The Professional Development School Model

Connection between Perceptions held by Teacher Candidates and by Teacher Trainers:

The Case of an Arab College for Education in Israel

**Abstract**

This study examines the impact of the Professional Development School (PDS) model on the interaction between students at an Arab college for teacher training in Israel and the teacher trainers who guide their practical experiences in schools. In addition, it examines correlations between and variance among perceptions of these two groups regarding dimensions of the PDS model. The study populations of 86 teacher candidates and 24 teacher trainers responded to questionnaires designed for each group regarding the implementation of the practical experience aspect of the PDS model. Distribution of questionnaires and data collection was done with the help of pedagogical instructors. It should be noted that this is not a comparative study.

The groups gave a weak assessment of the PDS model as a contribution to teacher training at the case study institution. There are weak or no correlations between the two groups’ responses to various dimensions of the model, indicating gaps between their perspectives. They did not give uniform ratings or evaluation to parallel questionnaire items that describe similar activities related to the model. There are no differences in teacher candidates’ assessment of dimensions of the model according to year of training or specialization. The hypothesis that teacher trainers’ perspectives would differ according to various aspects regarding their professional education and experience.

These findings illustrate superficial implementation of the model at this college. The findings are discussed and practical suggestions to implement the model more effectively are made. Limitations of the study are discussed and directions for future research on the subject proposed.
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**Introduction**

The rationale for this study is based on the ongoing discussion and knowledge emerging from previous studies on teacher training using the Professional Development School (PDS) model (Damore, Kapustka, & McDevitt, 2011; Ikpeze, Broikou, Hildenbrand, & Gladstone-Brown, 2012; Vrijnsen-de Corte, Brok, Kamp, & Bergen, 2013). These studies address central issues related to implementation of the model in teacher training institutions and schools, and the renewed roles of pedagogical instructors, teacher trainers, and teacher candidates.

The institute considered in the current case study is the Al-Qasemi Academic College of Education, located in the Haifa District in Israel. Al-Qasemi, founded as an institute of Islamic Studies, is certified by the Council for Higher Education in Israel. Al-Qasemi adopted the PDS model as one of the training frameworks it uses to realize its declared goals for teacher candidates: (a) improving the training and professional development of teacher candidates; (b) linking the academic culture of teacher training institutes with the practical culture of teaching and educational activity in schools; (c) improving the quality of practical teaching experiences in schools; and (d) improving the level of proficiency of teachers in subjects that are priorities in the Israeli education system in general, and the Arab-sector education system in Israel in particular. The Al-Qasemi Academic College views one of the main factors influencing effective and quality teaching as being the degree of partnership between the college and the educational field, and especially its partnership with the staff members who fulfill the role of teacher trainers.

It should be noted that using the PDS model involves a great deal of commitment and investment of economic and human resources. During teacher training, organizational and professional difficulties may arise that create gaps between expectations of the role of the teacher trainer based on the conceptual model and the actual teacher trainer’s role that emerges in practical experience (Maskit & Mevurach, 2013). These gaps may limit the benefits of teacher training programs using this model.

In light of the importance that the PDS model accords to the contribution of teacher trainers in improving the training processes, the current research broadly examines the interactions between teacher candidates and teacher trainers.

**Theoretical Background**

**Teacher Training in Israel**

The term “teacher candidates” refers to education students and pre-service teachers. Teacher trainers are experienced, professional teachers who take on the role of ensuring that teacher candidates are equipped with the necessary teaching skills, values, and a commitment to improve student learning. Training programs for teacher candidates in Israel operate via two separate systems. One system is part of the teaching certificate programs offered by university faculties of education, and the other is through colleges of education. Al-Qasemi is a college of education that operates in the Arab sector of Israeli society. The college’s charter highlights the social changes necessary to address the challenges facing the Arab education system in Israel. It draws on research recommendations and evaluations of teacher training programs in order to improve the quality of its training.

