adopted as follows: very high and given (5), high and given (4), medium and given (3), weak and given (2), very weak and given (1) to answer the items.

3.4 *Validity of the Study Instrument*

To check the apparent validity of the instrument, the instrument was presented to a group of specialized and experienced arbitrators from among the faculty members of Jordanian universities. This is to verify the accuracy of the content of the items and to express their opinions in terms of the clarity of the items, the linguistic formulation, their suitability to measure what they were developed for, and the affiliation of the items, in addition to any modifications to the items as they see fit. The arbitrators' comments were also taken into account and worked on the linguistic reformulation of the items that were agreed upon by (80%) of the arbitrators as a criterion for judgment. It was used on an exploratory group of thirty (30) students from the study community to determine the extent of the validity of the study instrument, the statistical contribution of its items, and to assess the correlation coefficients between the items and the overall tool score to validate the validity of the study instrument's construction. The outcomes are shown in Table (2).

Table 2: Correlation coefficients between items and the degree of the domain and the total degree of the instrument

Obstacles related to the practical education program			Obstacles related to the supervisor of practical education			Obstacles related to school administration		
item	item link with		item	item link with		item	item link with	
	axis	instrument		axis	instrument		axis	instrument
1	**0.797	**0.732	1	**0.776	**0.668	1	**0.703	**0.657
2	**0.770	**0.696	2	**0.707	**0.644	2	**0.697	**0.555
3	**0.775	**0.702	3	**0.755	**0.695	3	**0.743	**0.654
4	**0.772	**0.713	4	**0.791	**0.704	4	**0.781	**0.662
5	**0.797	**0.651	5	**0.639	**0.557	5	**0.778	**0.619
6	**0.753	**0.688	6	**0.787	**0.602	6	**0.762	**0.669
7	**0.762	**0.669	7	**0.737	**0.657	7	**0.724	**0.622
8	**0.783	**0.648	8	**0.777	**0.711	8	**0.772	**0.700
9	**0.791	**0.785	9	**0.748	**0.640	9	**0.658	**0.588
10	**0.751	**0.632	10	**0.718	**0.669	10	**0.772	**0.713
11	**0.632	**0.596	11	**0.799	**0.619	11	**0.744	**0.606
						12	**0.723	**0.697

Obstacles related to the cooperating teacher			Obstacles related to the student/teacher		
item	item link with		item	item link with	
	axis	instrument		axis	instrument
1	**0.775	**0.701	1	**0.713	**0.611
2	**0.752	**0.620	2	**0.728	**0.644
3	**0.710	**0.642	3	**0.705	**0.658
4	**0.698	**0.611	4	**0.699	**0.578
5	**0.663	**0.588	5	**0.687	**0.597
6	**0.745	**0.618	6	**0.719	**0.644
7	**0.782	**0.669	7	**0.708	**0.657
8	**0.773	**0.549	8	**0.731	**0.688
9	**0.696	**0.558	9	**0.654	**0.636
10	**0.677	**0.600	10	**0.699	**0.655
11	**0.741	**0.611			
12	**0.689	**0.586			
13	**0.690	**0.599			

** Statistically significant at level α = 0.01

The values of the correlation coefficients of the instrument items ranged between (0.549-0.785), according to Table 2, and all of these values are statistically significant at the level of (= 0.01). The values of the correlation coefficients of the instrument items ranged between (0.625-0.797) with the domain they belong to. Additionally, the domains' Pearson correlation coefficients and the instrument's overall score were retrieved, and the results are displayed in Table (3) displays the values of the correlation coefficients between the domains and the instrument's overall score (3).

