EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING SUPERVISION: IMPLICATIONS TO EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

Summary: The study “Experiential Learning Supervision: Implications to Education Management” was done during the second semester of Academic Year 2014-2015 employing two sets of respondents: Teacher Education Graduates and Student Teaching Supervisors, who assessed the supervision on student teaching (experiential learning). These sets of respondents were from public and private TEIs in Nueva Ecija such as Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Central Luzon State University, Wesleyan University -Philippines, and Araullo University, Philippines.

The following are the results on the assessments of the student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs on student teaching supervision based on these three phases of student teaching activities, as follows:

2.1 Pre-Deployment;
2.2 Deployment; and
2.3 Post-Deployment

• Both the student teaching supervisors and the teacher education graduates strongly agreed that the student teaching activities during the pre-deployment, deployment and post-deployment have been carried out properly and have developed the quality of teaching among student teachers.

For the comparison of the assessments of student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs based on the above cited phases of student teaching activities, the following results were obtained:

• The student teaching supervision of student teaching supervisors from public and private TEIs on student teaching activities during pre-deployment and during deployment do not differ; while there is significant difference on their assessment on post-deployment activities.

• The assessment of teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs on student teaching supervision of student teaching activities during pre-deployment and post-deployment have no significant difference. However, supervision of activities during deployment varies from the two groups of respondents.

• In the comparison of the assessment on student teaching supervision between student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs in Nueva Ecija, significant difference was found.
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1. Introduction

Teacher education in the Philippines is an important aspect of the educational scheme. It involves designing and educating an individual to become a teacher, to be the forerunner and fountain of wisdom, who in one and many ways, touches and changes the lives of people to become more responsible citizens. Indeed, people and society expect much from a teacher. This expectation is clearly depicted on Dep.Ed.’s battle cry, “Be proud you are a teacher, the future depends on you” and “Edukasyon ang Solusyon.” Bilbao (2006) said that someone once wrote of teachers saying, “Even on your worst day on your job, you are still some children’s best hope.” It is also said that teaching is more than a job or a career. It is a mission for those who feel the heavy burden of developing the minds and hearts of young people for the future of the country.

According to Congressional Commission on Education to Review and Assess Philippine Education (EDCOM) Report (1991), the quality of Philippine education has been declining as evidenced by the poor performance of pupils and students in regional and national achievement tests especially in mathematics and science courses. The former Department of Education Secretary reported that more than half of the 1.3 million graduating students in public and private high schools are unfit for college (Soliven, 2007). The NCAE results merely validated previous results of the achievement tests where 59.55% of the graduating students got low scores in the said scholastic aptitude test (Press Release, Senate of the Philippines, 2007). This fact is stated in Congressional Commission to Assess Philippine Education (EDCOM) Report (Villenes, 1991) which even cited this cause: “that teachers are poorly trained”. This report also stressed that the inadequate training of teachers during their pre-service and in-service years were the reasons why many teachers were not prepared for teaching.

Aside from the above scenario, the low quality of teacher education graduates was also cited in the report as a great cause of the decline in Philippine education. There is great truth in this finding of EDCOM since nowadays, teaching does not attract the best students, or the most talented members of today’s younger generation. For reasons of their own, one of which is that they regard teaching as “a poorly esteemed profession” (EDCOM, 1991). Many entering college freshmen simply dislike the world of teaching as shown by their swelling enrolment in course offerings which are popularly pursued by their peers. To give prestige to the teaching profession, the Philippine Professionalization Act of 1994 was passed, making teaching a genuine profession at par with other professions. The professionalization of the teaching profession is thus hoped to attract deserving teachers-to-be among the gifted members of today’s youth.

In response to EDCOM’s report, many memorandum orders and directives were sent to the field by education officials. But in relation to teacher training, CHED Memorandum Order No. 30 (CMO No. 30) promulgated on September 13, 2004 made an impact. This order embodies the directives, policies and standards for the undergraduate teacher education curriculum. Its main purpose is to rationalize the teacher education curriculum of the country to keep abreast with the demands of global competitiveness by improving the quality of instruction in teacher education through provision of student activities during their student teaching. One of these activities is their field study course where they are immersed to cooperating schools to observe, analyze, and reflect on the activities done in the school. Student teachers actually experience the different circumstances in teaching that are found in books and discussed in
the four corners of the classroom. Through this CHED directive, student teachers are expected to become more keenly aware and sensitive to the learners and the learning environment.