**PDS Model for Teacher Training**

There is widespread agreement that training should be made more meaningful for teacher candidates. Researchers have suggested strengthening the link between academic training and practical experience by exposing teacher candidates to a wide range of activities in a school environment (Waege & Haugalokken, 2013). The philosophy of the PDS model is based on constructivist learning theory. The PDS model, currently implemented in many teacher training programs, is based on the guiding principle of partnership as a value. It necessitates a commitment among all stakeholders to work towards developing a mutually beneficial partnership and mutual learning (Linton & Gordon, 2015; Neapolitan & Levine, 2011). Thus, through field experiences, a PDS provides opportunities for stakeholders to engage in pedagogic discourse, share their visions, and apply educational approaches in various contexts (Hollins, 2015). This reflects an understanding of education as being created socially and culturally. Therefore, academic advisors at universities, pedagogic instructors in teacher training colleges, and mentors for teachers in schools are all expected to adopt epistemic planning and evaluation methods that provide every teacher candidate with opportunities to teach in a classroom (Linton & Gordon, 2015). At the same time, the learning experiences they offer must be effective, cohesive, and promote continuity and professional consistency (Parsons, Parker, Daoud, Bruyning, Gallagher, & Groth, 2016).

According to the PDS model, the emphasis in practical training should be on cooperation and a reciprocal relationship between the academic institution (university or teacher training college) and the educational field (schools and kindergartens). The direction should be toward establishment of a true partnership among the supporting organizations and educational institutions. They should be active partners in the training process. Teachers at all grade levels should be considered partners in the achievement of educational teaching (Maskit & Mevurach, 2013). In this model of training, teacher candidates are guided through experiences teaching in the field (Moore, 2010; Zeichner, 2010).

Clearly, division of roles and responsibilities between the stakeholders (partners) is an essential component of the operation of the PDS. The faculty at the teacher training college or university, teacher trainers, pedagogic instructors, and school officials all must have adequate expertise in terms of content and pedagogy so they can deliberately and consistently facilitate the desired learning outcomes of teacher candidates, and provide a context for proper training (Linton & Gordon, 2015). Moreover, all partners should clearly define their avenues of involvement in this partnership. This helps establish a collaborative structure, which is essential for shaping meaningful experiences for teacher candidates (Kolpin, Shoemaker, Cosenza, Allen, Cary, Ensey, McCambridge, Morris, & Trotter, 2015). They link the academic culture of the institution with the culture of instruction and educational activity in schools. All partners, regardless of role, should have opportunities for pedagogical growth as a result of their participation (Rust & Clift, 2015). The essence of the PDS model is the creation of learning communities in which all stakeholders continually learn, explore, and develop professionally.

The National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS, 2008) defines and delineates nine essential elements of the PDS. For the current research, we refer only to the first four elements:

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;
2. A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;
3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants.

Partner institutions in a PDS share responsibility for achieving five goals: (a) to maximize the learning and achievement of teacher candidates through development and implementation of exemplary practices; (b) to engage in ongoing exploration of teaching practice; (c) to enrich teacher training and student achievement; (d) to ensure significant and continuous professional development; (e) to train effective new teachers.

As noted above, the PDS model is based on the premise that the training institution can improve the quality of training by providing teacher candidates with practical experience in an authentic and relevant environment backed by a supportive professional framework (Avdor, 2013). In the PDS model, teacher candidates are accompanied by trainers and pedagogical instructors. By taking part in various guided teaching and educational activities in schools, they experience a gradual and ongoing encounter with the teaching profession and deepen their familiarity with the school as an organizational and cultural system. As part of this experiential framework, groups of approximately eight teacher candidates have practice experience in a school one day per week. In addition, they take part in a week-long intensive program during the second semester of the academic year, during which they become familiar with the school (or kindergarten) system. During these experiential training days, teacher candidates observe lessons; teach various disciplines under the guidance of a veteran teacher; undertake personal educational projects in the school (such as mentoring a student or group of students); conduct private tutoring; participate in a wide range of school activities and projects; meet with staff members; analyze issues in education as part of individual and group instruction; and more. The partnership between the academic institution and the school makes this type of broad experience possible.