Table 3: The value of the correlation coefficients between the domains and the total score of the instrument

Total	Domains
0.812**	Obstacles related to the practical education program
0.844**	Obstacles related to the supervisor of practical education
0.832**	Obstacles related to school administration
0.808**	Obstacles associated with the cooperating teacher
0.855**	Obstacles related to the student/teacher

** Statistically significant at level (α = 0.01)

Table (3) indicates that there are high and statistically significant correlation coefficients at the

significance level (α = 0.01) between each of the axes and the total degree of the instrument, as the values of the correlation coefficients ranged between (0.808-0.855), which indicates a degree of internal validity for the domains of the instrument.

3.5 Reliability of the Study Instrument

To verify the reliability of the study instrument, it was applied to a pilot sample consisting of thirty (30) students from the study population, and the reliability coefficients were calculated by the method of internal consistency for the items of the instrument using the Cronbach-Alpha equation. Table (4) shows that.

Table 4: Internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) for the study instrument

Number of items	Cronbach's alpha	Domains
10	0.833	Obstacles related to the practical education program
10	0.841	Obstacles related to the supervisor of practical education
12	0.854	Obstacles related to school administration
13	.0879	Obstacles related to the cooperating teacher
10	0.812	Obstacles related to the student/teacher
55	0.920	Total

The values of the reliability coefficients for the domains' items ranged between (0.812-0.879), while the value of Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the items as a whole was (0.812-0.879). Table (4) shows the values of the internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) for the study instrument's items (0.92). All of these numbers are regarded as suitable for this investigation.

3.6 Study Variables

The study included the following variables:

1. The dependent variable is:
- Obstacles faced by students of practical education "classroom teacher" at the University of Petra during field training
2. The independent variables are:
- School ownership has two categories: government and private.
- The average is and has three levels: (good and less, very good, and excellent).

3.7 Statistical Processing

The following statistical methods were used to process the data using the SPSS program:

- The mean scores, standard deviations, rank, degree, and total score of the instrument items were retrieved to respond to the first query.
- The Two-Way MANOVA test was used to compare the study sample's mean responses for the school and average variables to respond to the second question.
- The internal consistency coefficients for the research instrument were calculated using the Cronbach-Alpha equation.

The internal consistency validity coefficient of the study instrument was calculated using the Pearson correlation coefficient.

The study instrument, which assigns one point out of five possible degrees to each of its items, was also corrected using a five-point Likert scale. As a result, the reference points for evaluating the sample members' average responses to the study instrument are shown in Table (5).

Table 5: Standard values to judge the average responses of the sample members to the study instrument

Mean Value	Degree
1.33– 1.00	Low
3.67– 1.34	Medium
5.00 – 3.68	High

4. Results and Discussions

A presentation of the results of the sample's responses to the study instrument is presented after conducting data collection, processing, and statistical analysis. The results were as follows:

First, the answers to the first question, which asks: What are the biggest challenges that the University of Petra's practical education "classroom teacher" students confront during field training?

To respond to the first query, the mean scores, standard deviations, and evaluation degree for the instrument's overall score as well as the primary challenges that University of Petra students pursuing practical education as "classroom teachers" faced during field training were determined. The outcomes are presented in Table (6).

Table 6: Mean scores, standard deviations, and ranks of the main obstacles facing the students of practical education "classroom teacher" at the University of Petra during field training, descending according to the mean scores

Degree	Rank	SD	Mean scores	Domains	N
medium	3	0.92	3.06	Obstacles related to the practical education program	1
medium	1	0.88	3.17	Obstacles related to the supervisor of practical education	2
medium	2	0.87	3.07	Obstacles related to school administration	3
medium	4	0.87	3.02	Obstacles related to the cooperating teacher	4
medium	5	1.04	2.75	Obstacles related to the student/teacher	5
medium		0.73	3.02	Total	