The researcher has been serving as student teaching supervisor for nine years already, and in such capacity he wanted to be of better assistance to the student teaching program of his TEI, through the meanings of the data that this study would generate. Based on this line of thinking, the researcher felt confident that the choice of this problem would give relevance and importance in meeting present-day educational concerns and issues.

2. Research Methodology

This study aimed to describe and assess the student teaching supervision by selected public and private Teacher Education Institutions in Cabanatuan City and in Nueva Ecija during Academic Year 2014-2015. Specifically, it sought to find answers to the following:

1. Comparison on the assessment of student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from public TEIs on pre-deployment, during and post – deployment student teaching phases
2. Comparison on the assessment of student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from private TEIs on pre-deployment, during and post – deployment student teaching phases
3. Comparison on the assessment of student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs on pre-deployment, during and post –deployment student teaching phases
4. Implications to teacher education curriculum and cooperating schools

The researcher utilized the descriptive method of study. Data were gathered from the Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) located in Cabanatuan City: the Colleges of Education of the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Araullo University, and Wesleyan University-Philippines, as well as from Central Luzon State University located in the Science City of Muñoz.

2.1 Research Sample

This study utilized two sets of respondents, teacher education graduates and student teaching supervisors from each of the four respondent Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs). Table 1 shows these respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEIs</th>
<th>Teacher Education Graduates (35-53%)</th>
<th>Student Teaching Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUST</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSU</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WU-P</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The table shows the number of respondents: 255 for the teacher education graduates out of 718 graduates for Academic Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. However, only 210 of them were actually employed as respondents because the rest did not return their questionnaire. All of the 14 student teaching supervisors during the A.Y. 2014-2015 from all the respondent TEIs were used as respondents.

Random sampling strategy was employed in the selection of teacher education graduates. However, purposive sampling was utilized in the selection of student teaching supervisors.

2.2 Instrumentation

Description. Two different sets of questionnaire were devised: one for the student teaching supervisors, and one for the teacher education graduates. To wit:

For the Student Teaching Supervisors: the items were intended to identify their supervisory activities during pre-deployment, during deployment, and post-deployment of student teachers.

For the Teacher Education Graduates: the sets of items in this part were similar to the items in the questionnaires for the student teaching supervisors.

3. Research Results and Discussions

1. Comparison of Assessment on Student Teaching Supervision between Student Teaching Supervisors and Teacher Education Graduates from Public TEIs in Nueva Ecija

Table 2 shows the statistical results using t-test comparing the assessment on student teaching supervision of student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from public TEIs in Nueva Ecija.

Table 2 shows that the overall t-computed was 4.093 which is lower than t-critical of 1.663 which implies that there is significant difference on the assessment on student teaching supervision of student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from public TEIs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases of Student Teaching</th>
<th>t-computed</th>
<th>t-critical</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-deployment</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Deployment</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Deployment</td>
<td>3.068</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.093</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the assessment of student teaching supervisors from public TEIs compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates during pre-deployment activities, the statistical analysis resulted to computed t-value of 2.271 which is higher than the t-critical of 1.701 which implies that there is significant difference on their assessment on student teaching supervision on pre-deployment activities. This could be interpreted that some of the activities
for student teachers on pre-deployment activities were either be strictly observed or not by the student teachers.

As can be gleaned, the teacher education graduates strongly agreed that they conducted pinning and investiture rites during pre-deployment while the student teaching supervisors only agreed on it.

Although almost of the items obtained the same verbal description of “strongly agree”, the numerical ratings have high difference. For instance, there is a big difference on the numerical value given by the two groups of respondents in the item “presented and endorsed them as student teachers to the college dean and other school officials before sending them to the cooperating schools”. There was also big difference in the numerical ratings obtained by the two groups of respondents on the item “oriented them on the philosophy of the school as well as the curriculum and the nature, scope and objectives of the course/subject they will handle”; where the assessment of student teaching supervisors obtained a mean of 4.78 while the teacher education graduates obtained a mean of 4.55. The item “conducted for them a personality development seminar before their deployment” also obtained high difference in numerical rating where the student teaching supervisors’ assessment obtained an almost perfect score while the teacher education graduates’ assessment obtained a mean of 4.69.