**Benefits of PDS model to teacher candidates.** Previous research testifies to the contribution and positive results of using the PDS model in the training of teacher candidates (Sandoval-Lucero, Shanklin, Sobel, Townsend, Davis, & Kalisher, 2011). The model helps challenge and change stereotypes about the teaching profession (Stairs, 2011). It encourages ongoing growth among teacher candidates (Armstrong, Rudolph, & Austin 2011). Recent research indicates that teacher candidates in programs using the PDS model display higher degrees of self-efficacy (Nodine, Reece, & Roberts, 2016). They are more willing to take initiative in new realms of educational practice, and acquire greater instructional experience, as compared with their peers who undergo a traditional training program (Willhite, McIntyre, & Willhite, 2008). Moreover, they develop and maintain more effective teaching strategies than do teacher candidates trained in a traditional environment (Stallings & Kowalski, 2011).

In specific, the practical experience gained through the PDS model improves teacher candidates’ perceptions of themselves as professionals, instills them with greater confidence, and improves the proficiency of their teaching skills (Snow, Flynn, Whisenand, & Mohr, 2016). It upgrades existing attitudes among teacher candidates (Walling & Lewis, 2012). This practical experience provides them with a foundation which helps them become successful novices and satisfactorily fulfill their new roles. These experiences lead to progress in a variety of standard and prestigious certification measures (Theiss & Grigsby, 2010) and improve the level of learning among graduates (Rice, Merves, & Brown, 2011).

The PDS environment is seen as a critical component in giving teachers leadership potential (Cosenza, 2013), and especially in developing educational leadership (Rieckhoff & Larsen, 2012). It improves students’ success in teaching, and increases their self-sufficiency and self-regulation (Heafner & Spooner, 2008). A quantitative analysis revealed a significant improvement in the time management skills of teacher candidates in PDS (Castle, Fox, & Fuhrman, 2009). The practical experiences in schools make them more culturally sensitive and responsive (Pohan, Ward, Kouzekanani, & Boatright, 2009). They exhibit a higher degree of presence and mindfulness (Cuddapah, Masci, Smallwood, & Holland, 2008). Teacher candidates in a PDS environment report personal and professional growth (Polizzi, 2009). They have a higher probability of remaining in the profession (Neapolitan, Hartzler-Miller, Kenreich, Wiltz, Schafer, Proffitt, Kirmani, & Bolton, 2008). They tend to focus more on self-reflection, and the reflective feedback they receive deepens their integration into the processes of teaching and learning. They are more willing to discuss various assessments of their work (Castle, Fox, & Fuhrman, 2009). They use innovative pedagogical approaches that better support students’ learning (Castle, Rockwood, & Tortora, 2008). The model’s contribution is further reflected in participants’ ability to organize their learning, manage their classes, interact with their students, and gain and maintain their attention (Mitchel & Hindin, 2008).

The bottom line is that the research supports use of the PDS model for teacher candidates. They receive high-quality preparation for their future work as teachers. The model gives them a more meaningful experience, better training, professional confidence, increased opportunities for integration into the teaching profession, effective mentoring, and a strong link between the training institute and the classroom, as these relate to their orientation and long-term expectations (Damore et al., 2011).

**Teacher trainers in the PDS model.** In the context of PDS, a teacher trainer must be skilled in mentoring, be aware of the goals of the practical experience in schools, and have holistic knowledge about teacher training (Association of Teacher Educators, 2000). Therefore, to ensure meaningful experiences, the choice of qualified trainers in PDS partnerships is critical (Zeichner & Bier, 2015). Teacher trainers are expected to carefully and systematically observe teacher candidates, to offer guided work practices, and to implement key teaching components using their expertise (Parsons et al., 2016). They should help identify conditions and characteristics that contribute to the successful hosting of teacher candidates in their school.