Table (6) shows that the degree of obstacles facing students of practical education "classroom teacher" at the University of Petra during the field training as a whole came with a score of (medium), with a mean score of (3.02) and a standard deviation of (0.73), which indicates that there are obstacles faced by the field training students. This result is due to the short period granted to the field training student to apply everything she learned at the university of theoretical knowledge during one semester, and it is only three days out of each week for the semester, and a specific time from 8 to 12 o'clock, and this is an insufficient period to practice the profession of teaching correctly and appropriately to achieve the set goals, which had an impact on the existence of obstacles facing the student teacher on various other axes. This requires increased attention, whether by the supervisor of practical education, the school administration, or the cooperating teacher. The domains also arrived in the order of With a median score of 3.1 and a standard deviation of 0.53, the domain "obstacles connected to the supervisor of practical education" took the first position. With a mean score of 3.07 and a standard deviation of, the domain "obstacles connected to the school administration" finished in second place (0.87). With a mean score of 3.06 and a standard deviation of (0.92), the "obstacles related to the practical education program" domain placed third with a degree of difficulty (medium), and the "obstacles related to cooperating teacher" domain placed fourth with a mean score of 3.02 and a standard deviation of (0.92). (0.87). With a mean score of (2.75) and a standard deviation of, the "obstacles related to the student/teacher" domain came in last. Assuming that the items were ordered in descending order by mean scores, the values of the mean scores, standard deviations, and degree of evaluation for the items in each of the domains were also computed. The outcomes are presented in Table (7).

Table 7: Mean scores, standard deviations, and ranks of the items in each of the domains descending according to the mean scores.