Table 2 shows that when the assessment of student teaching supervisors from public TEIs compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates from public TEIs during deployment activities, the statistical analysis resulted to computed t-value of 3.033 which is higher than the t-critical of 1.684 which implies that there is significant difference on their assessment on student teaching supervision on deployment activities. This could be interpreted that most or some of the activities for student teachers during deployment phase were properly administered or not by their student teaching supervisors. On the item “make analyses, reports and presents these to the deans/ department head”, the student teaching supervisors agreed only while the teacher education graduates strongly agreed on it. Moreover, on the item “confer frequently with the cooperating teacher to determine how the cooperating teacher perceives the student teacher’s performance and to address any problems or concerns the cooperating teacher may have”, the student teaching supervisors strongly agreed while the teacher education graduates only agreed on it. Further, on the item “test the reliability of observation by comparing the teaching performance of the student teachers to their co-student teachers”; a verbal description of “agree” was obtained by the student teaching supervisors; while teacher education graduates obtained “strongly agree” verbal description. The rest of the items on deployment activities obtained the same verbal description; however there were big difference in the numerical ratings of the two groups of respondents on the said items. For instance, on the item “visit student teachers regularly to monitor the development of their teaching skills”, the student teaching supervisors obtained an extreme mean of 4.89 as compared to the numerical value of 4.27 obtained by teacher education graduates. Moreover, the item “conduct interviews regarding student teachers’ problems in teaching and in their relationship with their peers and cooperating teachers” obtained a perfect mean for student teaching supervisors while that of the teacher education graduates, very low mean was derived. Also, on the item “check and correct the lesson plan, modes of teaching and other instructional materials every visitation”, the student teaching supervisors’ assessment on the said obtained almost perfect mean while the teacher education graduates’ assessment on the same item obtained a very low mean.
Moreover, the assessment of student teaching supervisors from public TEIs when compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates from public TEIs on post-deployment activities, the statistical analysis resulted to computed t-value of 3.068 which is higher than the t-critical of 1.761 which implies that there is significant difference on their assessment on student teaching supervision on post-deployment activities. This could be interpreted that the student teaching supervisors from public TEIs have either followed carefully or given less importance the post-deployment activities for student teachers.

As can be gleaned, all the items in the post-deployment activities obtained verbal description of “strongly agree” from both groups of respondents; however their numerical ratings have high differences. For instance, the assessment of student teaching supervisors in the item “require student teachers to write their Student Teaching Portfolio” obtained a mean of 4.89 which is higher than the assessment of teacher education graduates. Further, the assessment of student teaching supervisors on the item “evaluate student teaching performance by providing the teaching anecdotes written by the cooperating teachers” obtained a mean of 4.62 which is also higher than the assessment of teacher education graduates. Also, the item “give diagnoses and correct the inappropriate ways they have acquired from the cooperating teachers/cooperating schools” obtained high disparity on the result where the student teaching supervisors’ assessment obtained a mean of 4.84 as compared to the teacher education graduates’ mean of 4.33. The item “conduct seminar where each of the student teachers is able to share his valuable experiences that made him teaching competencies more refined and excellent” obtained high disparity on the result where the student teaching supervisors’ assessment obtained a mean of 4.73 as compared to the teacher education graduates’ mean of 4.56.

2. Comparison of Assessment on Student Teaching Supervision between Student Teaching Supervisors and Teacher Education Graduates from Private TEIs in Nueva Ecija

Table 3 shows that the overall t-computed was 2.451 which is higher than t-critical of 1.663 which implies that there is significant difference on the assessment on student teaching supervision of student teaching supervisors and teacher education graduates from private TEIs.

<p>| Table 3: Comparison of the Assessment on Student Teaching Supervision of Student Teaching Supervisors and Teacher Education Graduates from Private TEIs in Nueva Ecija |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases of Student Teaching</th>
<th>t-computed</th>
<th>t-critical</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-deployment</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Deployment</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Deployment</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.451</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>0.0089</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data could be interpreted that the supervision of student teaching activities for student teachers of private TEIs were either be properly implemented and observed, or less emphasized by their student teaching supervisors.

Teacher education graduates strongly agreed that they were given seminar on personality development before their deployment while the student teaching supervisors only agreed on
it. The rest of the items obtained the same verbal description, however, the numerical value of each item from both groups has big difference.

When the assessment of student teaching supervisors from private TEIs compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates from private TEIs on pre-deployment activities, the statistical analysis resulted to computed t-value of 3.346 which is higher than the t-critical of 1.701 which implies that there is significant difference on their assessment on student teaching supervision on pre-deployment activities.

