



## **The Pedagogical instructors' perspective of the PDS Model In Teachers' Training**

**Tareq Murad<sup>1</sup>**

**Nabil Assadi<sup>2</sup>**

**Yaser Awad<sup>3</sup>**

**Muhammad Ibdah<sup>4</sup>**

**Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 12 (4)**

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 13 Apr 2021

Date of revision: 12 Aug 2021

Date of acceptance: 11 Oct 2021

**Tareq Murad, Nabil Assad, Yaser Awad, Muhammad Ibdah(2021). The Pedagogical instructors' perspective of the PDS Model In Teachers' Training. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 12(4). 67 – 79.**

---

<sup>1</sup>The department of pedagogical training: Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher education

<sup>2</sup>The department of Mathematics: Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher education

<sup>3</sup>The dean of higher studies: Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher education

<sup>4</sup>The dean of Academic studies: Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher education



## **The Pedagogical instructors' perspective of the PDS Model In Teachers' Training**

**Tareq Murad<sup>1</sup>, Nabil Assadi<sup>2</sup>, Yaser Awad<sup>3</sup>, Muhammad Ibdah<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>The department of pedagogical training: Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher education

<sup>2</sup>The department of Mathematics: Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher education

<sup>3</sup>The dean of higher studies: Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher education

<sup>4</sup>The dean of Academic studies: Sakhnin Academic College for Teacher education

Email ID: tarenal22@gmail.com, nabilgood1@sakhnin.ac.il, awad\_y@netvision.net.il, imuh@sakhnin.ac.il

### **ABSTRACT**

The study aims to examine the contribution of the PDS model as perceived by pedagogical instructors. The research questions derived from the central goal are:

What are the characteristics of the PDS instructional model that contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the practical process of student teachers? What are the dimensions of the pedagogical instructor's knowledge of the perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs of the trainees in the effective implementation of the PDS training model? What are the factors that hinder the implementation of the PDS training model?

To collect the research data, and following the detailed explanation of the pedagogical guides on the purpose of the research, a questionnaire was uploaded to the Google Docs system and a 20-questions interview was conducted. They were asked to use the link for filling out the questionnaire. The participants were also informed that there are no correct or incorrect answers when filling out the questionnaire and that everyone will answer to the best of their understanding, opinion and feelings.

The findings show that PDS model does not deviate from the other models, and it stresses the process of professional socialization of the students. In addition, the pedagogical instructors who participated in this study emphasized the subject of teaching as a profession and demonstrated well their work in this field. Throughout the interviews, the instructors addressed the content, teaching at large, the teaching strategies, lesson planning. This is to increase interest in learning, and develop thinking among their students, but at the same time, they emphasized other aspects of training such as; communication between teachers and students, working with other trainee.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Students and teachers in teachers' education attribute a great importance to the pedagogical training than to the traditional training procedure; including academic courses taught during teacher training (Lazovsky and Schreif, 1992). The pedagogical instruction is considered an essential platform for teacher students to learn about the practical aspects of the field of teaching, to make relationships with the school students, with the teachers' staff, with the management and with parents (Gilad, 2005 and Lazovsky and Schreif, 1992).

The pedagogical training is complex matter for student teachers, since it is a meeting place between training in the theoretical level and the educational activity. Moreover, this is the real-life encounter between the three vertices of the practicum: the pedagogical guide, the training teacher and the teacher student (Zilberstein, Panevsky and Goz, 2005; Reichenberg, 1998). The pedagogical training is a process that may enables students to cope emotionally with the conflict between their approaches, beliefs and attitudes on the one hand and the actual situation in the field of work on the other, and at the cognitive level with different didactic methods and strategies (Reichenberg, 1998).

Guided training in teaching is the essence of the theoretical studies that take place there and it is of great importance for the teacher students. In pedagogical training, the students are given opportunity to practice the life of classroom and school in real way under the supervision of teachers who have many years of teaching experience, and experienced and qualified pedagogical guides. In the training schools, the trainees are exposed to the various factors involved in teaching and management. In addition, the students observe and analyze the activities that take place there.

Following the practical training period, the students will acquire proper work habits, learn to prepare a reasoned lesson plan, and equip themselves with the tools that enable them to build and develop a study unit under the supervision and guidance of the accompanying pedagogic instructor.

There are three models for conducting the process of pedagogical training; The Traditional Model, the **PDS** model (Professional Development Schools), and the Academic-Class model. The three models are based on three main focal points; the college student, the training teacher and the pedagogical supervisor. The difference between the priors lies in the functioning of each factor, the nature and characteristics of the relationship between them, and the physical, macroeconomic and organizational environment in which they operate.

The traditional model, like the other models, allows encounters between the students, the training teachers and the pedagogic instructor several hours a week during the years of training. The process includes meetings at the school, observation by classroom teachers, and participation in the teaching process. All of these are done according to the tight schedule of the training teacher and the pedagogical instructor. In addition, workshops that take place at the college at the end of the training day are conducted. The teaching workshops are designed to process and analyze both the theoretical and practical levels of issues encountered by the trainees in practicum.

The PDS model in teacher training is a platform of partnership between the institution and the school. The intensive training of students for a longer period in a school during the school year, accompanied by the supervision of an instructor, creates a close connection between the academic institution and the school. Thus, cooperation is firmly established (Ministry of Education, 2014).

In the course of the discussions by the pedagogical training coordinators of teacher education colleges in (Mofet) Institute, the disadvantages of the traditional models were compared with the PDS Model. It was found that there is dissatisfaction with the teachers' training process according to the traditional model, mainly from the following aspects: In the traditional model, the physical conditions of the pedagogical guides were not comfortable (they worked within scattered frameworks), there was a sense of apprehension among school principals and kinder gardens.