N	Item	Mean score	SD	Rank	Degree
3	The time allotted for the program during the semester is insufficient	3.43	1.40	1	medium
5	The number of lessons is not enough to communicate with students	3.37	1.35	2	Medium
7	The program does not allow the implementation of educational activities that achieve results	3.17	1.29	3	Medium
6	The period of the program does not allow the implementation of modern teaching methods	3.15	1.41	4	Medium
8	The program lacks the necessary financial capabilities	3.12	1.45	5	Medium
9	The program does not take into account the distribution of the student/teacher to the classes based on their wishes	3.11	1.44	6	Medium
4	The nature of the program is not clear in terms of the implementation mechanism	3.01	1.29	7	Medium
2	Lack of clarity in the instructions for practical education	2.94	1.27	8	Medium
1	Lack of clarity on the tasks required in the field training	2.75	1.26	9	Medium
10	Delays in the procedures for distributing the student/teacher to schools	2.52	1.44	10	Medium
The total score for the domain of obstacles related to the practical education program		**3.06**	**0.92**	**Medium**	
4	The supervisor discusses the student with the teacher after each class visit to provide him with feedback	3.84	1.34	1	High
3	The academic supervisor encourages me to be self-reliant	3.58	1.40	2	Medium
6	The supervisor remains throughout the entire class	3.53	1.37	3	Medium
1	The academic supervisor meets with the trainee to clarify what is required of her	3.48	1.42	4	Medium
10	The supervisor organizes orientation and group meetings for the student teacher during the training period	3.27	1.31	5	Medium
9	The supervisor did not reinforce the positive attitudes of the student teacher and focused on the negative	2.88	1.38	6	Medium
5	Lack of clarity in the ideas and opinions of the supervisor among the student teacher	2.81	1.36	7	Medium
7	The supervisor's failure to solve the obstacles faced by the student teacher	2.80	1.37	8	Medium
2	The trainee was frustrated by the supervisor	2.75	1.41	9	Medium
8	Failure to provide the student teacher with assessment criteria in practical education	2.74	1.31	10	Medium
The total score for the domain of obstacles related to the supervisor of practical education		**3.17**	**0.88**	**Medium**	
2	Follow up on student/teacher attendance and absence	4.06	1.28	1	High
1	The school administration did not play an adequate role in informing the student teacher of the school's regulations	3.36	1.39	2	medium
12	The school principal provides the necessary administrative facilities for the success of field training	3.32	1.35	3	Medium
5	She takes care of the trainee student and provides her with incentives	3.16	1.46	4	Medium
3	The school principal looks at the preparation books	3.07	1.50	5	Medium
7	The school principal allocates a classroom for trainee students	3.00	1.65	6	Medium
11	A large number of students per class in the cooperating school	2.89	1.54	7	Medium
10	Lack of educational technology in the school	2.85	1.59	8	Medium
4	Difficulty dealing with the school principal	2.82	1.59	9	Medium
6	The school principal attends class sessions with the student/teacher	2.81	1.58	10	Medium
9	The school administration's lack of confidence in the student's abilities	2.80	1.45	11	Medium
8	Holds several meetings for trainee students	2.65	1.48	12	Medium
The total score for the domain of obstacles related to school administration		**3.07**	**0.87**	**Medium**	
4	The cooperating teacher's mastery of the subject he is studying	3.72	1.40	1	High
1	Explains the school's rules, regulations, and internal regulations	3.61	1.32	2	Medium
5	She uses a variety of teaching methods during my observations of her	3.60	1.42	3	Medium
2	Monitors student/teacher performance on an ongoing basis	3.58	1.31	4	Medium
6	The student/teacher is objective	3.46	1.28	5	Medium
3	Always check the preparation notebook	3.07	1.39	6	Medium
10	Not allowing the student/teacher to teach more than one full lesson	2.93	1.48	7	Medium
7	The weak contribution of the cooperating teacher in developing the student/teacher's experiences in planning for teaching	2.77	1.34	8	Medium
11	Lack of guidance provided by the cooperating teacher after the implementation of the lesson	2.70	1.35	9	Medium
9	The cooperating teacher's lack of knowledge of the subject he is studying negatively affects the student teacher's performance	2.56	1.46	10	Medium
13	The cooperating teacher's lack of interest in addressing the problems that I face with the students in the classroom	2.56	1.44	11	Medium
8	Non-cooperation of the cooperating teacher with the student teacher during field training	2.42	1.42	12	High
12	The collaborating teachers focus on other subjects and neglect	2.34	1.30	13	Medium
The total score for the domain of obstacles related to the cooperating teacher		**3.02**	**0.87**	**Medium**	
2	Fear of the academic supervisor's evaluation	3.17	1.35	1	Medium
3	Difficulty coordinating between practical education and other courses in the same semester	3.10	1.37	2	Medium
1	Part-time student/teacher full-time for practical education	3.07	1.33	3	Medium
5	Difficulty dealing with low achievers	2.80	1.33	4	Medium
4	I find it difficult to manage and control the class	2.77	1.42	5	Medium
6	My confusion when entering the cooperating teacher to attend an assessment session	2.69	1.34	6	Medium
7	Ignore reinforcement for students promptly	2.58	1.35	7	Medium
8	I am having difficulty formulating behavioral objectives for the lesson	2.53	1.34	8	Medium
10	I feel confused when receiving the question from the students	2.40	1.34	9	medium
9	I suffer from a poor ability to prepare appropriately for the new lesson	2.38	1.34	10	medium
The total score for the domain of obstacles related to the student/teacher		**2.75**	**1.04**	**medium**	

According to Table (7), the domain of challenges associated with the overall practical education program had a degree (medium), the highest of the domains, with a mean score of (3.06) and a standard deviation of (0.92). The period allotted to the program during the semester is insufficient, according to item (3), and received a medium grade, with a mean score of (3.43) and a standard deviation of (1.40). The last-placed question (10) was about "The delay in the procedures for distributing the student/teacher to schools," and it had a medium degree, with a mean score of (2.52) and a standard deviation of (0.09). (1.44). This indicates that the period allocated for the training program for practical education is not enough and needs a longer period to obtain more benefits for the student teacher, where the student teacher's working period is three days a week during the second semester from 8 am to 12 pm. It does not allow the implementation of modern teaching methods for students, and this explains why the field training for students during the week needs to be five days throughout the entire second semester, and it came in the last position for the same axis, paragraph 10, which stipulated the delay in the procedures for distributing the student/teacher to schools to an average degree and with a mean score of (2.52). This indicates that the process of distributing the student/teacher to the cooperating teacher is delayed by a week from the start of the second semester, and during this week there will be meetings for the female students about the water training course, including instructions, directions, and clarifications related to field training and the mechanism of the evaluation system for this course, and training workshops on classroom management, teaching methods, evaluation methods, the achievement file for field training, and the observation system. This result agrees with Habayeb's (2016) study, which emphasized the importance of increasing the number of lessons and the period for student-teachers in cooperating schools.