Formal mentoring, according to the PDS model, should be strategically defined, so as to best enable students to teach and develop their professional experience. The focus of mentoring is to encourage students’ growth and to positively influence their development (Bush, 2015). Teacher trainers who develop these skills can serve as pioneering agents of change.

It should be noted that the PDS model insists that the personal and professional development of teacher trainers receives as much attention as does the development of their apprentices (Moir, Barlin, Gless, & Miles, 2009). Recent findings provide reasonable evidence that these mentoring experiences improve the quality of teaching among hosting teachers and teacher trainers (Snow et al., 2016). By fulfilling the intent of PDS, the professional skills of the teacher trainers are strengthened (Epstein & Willhite, 2017)

According to the PDS model, teacher trainers are encouraged to provide reflective and formative evaluation to teacher candidates; thus, the model increases the frequency of these evaluations and improves their quality (Snow et al., 2016). Teacher trainers using the PDS model report having a deep and focused understanding of the culture of teaching (McCormick, Eick, & Womack, 2013). They also report improvement in their skills of communication and cooperation (Beaty-O’Ferrall & Johnson, 2010).

Partners using the PDS model report that it allows teacher trainers to assume leadership roles in developing the school as an educational organization. It provides them with opportunities to develop their skills of reflection and analysis (Carpenter & Sherretz, 2012). It optimizes the professional development needs of novice and veteran teachers alike. As the level of cooperation increases and a shared vision emerges, the teacher trainers evolve into educational leaders (Kurtz, 2009). This type of leadership reflects appropriate behavior and a high level of connection to the teaching profession and to the teacher candidates, who are their future colleagues (Riel & Becker, 2008). The weekly meetings between students and teachers is an important mechanism for enriching the experience (Bennett, 2011). Teacher candidates report they understand and assimilate their lessons, and receive a high level of support and cooperation from the teacher trainers (Mitchel & Hindin, 2008).

In a PDS, senior and veteran teachers who are career professionals have multiple opportunities to be involved in teaching and educational research. Teacher trainers are key stakeholders in improving the school culture through collegiality and professionalism. Unfortunately, they may feel over-burdened from this extra responsibility in addition to their regular classroom duties (Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, & Tomlinson, 2009). Recent research indicates a number of positive influences experienced by veteran teachers as a result of their expanded role in schools as teacher trainers. This is reflected in general professional development, leadership, and particularly in terms of openness to change (Gallo-Fox & Scantlebury, 2016; Helms-Lorenz, van de Grift & Maulana, 2015).

Most previous studies on PDS relate to its contribution to the school context. The most important factor in enriching the educational experience is perceived as being the school as a training locale (Brindley, Daniel, Rosselli, Campbell, & Vizcain, 2008). At the same time, most important factor in improving work experience is seen as being the relationship between teacher candidates and teacher trainers (Duffield, 2006). Reports show that the model positively benefits teacher candidates in terms of a marked improvement in terms of knowledge and pedagogy, and benefits teacher trainers in terms of personal and professional growth. These two contributions of PDS can be attributed to the integrated learning and research communities that are formed in the application of this model (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2010). This model challenges previous perceptions of teaching and improves the effectiveness of the training experience.

In summary, pedagogic training based on the PDS model creates a strong connection between the theory studied in college or university and the practical experience in the field, which is guided by an experienced teacher.

**The Current Study**

The current study examines how teacher candidates at the beginning of their careers perceive the contribution of the PDS model in enriching their training, empowering them through reflective feedback, providing practical educational experience, and integrating various teaching methods. Additionally, it examines how teacher trainers increase their sense of professional responsibility by partnering in the training of future educators, introducing teacher candidates to field practice, and guiding them through the processes of planning and implementing teaching.