The third model- Academy-class, the aim of the model is to strengthen the partnership between academy and schools and districts, which is designed to address three main challenges: to promote meaningful learning in classrooms by co-teaching, integrating two adults working simultaneously in the classroom; Improving the training of college students' and the professional development of experienced teachers (Ministry of Education, 2014).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Pedagogical Training (Practicum)

The main role of teacher training is to train students to act according to the teaching professor as a teacher (Lem, 1989). The process of formal training for teaching is based on theoretical learning and on practical experience. The two processes: theoretical education and practicum are supposed to constitute comprehensive work-training environment for the trainees. This is to reach the wisdom of action, which is a set of simple practical principles and criteria that characterize coping with teaching situations, reflecting the level of cognitive and emotional awareness in constructing a system of preferences for what is essential in unique practical situations and finding and to find possible ways of dealing with them (Evans, 2007). The wisdom of action comes with the help of theory, which fulfills the need for order and verification of the phenomena that occur during practical experience (Lunenburg & Korthagen, 2009).

Practicum is a significant factor in the process of professional socialization (Reichenberg and Sagi, 2003); it also deals with reality at the time of actual teaching in the school, in the classroom environment, and directly touches the teacher's inner layers; Principles, beliefs and attitudes and a sense of developing professional identity (Lunenburg & Korthagen, 2009).

The goals of pedagogical training are exposing the student teachers to theoretical knowledge in teaching, and deepening the understanding between the practical level and the theoretical one (Korthagen & Lagerwerf, 2001). Other goals are: exposing the students to didactic aspects, designing study units, teaching methods and instructions (Khalil and Assadi, 2005).

Providing an opportunity for the students to learn from their personal experience (Khalil and Assadi, 2005) and developing reflective thinking that increases the wisdom of practice to the learners. In addition, it exposes their personal knowledge to them, (Dickman,2005).

According to (Zmora, 1990) the student in formulating their educational approach and positions and development of perspective, orientation and approach (Parkison, 2008a) and raising students' awareness of the fact that practical experience is a developmental process that is influenced by the personal and cultural characteristics of those who are prepared to teach (Awad and others, 2009). From the macro-political context (Parkison 2008b), from the structure of the training program and from the organizational environment in which the practicum takes place (Kagan, 1992).

The pedagogical training constructed upon three main pillars that are interwoven: the pedagogical instructor, the college student, and the training teacher. All three typically work towards a common goal, but each assumes a different responsibility in the process. This triangle creates a complex relationship with many faces. Some scholars have attached great importance to this relationship and its future influence on the image and the resonance of the students (Zilberstein, 2005).

The role of the pedagogical guide is to promote the personal development of the trainees. Besides, it is expected to provide them with psycho-social support to promote a professional approach and to address the range of training skills necessary to promote the norms and standards for proper implementation of the required teaching tasks at the classroom (Emmanuel, 2005).

The role of the training teacher is to open the classroom to the trainees, help them build the required activities, monitor their performance and scientifically analyze their work. The training teachers are exposed in their work to the students and serve as a role model (Zimmerman, 2000). In other words, they must present a model worthy of imitation, a model that will enable students to be successful teachers who are interested and capable of introducing changes and innovations in their work (Ziv, 1990).

A Major role of the students in the process of practicum is to cooperate with the pedagogical instructor and the training teacher, acting in accordance with the given instructions, initiating and seeking the knowledge and resources required for their professional development, developing effective communication with their academic environment (Khalil and Assadi, 2005).

Other attitudes that learners need to exhibit are showing openness and willingness to seek help and consultation (Segal, Ezer and Gilat, 2009); expressing willingness to cope with different situations in teaching (Evans, 2007); developing a variety of teaching methods that will enable him to respond to the students' needs and to the different learning styles of each student (Eshet and Dagani, 2000).

In Zoabi & Awad (2012), students and pedagogical training evaluators may be aware that the beginning of the training process is not always the appropriate time for the student teachers to focus on the school students in particular, to learn about the formative and summative assessment, about openness and acceptance of criticism. These issues are becoming relevant to the trainees only later on, after they become free from preoccupation with the self, the need to survive and after gaining self-confidence.

#### **PDS (Professional Development Schools) Model**

(Professional development schools) is a broad-spectrum approach, under which under lie numerous specifics and relevant details. The novelty of this approach lies in the grand shift that it introduces to the classical role of the school. It simply suggests that schools are not merely an environment where pupils gain new and continuous knowledge, rather an integrated environment where novice teachers have their very own fair chance of learning, prosperity, and original experience.

The PDS Model first appeared in 1986 in the Holmes group report, *The Tomorrow Teachers*. The PDS model combines elements such as the (Clark, 1990), the School for Experimentation, (Goodlad, 1990), and this model refers more to a school as a laboratory, or a place for clinical development of novice teachers; a new type of school (Holmes, 1990). Unlike the traditional model, the PDS model creates a partnership between the schools and the institution that trains the students (Ariav, 2011; Zilberstein, 1995). This training model provides the students with the opportunity to learn the teaching while practicing in schools.

Among the most important **assets** that this approach actively employs is experienced teachers. In the geographical region where the study was conducted, a teacher with a minimum of 10 years of experience is labeled an **expert teacher**. Typically, a novice teacher at a school is assigned to one of the prior of, at least, two months. During the two-month period, novice teachers accompany their expert colleagues in class; help them with the conducting of exams, evaluation, and class preparation.

Ariav (2006) considers the partnership, an opportunity for simultaneous professional development for the student teachers in the training institution, and school staff. (Cochran-Smith, 1991) describe three possible models for this partnership: the model of consent, the model of incompatibility, and the partnership model. Darling-Hammond (1998) describe professional development schools as spaces where the students and the training teacher make learning experiential based on teacher's questions, cooperative, and dialogue.