Additionally, it demonstrates how the domains of challenges about the supervisor of practical education as a whole reached a medium degree with a mean score of (3.17) and a standard deviation of (0.88). Item (4), which read: "The supervisor discusses the student with the teacher after each class visit to provide her with feedback," was ranked top in the domain and had a high degree of performance, with a mean score of (3.84) and a standard deviation of (1.34). This shows that the academic supervisor fulfilled his responsibility and was eager to give the trainees feedback and critical notes about their performance for improvement and development, as well as to point them toward suitable training methods following each field trip, to appropriately qualify and prepare the trainees. The student teacher failed to offer evaluation criteria for practical instruction, according to the item (8), which received a medium grade with a mean of (2.74) and a standard deviation of (1.31). This outcome may be explained by the fact that there are multiple practical education supervisors, and as a result, they differ in how clearly they define the evaluation criteria for students. This is especially true given that a portion of the evaluation is based on classroom observation, which necessitates increased attention from academic supervisors to field-training students and may be related to a large number of field-training students in a single group. This outcome is in line with the research by Al-Tarawneh and Hoymel (2008). Also, there are many field training students who do not attend the first face-to-face meeting at the university, which is held by the practical education supervisors. All evaluation criteria for field training are explained in detail. Therefore, it is recommended to hold meetings in the first week remotely through Blackboard so that all students can view everything related to field training at any time.

Furthermore, the domain of obstacles related to the school administration as a whole came to a medium degree, with a mean score of(3.07) and a standard deviation of (0.87). The highest rank in this domain came from item (2), which stated: "Following up the student/teacher's attendance and absence" came that a high degree, with a mean score of (4.06) and a standard deviation of (1.28). This indicates the follow-up and interest of the cooperating schools in taking the attendance and absence of female students during the field training period, while item (8) came in last place, which stated: "Multiple meetings are held for the trainee students" with a medium degree and a mean score of (2.65) and a standard deviation of (1.48). This indicates that the meetings with the trainee students were at an average rate in the cooperating schools, and this explains the shortcoming in the role and

responsibilities of the administration of cooperating schools for the practical education program towards the student teacher and its focus on the primary teacher in the school. This result is consistent with Mahafza (2008) and Habayeb (2016).

It is clear from the table that the dominance of obstacles related to the cooperating teacher as a whole came to a medium degree, with a mean score of (3.02) and a standard deviation of(0.87). With a mean score of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 1.40, item (4) ranked first in this domain. This indicates the cooperating teacher's mastery of the material he teaches to the students. In the last rank came item (12), which states: "The cooperating teacher's focus on other subjects and neglect," to a medium degree, with a mean score of 2.34% and a standard deviation of 1.30. It can be attributed to the nature of the lower basic school stage, where there is a level of grading of subjects according to importance. Accordingly, the classes are distributed according to the academic schedule, and another class may be delayed or progressed based on certain circumstances. It is necessary to pay more attention to field training students. This result is consistent with the study of Abu Nimra (2003).