From the 15 items in the pre-deployment activities, only the item “conduct personality development seminar before deployment” obtained different verbal description: student teaching supervisors’ assessment falls on “agree” while teacher education graduates’ assessment falls on “strongly agree”. Fourteen items, however, obtained the same verbal description of “strongly agree”. Nevertheless, the numerical values obtained by the two groups of respondents in these 14 items were of high discrepancy. For instance, the assessment of student teaching supervisors on the item “conduct courtesy calls and endorses the student teachers to the deans, and directors before sending them to the cooperating schools” obtained a perfect mean while the teacher education graduates’ assessment obtained a mean of 4.62 only. The assessment of student teaching supervisors on the item “teach the types of lesson plans prescribed by Dep.Ed.” obtained also perfect mean while for teacher education graduates, a mean of 4.71 was computed. Further, the assessment of student teaching supervisors on the item “orient student teachers on the philosophy of the school as well as the curriculum and the nature, scope and objectives of the course/subject they are handling” obtained as well a perfect mean while the teacher education graduates’ assessment obtained only a mean of 4.71. In addition, the following items also obtained very high discrepancy on numerical ratings from both groups of respondents: “provide the student teachers the expectations from them by the cooperating schools”, “meet with the cooperating teachers and the principals and discuss with them the competencies needed by the student teachers to master”, “give student teachers the lists of materials student teachers need before deployment”, “teaches student teachers on the formulation/conception of lesson plans’ objectives in terms of students/pupils’ knowledge, understanding, skills, habits, attitudes and appreciation”, “orient student teachers on the importance of student teaching”, “Conduct pinning and investiture rites to boost student teachers’ morale and esteem”, “conduct meeting with the Teacher Education Institution faculty for the selection of cooperating schools to be chosen from the list provided by DepEd.”, and “conduct meeting with the cooperating schools and discusses with them the Teacher Education Institution-DepEd Memorandum of Agreement”.

Furthermore, when the assessment of student teaching supervisors compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates from private TEIs during deployment activities, the statistical analysis resulted to computed t-value of 1.251 which is lower than the t-critical of 1.684 which implies that there is no significant difference on their assessment on student teaching supervision on deployment activities. This means that the supervision of student teaching supervisors on student teaching activities for student teachers during deployment was properly administered because almost all of the 21 items obtained high means and verbal description of “strongly agree” from both groups of respondents except for the items: “check and correct the lesson plan, modes of teaching and other instructional materials every visitation”, “concentrate on observing classroom behavior, interpreting it only after the observation is completed”, “test the reliability of observation by comparing the teaching performance of the student teachers to their co-student teachers” and “interpret the coded observations” which obtained different verbal descriptions from the respondents.
Moreover, when the assessment of student teaching supervisors on post deployment activities compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates from private TEIs, the statistical analysis resulted to computed t-value of 0.022 which is lower than the t-critical of 1.761 which implies that there is no significant difference on their assessment on student teaching supervision on post-deployment activities. This could be interpreted that the activities for student teachers during post-deployment were appropriately imposed by the student teaching supervisors because all of the items as assessed by the two groups of respondents obtained high means and fall on verbal description of “strongly agree” except for the item “ask student teachers to give recommendations for the improvement of the student teaching program of the TEI” where the student teaching supervisors rated the item as “agree” while the teacher education graduates rated the same item as “strongly agree”.

3. Comparison of the Assessment on Student Teaching Supervision between Student Teaching Supervisors and Teacher Education Graduates from Public and Private TEIs in Nueva Ecija

When the combined assessment on pre-deployment activities of student teaching supervisors from public and private TEIs compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs, the statistical analysis resulted to computed t-value of 3.908 which is higher than t-critical of 1.671 which implies that there is significant difference on their assessment on supervision of pre-deployment activities. Although all of the items in the pre-deployment activities obtained the same verbal description of “strongly agree” in all items in the pre-deployment activities, the numerical values obtained, however have big differences. For instance, the assessment of student teaching supervisors on the item “conduct courtesy calls and endorses the student teachers to the deans, and directors before sending them to the cooperating schools” obtained an overall mean of 4.97 as compared with the teacher education graduates of 4.63. Also, the assessment of student teaching supervisors on the item “orient student teachers on the philosophy of the school as well as the curriculum and the nature, scope and objectives of the course/subject they are handling” obtained an overall mean of 4.89 which is also high if compared with the teacher education graduates’ assessment of 4.63.