The PDS is a concept related to the process of **restructuring**. This process should include organizational structural changes, teacher remodeling, resource allocation, improvements in teaching and learning processes, and changes in relationships between teachers, principals, supervisors, and students, and institutions of higher education (Murphy, 1990). The aim of this process is to develop models of schools with institutional structures that will support improved social and academic learning of schoolchildren, and an improvement in teachers' pedagogical training (Levine, 1990).

Assadi and Murad (2017) conclude that trainees are more convinced that they made more professional and correct choice of career after the implementation of the program, in addition, the student teachers' attitude towards the pedagogical instructor, the training teacher, and the school students was higher after the implementation of the model. As best practice development models, professional development schools are becoming the most effective places for clinical training for future teachers. There is ample evidence that students are being retained or their practicum as a strong factor in their professional preparation (Goodlad, 1990; Levine, 1990).

Another goal of the PDS model is that the whole school should be involved in the training of the student teacher, not just the pedagogical instructor (Goodlad, 1990; Clark, 1990). Professional development schools operate with the appropriate orientation, and the approach must reflect the geographic, ethnic and economic diversity of the student population in the society (Zimper, 1990; Holmes Group, 1990). It is clear, that the number of designated

PDS sites is, in fact, relatively small, since the preparation and training of intern teachers will not be the task of most schools, as the Holmes Group (1990) has noted. The establishment and operation of professional development school is a result of collaboration between the Academy and local schools (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Holmes Group, 1990; Kennedy, 1990).

The PDS model has a number of drawbacks, such as the consumption of large resources (Zimper, 1990), a mismatch in programs that combine schools and institutions (Goodlad, 1990). Few schools can join the proposed PDS model, so the teachers will have to prepare themselves for competition for a place to the desired training program (Zimpher, 1990).

The model of the Professional Development School (PDS) currently implemented in the training program of the academic colleges in Israel, it is based on the principles of partnership as a leading value and on the mutual concern and commitment to promote and develop all the factors involved in this partnership in general (Ariav, 2001; Zelberstein, 1995).

### **The Pedagogical Guide**

The field of practicum is known to play a vital role in teacher training programs. Student teachers generally describe their professional experience as the most important and relevant aspect of their program at large (Ferrier-Kerr, 2009; Standal, Moen, & Moe, 2014), partly because they appreciate the opportunity to be with expert teachers in the training ((Hennissen, Korthagen & Bergen, 2011). A discussion of pedagogical guidance and mentoring sessions allows teachers to begin to identify their actual types of knowledge Such as practical knowledge (Fenstermacher, 1994), professional knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996), and conditional knowledge (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2004).

Kessels and Korthagen (1996), note that the nature of practical knowledge revealed through training conversations is structured. The event is context-based, that is, through mentoring conversations, instructors have a great influence on how and what student teachers are learning (Edwards & Protheroe, 2004). Pedagogic instruction should accelerate the process of receiving experiences by trainees (Ericsson, 2006), while increasing their level of participation in the knowledge-building process.

Despite the fact that pedagogical instructors serve in different roles and serve as different functionaries (Hennissen, Crasborn, Brouwer, Korthagen & Bergen, 2008), a crucial and central role in training is related to the ways in which experienced teachers and colleagues assist the student teachers.

In this model, the instructor not only trains the students, but also facilitates them to be part of the school (Ariav, 2001). Following the activity of the pedagogical guide in the PDS model, the relationship between the training factors is strengthened and the degree of anxiety of all the factors decreases. The meetings between the student teachers, the training teachers and the pedagogical instructors in an organized framework contribute to bridging gaps and problems, and contribute to the professional development of all the partners (Abdur, 2004).

According to (Gross, 2015), PDS pre-service teacher candidates' perceptions of readiness mirrored the level of self-efficacy expressed by the traditional cohort. Both pre-service teacher candidate groups spoke highly which focused on how to address aspects of student diversity. These pre-service teacher candidates identified that this course provided them with important background information on various student exceptionalities, provided the opportunity to examine IEPs and behavioral plans, and discussed the role that differentiation played in meeting students' needs. Many traditional and PDS pre-service teacher candidates discussed that in their other courses teacher educators created an awareness surrounding differentiation, but they felt unprepared in knowing exactly what tools to use for particular subject areas.

The pedagogical guides are required for unique skills in order to fulfill their role (Milat, 1999). The instructors will change their training skills. This includes encouragement, counseling, and professional support (Anderson & Shanon, 1988). The pedagogical guide is required in this model for skills, communication, and organization in schools and academy (Koster, 1996).

### **The Research Objectives and Questions**

The main objective of the study is to examine the effectiveness of the PDS model as perceived by pedagogical instructors.

In light of this, the research questions derived from the central goal are:

1. What are the characteristics of the PDS instructional model that contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the practical process of student teachers?
2. What are the dimensions of the pedagogic instructor's knowledge of the perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs of the trainees in the effective implementation of the PDS training model?
3. What are the factors that delay the implementation of the PDS training model?
4. What are the main characteristics of the pedagogical instructor in the effective PDS model?
5. What would change / emphasize / negate the principles and working methods of the PDS model for increasing its effectiveness? In addition, to what extent is this model sensitive to discipline?

## ENVIRONMENT OF THE STUDY

It is of utmost important to show under what conditions the proposed PDS model will be effective. Thus, we need to point out the ambient in which the PDS program could be at its best as an educational approach. Presences of expert teachers, appropriate school facilities, managerial cooperation, presence of qualified teacher-students, and a collaborative, dialogue-rich school climate are all indispensable factors in the success of such approach. Availability of technological tools, appropriate facilities, cooperative principals, and methodical plans of actions are also elements of success for any proposed PDS model.