It also shows that the domain of obstacles related to the student/teacher as a whole came out with a medium degree, with a mean score of (2.75) and a standard deviation of (1.04). Item (2), "Fear of the academic supervisor's evaluation," ranked highest in the domain, with a mean score of 3.17% and a standard deviation of 1.35. This result can be attributed to the fact that the practical education course is equivalent to three courses, and it is 9 hours. Therefore, it affects the student's average significantly, and there is fear and anxiety about failing it. Also, this course needs a great effort from the student teacher in planning and implementation. In the last rank, item (9), states: "I suffer from a poor ability to prepare the appropriate preparation for the new lesson, with a mean score of (2.38) and a standard deviation of (1.34). It may be attributed to the fact that it has never represented a real position in explaining the educational material in a manner that suits the levels of students and the spirit of the age, and may also be attributed to the shame, confusion, and anxiety of female students while they are standing in the classroom in front of the students preparing for the lesson. This result agrees with the study of Al-Mustarihi and Tashman (2019).

Secondly, results related to the second question, which states: "Are there any statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05) in the average estimates of the sample members of the obstacles facing practical education students during field training due to the school ownership variables, the cumulative average?"

The mean scores and standard deviations of the students' instrument responses were computed following the variables to provide an answer to the question (school ownership, cumulative average). The outcomes are displayed in Table (8).

Table 8: Mean scores and standard deviations of female students' responses to the obstacles that students of practical education face during field training according to study variables

Variables	levels	M and SD	Obstacles of practical education program	Obstacles of supervisor of practical education	Obstacles of school administration	Obstacles of cooperating teacher	Obstacles of student/teacher	Total
school ownership	public	Mean	3.01	2.69	3.32	2.77	2.94	**2.95**
		S.D	0.83	0.80	0.84	1.00	1.17	**0.66**
	Private	Mean	3.7	3.26	3.02	3.07	2.71	**3.03**
		S. D	0.94	0.87	0.88	0.84	1.02	**0.74**
	Total	Mean	3.06	3.17	3.07	3.02	2.75	**3.02**
		S. D	0.92	0.88	0.87	0.87	1.04	**0.73**
cumulative average	Good or less	Mean	2.67	3.13	3.06	2.98	2.45	**2.87**
		S. D	0.84	0.73	0.79	0.67	0.94	**0.52**
	Very good	Mean	3.22	3.23	3.17	3.11	2.95	**3.13**
		S. D	0.86	0.93	0.88	0.97	1.07	**0.77**
	Excellent	Mean	2.98	2.95	2.64	2.72	2.32	**2.72**
		S. D	1.14	0.91	0.92	0.65	0.84	**0.70**
	Total	Mean	3.06	3.17	3.07	3.02	2.75	**3.02**
		S. D	092	0.88	0.87	0.87	1.04	**0.73**

According to the variable of school ownership and the cumulative average, there are apparent differences between the values of the mean scores of the study participants' responses to the domains and the overall degree of obstacles faced by students receiving practical education during field training (Table 8). The two-way multivariate analysis of variance test (Two Way MANOVA) was used to determine the statistical significance of the variations in means. Table (9) demonstrates this.

Table 9: Results of the Two Way MANOVA test of individuals' responses to the obstacles facing students of practical education during field training according to the study variables

Source of variance	Domains	Total Squares	df	Means Squares	F	Sig
School ownership Hotelling's =0.108 F =3.038 Sig =0.034	Obstacles of practical education program	0.540	1	.540	.673	**.413**
	Obstacles of supervisor of practical education	7.593	1	7.593	10.324	**.002***
	Obstacles of school administration	1.912	1	1.912	2.598	**.109**
	Obstacles of cooperating teacher	2.270	1	2.270	3.043	**.083**
	Obstacles of student/teacher	.462	1	.462	.447	**.505**
	Total	**.320**	**1**	**.320**	**.630**	**.428**
Cumulative average Wilks'Lambda =0.933 F =.991 Sig =0.433	Obstacles of practical education program	8.742	2	4.371	5.440	**.005***
	Obstacles of supervisor of practical education	2.142	2	1.071	1.456	**.236**
	Obstacles of school administration	4.999	2	2.500	3.397	**.036***
	Obstacles of cooperating teacher	3.075	2	1.538	2.062	**.131**
	Obstacles of student/teacher	11.220	2	5.610	5.425	**.005***
	Total	**4.388**	**2**	**2.194**	**4.326**	**.015***
Error	Obstacles of practical education program	126.941	158	.803		
	Obstacles of supervisor of practical education	116.202	158	.735		
	Obstacles of school administration	116.278	158	.736		
	Obstacles of cooperating teacher	117.832	158	.746		
	Obstacles of student/teacher	163.398	158	1.034		
	Total	**80.143**	**158**	**.507**		
Modified total	Obstacles of practical education program	135.758	161			
	Obstacles to the supervision of practical education	125.386	161			
	Obstacles of school administration	123.253	161			
	Obstacles of cooperating teacher	122.898	161			
	Obstacles of student/teacher	175.725	161			
	Total	**84.666**	**161**			