The research hypotheses are formulated according to these objectives and based on previous findings. The main research hypothesis pertains to the interactions between teacher candidates and teacher trainers. It predicts that these two groups will both evaluate the PDS model as making a positive contribution to candidates’ training. We further predict that there will be positive correlations between perceptions of model among teacher candidates and professional teacher trainers. In addition, it is hypothesized that in assessing the model, there will be no differences among teacher candidates that can be attributed to their number of years of training or area of specialization. However, it is predicted that there will be differences in the assessment of the model by teacher trainers that can be attributed to their level of exposure to the model’s content, prior education, years of teaching experience, the manner in which they joined the pedagogical training sessions, or the number of students they train.

**Methodology**

As stated, the aim of this quantitative study is to examine the perceptions of the effectiveness and contribution of the PDS model according to the teacher candidates and teacher trainers. Dimensions of the model are derived, based on a factor analysis of their responses. The correlations and differences among the two groups’ perceptions of these dimensions of the model are explored. Further, the study considers whether these differences can be attributed to procedural variables related to their professional education and experience.

It should be noted that this is not a comparative study.

**Research Tools**

Two questionnaires were designed pertaining to the implementation of the practical experience in the PDS model, one for teacher candidates, and the other for teacher trainers. The questionnaires were designed based on a review of the professional literature on PDS and with the help of veteran pedagogical instructors who themselves underwent training courses for pedagogical guidance and who were exposed to various models in the professional training of teacher candidates. Both questionnaires were validated by three experts who serve as lecturers and pedagogical instructors in teacher training colleges to ensure that they reflect the content and skills of the field being examined. In addition, the two questionnaires were examined in terms of validity of the structure and internal consistency. In both questionnaires, respondents were asked to answer on a four-point scale. Distribution of questionnaires and data collection was done with the help of pedagogical instructors.

**Questionnaire for teacher candidates.** This questionnaire includes 20 items (α = .89). In the factor analysis, the cumulative explained variance was 51.67%. Four factors (dimensions of the model) were identified. The first is entitled “enriching training” and includes seven items (α = .84). An example of an item in this factor is: “I feel/think that the pedagogical training according to the PDS model enriches my pedagogical knowledge and skills”. The second factor is entitled “empowerment through reflective feedback” and includes six items (α = .79). An example of an item in this factor is: “I feel/think that pedagogical training through the PDS model contributes to my reflections regarding my learning.” The third factor is entitled “promotion of teaching profession” and includes five items (α = .77). An example of an item in this factor is “I feel / think that the PDS model for pedagogical guidance increases my motivation to teach”. The fourth factor is entitled “integrating teaching methods” and includes two items (r = .37; *p* < .01). An example of an item in this factor is “I feel / think that the pedagogical training according to the PDS model contributes to the integration of teaching methods based on students’ needs”.

**Questionnaire for teacher trainers.** This questionnaire includes 15 items (α = .90). In the factor analysis, the cumulative explained variance was 67.45%. Three factors were identified. The first factor is entitled “partnership in training” and includes seven items (α = .88). An example of an item in this factor is “Using the PDS model, I feel that I, as a teacher, am a full, committed and influential partner in the process of training qualified teachers”. The second factor is entitled “exposing students to various fields of educational practice” and includes four items (α = .83). An example of an item in this factor is “In my opinion, the PDS model gives students opportunities to meet with experts, and they are exposed to a variety of teaching and educational processes”. The third factor is entitled “planning and application of teaching” and includes four items (α = .76. An example of an item in this factor is “I believe that in the PDS model, the school staff provides authentic learning experiences for students and cooperates in the design and implementation of meaningful teaching”.

**Study Population**

We received completed questionnaires from 86 teacher candidates. The gender distribution was proportional to that at the school (89% female). Of the students, 54 were in their second year of studies and 32 were in their third year of studies. We received competed questionnaires from 24 teacher trainers: 17 females and 7 males. In terms of their training and experience, 18 held a bachelor’s degree and 6 held a master’s degree; 13 had up to 15 years of experience in teaching, and 11 had over 20 years of experience. Each teacher served as trainer for two or three candidates.