Despite the fact that all the prior factors could be readily available, certain challenges, difficulties, and liabilities may occur. According to leading research, lack of motivation that results from work pressure could threaten the success of the program at large. Certain expert teachers may not have the time, the means, or the incentive to be part of such programs. The prior could also compromise the program's chances of success. Besides, many school teachers and principals are in fact convinced with the significance of the program, nonetheless, the school resources where they work may not be exactly as needed to host or endorse such experiments.

Certain points must be taken into account when using the proposed experience by practicing teachers in pedagogical practice, of which:

- The geo-political and the socio-economic circumstances surrounding the societies where the target schools are.
- The cultural, professional and educational background of the ministries of education and higher education that the study population belongs to.
- The level of readiness by the schools and the institutions that are involved or directly related to the program.
- Perceptions and attitudes of the participants regarding the PDS program as an educational and professional approach.

## METHDOLOGY

This study is based on the qualitative approach by an open questionnaire and individual interviews. The questionnaire was distributed among pedagogical supervisors according to PDS training model. In qualitative research, the paradigm is constructivist and is the construction that the researchers do for the entire process. The qualitative method enables the collection and processing of data (an open questionnaire) in an analysis mechanism, and the exposure of subjective phenomena and beliefs. Through the priors, the researchers will try to understand phenomena as they occur in the subjective reality of the interviewees, while trying to trace their personal and subjective points of view as they experienced it (Shakedi, 2003).

### Participants of the Research

In the present study, 10 out of 14 pedagogical instructors in the study, who constitute approximately 71.0% of all instructors who work according to PDS model in the pedagogical training at Sakhnin College for Teacher education.

**Table 1: Demographic and professional characteristics of the instructors**

Anonymous Name	Gender	Age group	Seniority in Training	qualification	Previous Training model	Educational institution Type	Training subject
Instructor 1	F	40-50	10+	Ph.D.	Traditional	Special education	Special Education
Instructor 2	F	20-30	5	MA	Traditional	Special Education	Special education
Instructor 3	F	30-40	5	Ph.D.	Traditional	Primary	Special Education
Instructor 4	F	40-50	10+	Ph.D.	Traditional PDS	Primary	Early childhood
Instructor 5	F	30-35	10+	Ph.D.	Traditional	Primary	Early childhood
Instructor 6	M	40-50	5	Ph.D.	Traditional	Primary	Mathematics
Instructor 7	F	40-50	10+	MA	Traditional PDS	Intermediate	English
Instructor 8	F	50+	6-10	MA	Traditional	Primary	Early childhood
Instructor 9	F	40-50	5	MA	Traditional	Primary	Early childhood
Instructor 10	M	50	6-10	MA	Traditional	Primary	Arabic

Table 1 shows that the majority study participants are women, most of them over the age of 40, and some of them over the age of 50, of whom five are with seniority over 10 years, half have PhDs and the others have master's degrees. Only two of them had prior knowledge with the PDS model, most of them conducting their instruction in primary schools, two in special education schools, and one in a junior high school,

## Research Instrument

### Open Questionnaire

In the questionnaire, the participants express their opinion on the research subject according to clear questions. Via the questionnaire, attempts are made to reach a subjective understanding of the interrogators (Zabar-Ben-Joshua, 1995). This study employed a two-part questionnaire, the first of which included background variables (gender, age, education, instructional site, etc.), and the second included structured open-ended questions for all of the training instructors.

### Research Procedure

In order to collect sufficient and informative research data, and following the detailed explanation of the pedagogical guides on the purpose of the research, the questionnaire was uploaded to the Google Docs system and sent a link through the email address to the training guides, they were asked to use the link for filling out the questionnaire. It was explained to the pedagogical instructors that the answers will be anonymous and used for research purpose. The participants were also told that there are no correct or incorrect answers when filling out the questionnaire and that everyone will answer to the best of their understanding, opinion and feelings.

### Data Analysis

The questionnaire analysis process was carried out in several steps until the final findings were obtained. The researchers performed as follows:

**Encoding:** All questionnaire responses were read sequentially to obtain an overall picture, allowing for a deeper understanding of the content obtained. In this way, it is possible to locate and define the main themes common to all interviews.

**Mapping categories:** Data analysis was done through content analysis of the answers, each sentence that was said in the context of the phenomenon being analyzed and divided into categories and subcategories respectively, examining the meaning of the texts and their linking, and each category was accompanied by examples and quotes from the interviews.

## Findings

To answer the research question, the researchers derived a number of questions and they are:

1. What are the characteristics of the PDS training model that contribute to increasing the effect of practicum process on the trainees?
2. How does the PDS model promote the pedagogical ability of the students in the content field?
3. What are the main characteristics and skills that this model promotes among the students?
4. What are the characteristics and features of the pedagogical instructor in this model?
5. What would you change/focus/eliminate PDS principles and instruction to increase its effectiveness?

The experimental work that could be noticed throughout the study could be concretized by the finding of the study. It is clear from the results that the PDS model as an educational approach is not only beneficial, but also critical to the educational process at large. Findings of the study show that such approach could be the difference between a novice teacher who will be deprived from the chance of continued education, and one who could continue to develop merely by presence at school. The prior is attributed to the fact that within such approach, a school is a vibrant and dynamic source of knowledge where novice teacher could in fact be lab researchers of pedagogy, rather than deliverers of information and facilitators of the educational process.

### 1. Characteristics of training model

PDS pre-service teacher candidates saw daily contact time with their school as positively influencing their perceptions of readiness for the teaching time. Learning became highly contextual, and as a result pre-service teacher candidates were provided with more opportunities, over a longer time frame, to engage in the process of praxis. Ongoing contact enabled pre-service teacher to engage in more collaboration and ongoing formative feedback. In addition, some pre-service teacher candidates spoke of having more opportunities to correct mistakes, which they perceived would not have been possible in the traditional model's rigid time schedule that excluded re-do opportunities (Gross, 2015).