Table 4: Comparison of the Assessment on Student Teaching Supervision between Student Teaching Supervisors and Teacher Education Graduates from Public and Private TEIs in Nueva Ecija

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases of Student Teaching</th>
<th>Combination (Public and Private)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t-computed</td>
<td>t-critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-deployment</td>
<td>3.908</td>
<td>1.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Deployment</td>
<td>2.778</td>
<td>1.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Deployment</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>1.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.43439</td>
<td>1.654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the assessment of student teaching supervisors on the following items “provide the student teachers the expectations from them by the cooperating schools”, “give student teachers the lists of materials student teachers need before deployment”, “teaches student teachers on the formulation/conception of lesson plans’ objectives in terms of students/pupils’ knowledge, understanding, skills, habits, attitudes and appreciation”, and “orient student teachers on the importance of student teaching”, each obtained a perfect mean of 5.00 which
is very high if compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates on the same items that obtained means of 4.58, 4.65, 4.77, and 4.75, respectively.

During deployment phase, the overall t-computed was 2.778 which is higher than t-critical of 1.664 which implies that there is significant difference on the assessments on student teaching supervision of student teaching supervisors from public and private TEIs and teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs during deployment.

As gleaned, teacher education graduates strongly agreed that their student teaching supervisors focus on interpreting classroom behavior during class observation while the student teaching supervisors only agreed on it. Moreover, the student teaching supervisors strongly agreed that they test the reliability of the observation made while the teacher education graduates only agreed on it. The rest of the items in the deployment phase obtained the same verbal description of “strongly agree”; however, their assessments have big difference on numerical values. Almost all of the items in the deployment activities, as rated by the student teaching supervisors, obtained higher means as compared to the means obtained in the assessment of teacher education graduates.

When the combined assessment on post-deployment activities of student teaching supervisors from public and private TEIs compared with the assessment of teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs, the statistical analysis resulted to computed t-value of 1.594 which is lower than t-critical of 1.697 which implies that there is no significant difference on their assessment on supervision of post-deployment activities.

Both groups of respondents from public and private TEIs strongly agreed on most of the items considered in the post-deployment activities. Almost all of respondents believed that the student teaching supervisors have complied with all the requirements and activities needed after deployment phase.

**4.1 Implications to Curriculum of Teacher Education**

Educators in the teacher education institutions must engage in curriculum leadership as stipulated in CHED Memorandum 30. They have to design a unique framework for their preservice teacher education courses which will eventually help achieve the national goal of education. Student teaching supervisors must have know-how in planning, implementing and evaluating their own preservice teacher education programs.

Curriculum design and leadership could also be considered by TEIs. These teachers can be significant contributors towards curriculum change which can ultimately revolutionize teaching and learning processes by concretizing the knowledge gained in different trainings and seminars. Administrators must encourage their teachers to take part in curriculum development and modification. Participation of students in curriculum planning must also be given emphasis. Include in the curriculum the different pre-deployment, during deployment, and post-deployment activities. Plan different courses of actions that will intensify the positive effects of such activities to preservice teachers.
4.2 Implications to the Cooperating Schools

Cooperating schools are partners of TEIs in molding student teachers to become the better educators, endowed with knowledge and wisdom to grasp the changing world of teaching.

The cooperating teacher plays multifarious roles in guiding the student teachers to learn, relearn, and unlearn. He has the authority over the student teachers therefore, he has the obligation to direct and say what the student teachers ought to do in school. In his shoulder lies a responsibility that can make or obliterate the success of student teachers.

The cooperating teachers must show the student teachers the great deal of teachers’ work, as a profession, as a mission, and as a vocation. They also has to put much emphasis on class observation to track down their limitations and weak points, train student teachers to the best of their ability by exposing them to different class scenarios. It can be done by simply allowing them observe various teachers and students/pupils from different grades/levels, and sections.

The school principals must find ways on how they can forge a linkage to community via student teachers as one of the better resources of the cooperating school and TEIs. The school principals can develop a master plan that can answer the need of student teachers to form a connection with the people in the community. For instance, they can let the student teachers present during PTCA meetings.

Conclusions

1. Both the student teaching supervisors and the teacher education graduates are in strong agreement that the student teaching activities during the pre-deployment, deployment and post-deployment have been well carried out.

2. The assessment of teaching supervisors from public and private TEIs on student teaching activities during pre-deployment and during deployment are comparable; while their assessment on post-deployment activities varies.

3. The assessment of teacher education graduates from public and private TEIs on supervision of student teaching activities during their pre-deployment and post-deployment shows no difference. However, their assessment on supervision of student teaching activities during deployment varies which means student teachers have received different degree of supervision during deployment activities.
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