**Statistical Analysis**

To examine the hypotheses, several data analysis tools were used, including descriptive statistics, factor analysis, Cronbach’s Alpha tests, and one-way ANOVA tests. In addition, statistical tests were conducted: effect size (ANOVA effect size: Eta-squared η2), Pearson correlations, and statistical inference.

**Results**

 Before presenting the findings, it should be noted that, none of the students said they had experienced any other training model and 14 of the teacher trainers declared that they had no exposure to the content or exclusive meaning of the PDS model.

**Overall perceptions of contribution of PDS model.** In order to examine the primary hypothesis that teacher candidates and teacher trainers will evaluate the PDS model as making a contribution to teacher training, and that both groups will report a significant effect of the model on training, effect size tests were conducted (ANOVA effect size: η2). The data presented in Table 1 show the interaction between “overall perception of the model by teacher candidates” and “overall perception of the model by teacher trainers”. There is a weak effect [F (20.3) = 8.35, *p* < .05, η**2** = .02]. This indicates that the perception of the model by these two groups is inconsistent. There is a high variance between groups (but not within groups) in evaluating the PDS model as making a contribution to training. This points to a discrepancy between the perspectives of these two populations.

**Table 1: Effect size (η2) between Overall Perceptions of the PDS Model Held by Teacher Candidates and Teacher Trainers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Interaction |  | SS | df | MS | F | *p* | η2 |
| Overall perceptions of dimensions of the PDS model held by teacher candidatesXOverall perceptions of dimensions of the PDS model held by teacher trainers | BG | 6.848 | 20 | 342. | 8.348 | 043. | **.019****weak effect** |
| WG | 0.123 | 3 | .041 |  |  |  |
| Total | 6.971 |  |  |  |  |  |

ES ≤ 0.022

 The discrepancy between students’ and teachers’ perceptions of the model is clear. Figure 1 illustrates the gaps and disagreements in their assessments of the contribution of the PDS, according to dimensions derived from factor analyses of the items in the two questionnaires.

**Figure 1: Overall Perspective of Teacher Trainers x Overall Perspective of Teacher Candidates**



From this graph, it can be concluded that teacher candidates and teacher trainers did not give uniform ratings to the items in the questionnaires, and did not equally evaluate items that are similar in terms of design and description, as seen in the following examples.

**Perceptions of dimensions of the PDS model.** There are parallel items in the two questionnaires pertaining to promotion of and enthusiasm for the teaching profession. In the teachers’ questionnaire the item is: “As a teacher, I help develop a positive attitude and enthusiasm for the teaching profession” and in the student questionnaire it is: “I feel that the PDS model increases my motivation to go into the teaching profession”. They received average scores of M = 3.69, M = 3.18 respectively.

Another example pertains to reflective feedback. The item in the teachers’ questionnaire is: “I give verbal and / or written feedback to students on a daily basis and relate to their professional development,” and in the students’ questionnaire it is: “I feel that the pedagogical training according to the PDS model contributes to my learning through the reflective feedback I receive”. These items were given average scores of M = 3.73 and M = 3.21, respectively.

A third example pertains to partnership in training. The item in the teachers’ questionnaire is: “In the PDS model I feel that I, as a teacher, am a full, committed, and influential partner in the process of training qualified teachers” and in the students’ questionnaire it is: “I feel that the training according to the PDS model leads teachers in schools towards greater cooperation with pedagogical guidance”. They received average scores of M = 3.58 and M = 3.14, respectively.

Although for most of the items, agreement is low, the graph does show several points of intersection, showing a convergence in the assessment of items similar in content and in the description of the activity. One such example is an item pertaining to research activities meant to take place according to the model. The results show that the assessment given by the teacher trainers was (M = 2.28; SD = 0.97) and that of the teacher candidates was (M = 2.16; SD = 0.96).