The findings of this study agree with the study of (Gross, 2015) above. The student-teachers are exposed to a very high rate of concentrated knowledge, while lack for the practical side of the paradigm. According to this study, the school comes to the rescue by contextualizing the learning-teaching experience for novice students.

The pedagogical instructors' answers contained a great deal of information about the characteristics of the training model, among other things the instructors mentioned characteristics related to effective classroom leadership, advancing the teaching instruction, others related to the classroom management, managing relationships with various factors in and outside the classroom.

The first feature related to the coordination between the trainer and the trainees, one of the interviewees noted that the training model allows for great and optimal coordination between the instructor and his students in everything related to lesson plans and adjusting the study material.

Among the most outstanding distinctive features of the model are **sustainability** and **affordability**. As expert teachers are readily available almost all-year-round, the need for specialized trainers for novice teachers diminishes. Research shows that expert teachers are highly motivated to provide their novice colleagues with all the necessary facilities, expertise, and tools that they need to progress. The prior scenario suggests that the need of outside intervention is deemed unnecessary. Besides, the schools facilities, technologies and materials are always available in abundance to novice teachers to use, apply, and benefit from free of charge. We could conclude from the prior that costly, specialized training facilities; like labs and training center have in fact become the school itself, which ensures an affordable, practical, reliable, and sustainable model for generations to come.

Instructor (1): "A student in practicum should be ready to teach the lesson while building a lesson plan in coordination with the instructor and coach", another instructor noted that the PDS model allows him to understand the needs of the students and be coordinated with him and available at any stage and subject. "Using the model that you feel close and available to the trainees, the time that the student spends in the field is relatively long, the communication I manage, the monitoring and consistency that the model allows make the students feel supported all the time, in any issue he has difficulty or questions.

Another prominent characteristic of the interview findings is the inclusiveness of the model; the model allows instructors to reach all areas in teaching the students, the pedagogical instructors pointed out classroom management skills, exchanging knowledge, mastery of teaching methods and instructions.

Instructor (1): "Mastery of effective lesson planning, showing respect to the students", Instructor (4): "The student must demonstrate technical ability in preparing units and individual lessons, adapting instructions and teaching strategies to the students, managing beneficial relationships with them.

## 2. Development of student abilities in the field of content in the training model:

As can be seen, the research population sees the professional and technical field as a key component in every training model, therefore the researchers ask the participants to report on the contribution of the model to the students' professional and pedagogical development. The participants were asked how the training model that they used increases (if at all) the students' self-learning and gives them tools and skills in the lesson plan? Give an example that reflects self-learning and effective lesson plan.

Another instructor stated, "The student chooses a particular study unit and applies it to a specific population. Provides the student with tools and skills in planning the lessons," another adds: "Self-learning takes place in all stages of planning and performing the activity / lesson and especially in the reflection stage. Another instructor expanded his answer and noted "Lesson plan requires in-depth disciplinary knowledge, the ability to access the material to the characteristics of diverse learners, also requires a student to adapt knowledge from informative information to conclusions and finally design meaningful learning.

From the answers above it can be noted that the pedagogical instructors place great emphasis on adapting the content learned to the planning and teaching methods, the instructors were asked how the practical work model used by you increases (if at all) the matching between the lesson planning and the actual procedure of the lesson. The researchers asked the participants if they could give an example that expresses planning versus implementation. The instructors' answers were not unified, and they did not unanimously that the practicum model increases the fit between lesson planning and its implementation by the students, one of the instructors says this very clearly: "

Another participant stated that the model creates more room for flexibility for instant changes, there are more modifications, adjustments, or alterations required. Another instructor says the following, "In my opinion regardless of the model, each student and any subject matter he chooses must match the design and implementation of teaching, another participant noted that, the student learns how to build a lesson plan, and how to formulate goals and objectives within the framework of studies at the college. The conclusion was made with the coaching teacher to go over the set, review it and adapt it to the needs of the students.

As mentioned above, one of the characteristics of an effective lesson is the achievement of the teaching goals in that lesson. So we asked the participants about the impact of the model to increase students' understanding and focus on the goal and the theme the lesson topic they teach. "The last instructor stated that: " Knowledge of subject matter in accordance with the curriculum help.

In addition to the technical areas and classroom management, (PDS) model increases the effectiveness of student-teacher communication. The researchers ask the participants to give examples of the contribution of PDS model to student-teacher communication; some of the answers indicate the model's contribution to strengthening teacher-student communication: "Activities and workshops to enrich the toolbox in communication".



Along with communication and thinking skills, we asked the instructors whether the model increases students' interest in learning. We wanted to test whether the PDS model confers increased enthusiasm for learning; the pedagogical instructors indirectly stated that the model does contribute to increasing students' enthusiasm. The subjects indicated that the model allows focus on teaching instruction or that the model allows feedback on teaching methods at the cognitive level, Social and emotions learning and involving the student in the process.

One of the instructors noted, "The feedback and reflection that the student fills allows him to see the effect of his performance on the students emotionally, socially, and cognitively". Another participant explains: "Success in achieving lesson goals, tackling new challenges, is rewarding. Therefore, the students must understand training tasks from easy to difficult". Another instructor notes: "The model emphasizes the active learning of students and the diverse teaching instructions of the student.

### 3- Features and skills that the PDS model promotes

From the participants' answers, we can relate to a number of features and skills that the PDS model promotes among students. In the category of thinking skills, we found that the model promotes creativity and thinking outside the box; one should emphasize that thinking outside the box has become an important component in teacher education. The instructor above emphasized this, but among the study participants, the contribution of the PDS, to creativity was controversial when the supervisors did not state clearly that the model enables creativity to students. Others noted that the pedagogical instructor is the most important factor in teacher training. The supervisor encourages creativity, promotes educational initiative in accordance with the basics of the PDS model, and diversity in teaching methods, using a variety of aids "Even when trainers referred to the model they did explicitly state that the model encourages creativity:" The model in nature emphasizes the emotional, cognitive social aspects.