* Statistically significant at level (0.05≥α)

It can be seen from the results of Table (9):

1. There are statistically significant differences at the level of (0.05≥α) between the mean score of the students' estimates on the domains of obstacles related to the supervisor of practical education due to the school ownership variable, as the value of test (f) on the domain was (10.324) and the level of significance was (0.002). The differences came in favor of private schools, with a mean score of (3.26) higher than public schools (2.69). This is because private schools have their daily and quarterly plans set in terms of time so that the original teacher explains them at the specified time according to the daily and quarterly plans. At the same time, there is tension among the student-teachers from not obtaining a full share of the three observations by the academic supervisor as a result of the delay of the original teacher in his course, and as a result, the effect of obstacles increases. It also shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of (0.05≥α) between the means on the rest of the items due to school ownership, as the statistical values of the (f) test on the axes ranged between (0.447–3.043) and at a significance level greater than (0.05), and these are considered values that are not statistically significant (0.05≥α).
2. 2. The test value (f) for the total score was (0.630) and at the significance level (0.428), and this value is not statistically significant at the level (0.05), demonstrating that there are no statistically significant variations between the means on the instrument's total score. This is

since challenges relating to the practical education curriculum, school administration, collaborating teachers, and student/teacher challenges are shared by all public and private schools. This outcome is in line with Otaibi (2018).

3. There are no statistically significant differences at (0.05≥α) between the mean scores on the rest of the domains due to the average, as the statistical values of the (f) test on two domains (obstacles related to the practical education supervisor, obstacles related to the cooperating teacher) reach between (1.456-2.062) with a significance level greater than (0.05), and these values are not statistically significant at the (0.05≥α) level. It also shows that there are statistically significant differences at the level (0.05≥α) between the mean score of the student's grades in domains (obstacles related to the practical education program, obstacles related to school administration, and obstacles related to the student/teacher) that are due to the average variable, as the statistical values of the (f) test reached on the domains (5.440) (3.397) (5.425) and at the significance level (0.005) (0.036) (0.005), respectively. The differences between the average members were (very good) on the one hand and the average (good or less) on the other hand, and between the average members (excellent) on the one hand and the average (very good) on the other hand, the differences came in favor of the average members (very good) with a higher mean. This may be because students whose cumulative average is very good are exposed to obstacles more than other distinguished students who can face obstacles in different ways, and they represent the largest part in terms of numbers in the practical education program.
4. The test value (f) for the instrument was (4.326) and was at the significance level (of 0.015). This value is statistically significant at (0.05), and the differences came between the average members (excellent) on the one hand and (good) on the other, with a higher mean on the tool. This further demonstrates that there are statistically significant differences between the average estimates of the tool's total score. This outcome is linked to their distribution to schools, impact processes, and environmental influences, as well as the presence of barriers associated with school administration, the practical education program, and the student teacher. This result is consistent with the research by Al-Mustarihi and Tashman (2009).