Another instructor notes, "The model enhances the use of 21st century skills that require creativity". He also added, "the model by nature enables innovation to the school and added value, role-playing films", moreover, the instructor and the coaching teacher cooperate and allow free creativity for students".

One instructor stated, "The student is asked to conduct activities that emphasize a different aspect each time: cognitive, emotional, social, motor, etc., which allow her to expand the way of looking at the skills that a student should acquire in the learning process. "The last instructor said, "Creativity and diversity are made possible by providing an opportunity for an educational initiative within the school framework, in addition to guidance for the use of diverse types of teaching, individually, in groups and collaboratively.

Some participants noted that reflective thinking is closely related to receiving feedback, and the participant were asked how the practicum model they use increases their ability to receive criticism or feedback and act in class based on the insights of the feedback or reflection. The instructors believe that PDS model encourages students to receive criticism because the model itself is built on reflection and feedback; the model exposes the student to positive feedback that pushes him or her to improve his performance. Another instructor stated, "the model allows for a cross-evaluation between the training teacher and the instructor who makes him know what and how can be improved".

The study population gave different responses regarding the contribution of the PDS; some pedagogical instructors do not believe that it depends on the model but on the student's personality while others believe that the model encourages students to take responsibility. For example, one of the instructor's stated, "in the beginning of each year, the students receive instructions regarding their areas of responsibility in practical work, which is essential and necessary for the teacher".

Regarding the independence of the students, the participants reported that the PDS increases the sense independence among the trainees because their production at the end of the year indicates mental and creative independence. Moreover, the model gives freedom of choice to the students, which increases their independence of action. The model challenges the trainees and leads to mental and operational independence. The model motivates and makes trainees believe in their abilities and encourages initiatives.

Besides the skills of thinking and individual work with the trainees, the model enables collaborative work with other students, training teacher, instructor and school staff, and thus experiencing teamwork. Some participants reported that the many reflection talks on the topic of teamwork are constantly rising and are considered an important element in the educational endeavor of the student.

### 4. The pedagogical instructors' features in PDS model

The instructors' answers were very diverse; one of the features that stood out in most of the instructors was the proficiency of the instructor in the field of content. "The model challenges the pedagogical instructor and asks for information in the depth of the subjects taught. In order to be effective, it is necessary to know the content area closely, the requirements of the students, society and the community and the curriculum. Another participant clarifies: "First of all, the pedagogical instructor must discover knowledge in the field of content and teaching instructions for delivering lessons, it must serve as a source of consultation for the students and a renewable asset for their career.

The researchers found additional features of allowing a discourse, "the instructor should initiate a discourse with the trainees, with the factors related to teaching in school and college, internal discourse within the group and

even personal discourse among themselves". The pedagogical instructor needs to be flexible and attentive to the needs of the trainees, reaching a study framework in the field itself is completely different from the theoretical study in college". "The feedback activity is very important in the work of the instructor and he should be skilled in providing feedback and managing it".

Another pedagogical guide referred to the fact that the guide should allow collaborative work "I assume that teaching work today requires cooperation between all parties involved in it, and therefore the instructor should be skilled in collaborative work".

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The main purpose of the research is to examine the effectiveness of the PDS training model in accordance with the perception of pedagogical instructors. To answer the research question, the researchers derived a number of questions and they are:

1. What are the characteristics of the PDS training model that contribute to increasing the effect of practicum process on the trainees?
2. How does the PDS model promote the pedagogical ability of the students in the content field?
3. What are the main characteristics and skills that this model promotes among the students?
4. What are the characteristics and features of the pedagogical instructor in this model?
5. What would you change/focus/eliminate PDS principles and instruction to increase its effectiveness?

The main objective of teacher training is to train students to act in accordance with the teaching profession as a teacher (Lem, 1989). The formal teaching process is based on theoretical material and practical experience. The two processes, theoretical learning and pedagogical training are supposed to be the guide for students in order to reach the wisdom of action. It is a system of practical and simple principles and criteria that characterize coping with teaching situations, and reflects the level of cognitive and emotional awareness in building a system of priorities for what is essential in unique practical situations and finding possible courses of action to address them (Evans, 2007).

Lem (1989) emphasizes the aspect of student-teacher transitions. The prior is compatible with the finding of this study which views the school climate as an open-laboratory environment which facilitates this transition.

Depending on the goals of teaching trainees, the PDS model does not deviate from the other models; in fact, emphasizes the process of professional socialization of the students. In addition, the pedagogical instructors who participated in this study emphasized the subject of teaching as a profession and demonstrated well their work in this field, throughout the interviews, the instructors addressed the content side, the teaching itself, the teaching strategies, the lesson planning. This is to increase interest in learning, and develop thinking among their students, but at the same time, they emphasized other aspects of training such as, communication between teachers and students, working with other trainee, and inner dialogue.

This finding is supported by the study of (Reichenberg and Sagi, 2003) that stresses the role of training; practicum is a significant factor in the process of professional socialization and interaction. Moreover, the practicum as it deals with reality during the actual teaching in the school, in the classroom environment and directly touches the inner layers of the teacher; Principles, beliefs and attitudes and the evolving sense of professional identity (Lunenbergl & Korthagen, 2009). Here, (Reichenberg and Sagi, 2003) support the notion that active communication and interaction are a byproduct of the implementation of the model.

The study is supported by the previous study of (Ferrier-Kerr, 2009; Standal, Moen, & Moe, 2014). They both point to the notion that pedagogical instructors emphasized the effectiveness of the PDS model in the field of content in the field of teacher training. Both studies described the actual practice of the students, which indicated the effectiveness of this model. Moreover, it is not surprising to emphasize pedagogical training in the field over other areas since trainees usually describe their professional experience as the most important and relevant aspect of their program

The instructors strongly emphasized the feedback, reflection and cooperation of the students; mentoring conversations allows the students to start identifying their types of knowledge in practice, such as practical knowledge (Fenstermacher, 1994), professional knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996), and conditional knowledge (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2004). The research literature reports that the PDS model has a number of shortcomings, such as resource consumption (Zimpher, 1990), and a mismatch in programs that integrate schools and instrumentation institutions (Goodlad, 1990). Few schools can join the proposed PDS model as the program could be highly demanding for schools located in unfortunate societies.

Trainees will therefore need to prepare themselves for a competition for a place in training (Zimpher, 1990). The study population emphasized logistics as one of the most important areas to change in the guidance model, training of pedagogical instructors, etc. They did not address resources. The guidance model discussed in this research is an effective and comprehensive training model, according to the study population, which emphasized the contribution of the model on the development of the trainees who knows how to teach an effective lesson, one who is aware of the characteristics of an effective classroom, and an effective lesson. The model allows the student to experiment in depth at school and apply the theoretical knowledge they have acquired in their studies, while

supporting and accompanying a sensitive, flexible, knowledgeable pedagogical instructor in the field of content and aware of the needs of students.

PDS is not a new concept in education; it is rather a renewed one. When comparing this model of the 21<sup>st</sup> century to its classical counterpart, staggering distinctions arise. In the area of curricula, most PDS pre-service teacher candidates expressed having stronger perceptions of readiness with the PDS curricula compared to their previous curricula experiences in the traditional route. With regards to understanding curricula, PDS pre-service teacher candidates expressed a lack of conceptual coherence within their traditional model experience. Most PDS pre-service teacher candidates articulated feeling comfortable with deconstructing outcomes in the PDS methodology course, based on the instruction that they had received in this course. PDS pre-service teacher candidates reported that they were taught how to deconstruct outcomes. The modeling of how to deconstruct curricular outcomes and scaffold learning provided PDS pre-service teacher candidates with greater understanding of the [course title] curricula. As a result of their experience in this methodology class, many PDS pre-service teacher candidates expressed having greater confidence working with curricula (Gross, 2015).

The model allows trainees together with their pedagogical instructors to acquire various tools and thinking skills that increase the effectiveness of the model. It can be noted that the model under study allows for constant dialogue and cooperation between all the factors involved in training students to enable them to apply the knowledge learned in a practical framework that has a pedagogical instructor guiding it, allows his growth, gives space to his needs, supports and helps, assesses and gives consistent feedback.

In today's world of information revolution, globalization, and instant access to knowledge; such models are an educational and professional necessity rather than auxiliaries to the educational process. Student teachers who are not able to have first-hand experience of real-life, real-school professional climate are not expected to perform the same as their peers who were actively, effectively, and directly exposed to such rich content and real circumstances.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdur, S. (2004). Evaluation report: Professional development of teachers in the collaborative project. Questionnaire findings for a summative evaluation of a project. Fraternity College. In Hebrew.
2. Anderson, E. M. & Shanon, A.L. (1988). Towards a conceptualization of mentoring. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 13,17-18.
3. Ariav, T. (2001). Teacher and School Training: Another Relationship: Reactions and Thoughts. Discussion Paper No. 6, Tel Aviv: Mofet Institute. In Hebrew.
4. Ariav, T., and Smith, K. (2006). Creating partnerships between teacher training institutions and the field: an international perspective with an emphasis on the School of Professional Development (PDS) model. In: Zilberstein, M., Ben-Peretz, M. and Greenfeld, N. (Eds.). *A new trend in teacher training programs: partnership between colleges and schools - the Israeli story*. Tel Aviv: Mofet Institute, pp. 21-67. In Hebrew.
5. Assadi, N. and Murad, T. (2017). The Effect of the Teachers' Training Model "Academy- Class" on the Teacher Students' Professional Development from Students' Perspectives. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 214-220.
6. Beyer, L. (1984). Field experience, ideology, and the development of critical reflectivity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(3), 36-41.
7. Clark, R. W. (1990). What school leaders can do to help change teacher education? Washington, DC. American association of colleges for teacher's education. (ERIC document No. 335 302).
8. Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Reinventing Student Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42 (2), 104 - 119.
9. Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2004). Practitioner inquiry, knowledge, and university culture. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. xt68ussell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (Vol. 1, pp. 601-649). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
10. Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1996). Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: Teacher stories. *Stories of teachers. School stories. Stories of schools. Educational Researcher*, 25(3), 24-30.
11. Darling- Hammond, L. (1998). Teachers and teaching: Testing policy hypothesis from a national commission report. *Educational Researcher*, 27 (1), 5-15.
12. Dickman, N. (2005). Writing a personal diary-course, as a tool for reflecting and promoting teacher learning processes during their training for facilitation roles as mathematics teacher teachers. Essay for partial fulfillment of the requirements for obtaining the Ph.D. in education. Haifa: The Technion. In Hebrew