5. Recommendations

In light of the obtained results, the researcher suggests the following:

1. The researcher recommends the need to reconsider the practical education program by increasing the period so that it becomes over the course of an entire semester so that it covers the daily program in force in schools.
2. The researcher also recommends conducting similar research and studies on the obstacles of practical education to include other variables and samples. In addition, holding training courses and workshops with departments and teachers of cooperating schools to determine the tasks and roles envisaged by them and to discuss the progress of the practical education program in schools.

References

Abu Jadu, S. (2001). *Recent trends in practical education*. UNRWA, Institute of Education.

Abu Nimra, M. (2003). The problems facing the students of the Faculty of Educational Sciences / UNRWA who are enrolled in the Practical Education Program during field application from their point of view. *Student Teacher Journal, 2* (1).

Al-Abadi, H. (2004). Practical Education Problems as Seen by Student Teachers in the Class Teacher Specialization and its Relationship to Their Attitudes towards the Teaching Profession. *University of Jordan Studies Journal, 31*(2).

Ali, F. (2009). *Practical Education Principles and Practices*. University of Khartoum Press.

Alimat, A. (2008). *The problems of practical education students in the College of Educational Sciences at Al al-Bayt University, practical education, future visions*. Arab Society Library.

Al-Miqdadi, A. (2003). Evaluating the Practical Education Program to Prepare a Mathematics Teacher at the University of Jordan. *Journal of University Studies, 3*, 314-329.

Al-Mustarihi, H., Tashman, G. (2019). The problems faced by students of practical education: Class teacher row, and child education in the University of Isra In the field training period. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Sciences, 5*(2), 56-74.

Almutlaq, F. (2010). The Reality of Practical Education for Class Teacher Students in the College of Education at the University of Damascus and the Prospects for its Development (A Field Study on Fourth Year Students - Class Teacher).*Damascus University Journal*, 1, (26), 61-96.

Al-Otaibi, M. (2018). The problems facing female students of practical education at the Faculty of Education in Muzahmiyah during field training. *Journal of the Islamic University of Educational and Psychological Studies, 27*(2)-382-407.

Al-Tarawneh, S., & Hoymel, O. (2008). The problems facing the student teacher during the field application period for the class teacher specialization at Mutah University. The Third Conference of the Faculty of Educational Sciences. Modernizing visions for practical education programs in the faculties of education in the Arab world in the third millennium. Zarqa Private University, 25 (1), 253-270.

Amer, T. (2008). *Prepared by the future teacher*. International House for Publishing and Distribution.

Atiya, A., & Al-Hashimi, A. (2007). *Practical Education and its Applications in Preparing the Future Teacher*. Dar Al-Manhaj for Publishing and Distribution.

Doxey, I. (1996). Preparing early childhood educators: Relation ship theory and field experiences.

Habayeb, A. (2016). The Difficulties of Practical Education as Seen by Students of Faculties of Educational Sciences in Palestinian Universities. Educational Sciences Studies, 43(3), 1251- 1265.

Hamid, N. (2011). A survey of the vision of female students of faculties of education about the problems of training them in the profession before service. *Journal of Educational Sciences, Cairo University, 19*(4), 3 – 57.

Harb, S. (2009). *Problems of practical education among trainee students*. A working paper presented for the school day held at the College of Education - the Islamic University - entitled field training between the performance of the student teacher and the directions of the educational supervisor and school administration.

Khazali, Q., & Momani, A. (2009). The problems of field training students at Al-Balqa Applied University from the point of view of the students themselves. *Sharjah Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1* (1), 59 – 91.

Mahafza, S. (2008). *The Problems Facing Practical Education Students in the Faculty of Educational Sciences at the Hashemite University*. The Third Conference of the Faculty of Educational Sciences. Modernizing Visions for Practical Education Programs in Faculties of Education in the Arab World in the Third Millennium. Zarqa Private University, 25,1 401-432.

Marei, T., & Sherif, M. (2014). *Practical Education*. Al-Quds Open University.