13. Edwards, A., & Protheroe, L. (2004). Teaching by proxy: Understanding how mentors are positioned in partnerships. *Oxford Review of Education*, 30, 183-197.
14. Emmanuel, D. (2005). The role of the pedagogical guide from three perspectives. In: M. Silberstein and R. Reichenberg (eds.), *A Renewed Study of the Internship Study Program in Pedagogical Training*. Tel Aviv: Mofet Institute, pp. 106-62. In Hebrew
15. Ericsson, K. A. (2006). Protocol analysis and expert thought: Concurrent verbalizations of thinking during experts' performance on representative tasks. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. Feltovich, & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 223-242). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
16. Eshet, J., & Degani, Z. (2000). One by One: Training Students for teaching in the Apprenticeship Approach. Academic College, Tel Hai, Conference in xperimental Education, Alternative Approaches in Teaching and Training. In Hebrew.
17. Evans, R. (2007). Existing practice is not the template. *Educational Researcher*, 3(9), 560-563.
18. Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Vol. 20. *Review of research in education* (pp. 3-56). Washington D.C: American Educational Research Association.
19. Ferrier-Kerr, J. L. (2009). Establishing professional relationships in practicum settings. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(6), 790-797.
20. Gilad, A. (2005). Training students in school: a practicum program under management and what it allows. *Flight and Act*, 11, 41-21. In Hebrew
21. Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, Jossy- Basscfd.
22. Gross, I. (2015). A Comparative Case Study of the Professional Development School (PDS) and Traditional Pre-Service Teacher Education Models. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*, Volume 7, Issue 1
23. Hennissen, P., Crasborn, F., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2008). Mapping mentor teachers' roles in mentoring dialogues. *Educational Research Review*, 3(2), 168-186.
24. Hennissen, P., Crasborn, F., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2011). Clarifying pre-service teacher perceptions of mentor teachers developing use of mentoring skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 1049-1058.
25. Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI
26. Kagan, M. D. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 129-169.
27. Kennedy, M. M. (1990). Professional development schools. *NCRTE Colloguy*. (ERIC Document Reproduction service No. 326 516).
28. Kessels, J., & Korthagen, F. (1996). The relationship between theory and practice: Back to the classics. *Educational Researcher*, 25(3), 17-22.
29. Khalil, M., and Assadi, C. (2005). The guide for pedagogical supervisors. Sakhnin: Sakhnin College for training teaching staff. In Arabic.
30. Koster, B. (1996). Towards a profile of teacher's educators: Roles and competences. In Ephraty and Lador (Eds). *The second international conference in teacher education: Stability, evolution and revolution*. The Zenman College for physical education and sport sciences. The Wingate institute and Mofet Institute.
31. Korthagen, F. A. J., & Lagerwerf, B. (2001). Teachers' professional learning: How does it work? In F. A. J. Korthagen et al. (Eds.), *Linking theory and practice: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education* (pp. 175-206). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
32. Lem, Ch (1989). Professional development of teachers. *Dapim*, Mofet institute, 6, 6-4.
33. Lazovsky, R., and Schreif, R. (1992). The Early Experience of Teaching Students in the Education System: Difficulties and Contribution. In B. Fresco, and D. Kfir (Eds.), *Ongoing Dialogue: Training for Teaching and Educational Practice*. Tel Aviv: Mofet Institute.
34. Levine, M. (1990). Professional practice schools: Building a model. Washington: American Federation Teachers. Ed 313344.
35. Lunenberg, M., & Korthagen, F. (2009). Experience, theory and practical wisdom in teaching and teacher education, *Teachers and Teaching: theory into practice*, 15(2), 225-240.
36. Milat, S. (1999). What between "Teacher and Teaching" and Pedagogical Guide? The Process of Making a Pedagogical Guide - Case Study, *Maof and Maaseh*, 5, 23-1. In Hebrew

37. Ministry of Education, (December, 2014). Academia – kitta, Partnership for Strengthening Teach. Concluding policy document of the Thinking Team. In Hebrew
38. Murphy, J. (1990). Helping teacher prepare to work in reconstructed schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41 (4), 50-56
39. Levine, M. (1990). Professional practice schools: Building a model. Washington: American Federation Teachers. Ed 313344.
40. Parkison, T.P. (2008a). Field placement treatments: a comparative study, *The Teacher Educator*, 43(1), 29-45.
41. Parkison, T. P. (2008b). Space for performing teacher identity through Kafka and Hegel, *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 14(1), 51-60.
42. Reichenberg, R. (1998). Traing teacher-student interaction as part of the practicum, and its connection to the development of reflective ability. *Dapim*, 26. Hebrew.
43. Reichenberg, R., & Sagi, R. (2003). Existence Styles - Who are you the educator? Tel Aviv: Mofet Institute. Hbrew
44. Zabar Ben Joshua, N. (1995). The qualitative research in teaching and learning. Tel Aviv: Masada. In Hebrew
45. Segal, S., Ezer, H., and Gilat, J. (2009). Stress in Teacher Training and its implications for Teacher Training. MSA, Teaching and Teaching Content Portal, Mofet Institute <http://portal.macam.ac.il/ArticlePage.aspx?id=2561>. Hebrew.
46. Shakedi, A. (2003). Words that try to touch - qualitative research, theory and application. Tel Aviv: Ramot.
47. Standal, Ø. F., Moen, K. M., & Moe, V. F. (2014). Theory and practice in the context of practicum: The perspectives of Norwegian physical education student teachers. *European Physical Education Review*, 20(2), 165-178.
48. Zilberstein, M. (2002). Lines for the specialization program in pedagogical instruction. Working Paper No. 1, Mofet Institute.
49. Zilberstein, M., Paniewski, R., Goz, E. (Eds.) (2005). Training Trial: Pedagogical Instructor - Student - Mentoring Teacher, Recipe for Success or Failure. Working Paper No. 4, Mofet Institute. In Hebrew.
50. Zimmerman, H. (2000). The kindergarten trainer and the art of training. Hed Hagan, Booklet D, Sivan 2004. In Hebrew.
51. Zimpher, N. (1990). Grating professional development school sites. *Theory into Practice*, 29 (1), 42-49.
52. Ziv, S. (1990). Practical experience in training for teaching, problems and approaches. Pages, 10, 43-25. In Hebrew
53. Zmora, D. (1990). Changing professional attitudes and behaviors during teacher training. *Study and Research in Teacher Training*, 1, 97-73. In Hebrew
54. Zoabi, K. & Awad, Y. (2012). Exploring Teaching Training Using Metaphors among Arab Students in Israel. *Creative Education*, 3(2), 217-223.