**Correlations between candidates’ and trainers’ perceptions.** In testing the hypothesis that there will be positive correlations between the teacher candidates’ perceptions of the dimensions of the model and those of the teacher trainers, the findings indicate a mixed trend. The findings shown in Table 2 show a moderate correlation between the overall perception of the dimensions of the model as perceived by teacher trainers (r = .46 - .62, *p* < .01). They show a similar trend among the overall perceptions of the dimensions of the model as perceived by teacher candidates (r = .46 - .70, *p* < .01). However, the rest of the findings show a mixed trend.

There were particularly strong correlations between overall teacher trainers’ perceptions of the model dimensions (r = .78 - .87, *p* < .001) and the overall teacher candidates’ perceptions (r = .76 - .84, *p* < .001). In contrast, the findings indicate relatively low correlations or no correlation between the two groups’ perceptions of the various dimensions of the model (r = .30 - .34; *p* < .05). The most prominent of these is the lack of correlation between the overall perception of the model expressed by the teacher trainers and the overall perception of the model held by the teacher candidates.

**Table 2: Pearson correlations between the perceptions of the dimensions of the PDS model held by teacher trainers and teacher candidates**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dimensions** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** |
| Partnership in training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Exposing students to various fields of educational practice | \*\*49. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planning and application of teaching | \*\*62 | \*\*54. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall perception of the model by teacher trainers | \*\*\*79. | \*\*\*78. | \*\*\*87. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enriching training | .27 | 30.\* | .16 | .28 |  |  |  |  |
| Empowerment through reflective feedback | 33.\* | 33.\* | .32\* | .31\* | \*\*68. |  |  |  |
| Promotion of teaching profession | 11. | 15. | .11 | .10 | \*\*70. | \*\*64. |  |  |
| Integrating teaching methods | .10 | .22 | .34\* | .26 | \*\*47. | \*\*49. | \*\*46. |  |
| Overall perception of the model by students | .20 | .26 | .14 | .24 | \*\*\*86. | \*\*\*85. | \*\*\*84. | \*\*\*76. |

\* *p* < .05; \*\* *p* < .01; \*\*\* *p* < .001

The findings show a moderate correlation between the teacher trainers’ perceptions of the three dimensions of the model derived from their questionnaire and the teacher candidates’ perception of the dimension of “empowerment through reflective feedback”. However, there is a correlation only between one dimension derived from the teacher trainers’ perception (“exposing students to various fields of educational practice”) and the teacher candidates’ perception of the dimension “enriching training”. Similarly, the findings indicate only a correlation between the perception of the teacher trainers’ dimension “planning and implementation of teaching” and the teacher candidates’ perception of the dimension “integration of teaching methods”. However, the findings indicate no correlation between the teacher trainers’ perceptions of their three dimensions and the teacher candidates’ perception of the dimension “promotion of teaching profession”. That is to say, pedagogical guidance according to the PDS model omits one of its basic principles (this is further referred to in the discussion).

The findings confirm the hypothesis that no variance among the teacher candidates’ perceptions of the model’s dimensions can be attributed to their year of training or specialization. Teacher candidates in their third year of the program (which corresponds to the second year of pedagogical training according to the PDS model), were no more likely report on the dimensions of “enriching training”, “empowerment through reflective feedback”, “promotion of teaching profession” or “integration of teaching methods” as compared with those in their second year of the program. Moreover, the findings do not indicate any differences between the teacher candidates’ perceptions of the dimensions of the model that can be attributed to their disciplinary specialization. In other words, enrollment in teaching specialties such as Arabic, English, Hebrew, mathematics, or early education is not a factor related to variation among the teacher candidates’ perceptions of their practical experience with the PDS model. Teacher candidates enrolled in one department did not express different perceptions than those in other departments.

This is not the case with regard to the hypothesis regarding differences in the perception of the dimensions of the model held by the teacher trainers. The findings do not substantiate the hypothesis predicting differences in perceptions among teacher trainers in all aspects of their professional education and experience. Given the statement by 14 of the teachers that they had no prior exposure to the content and meanings of the PDS model, the findings show no difference between teachers who were previously exposed to the content of the model and those who were not. That is to say, individuals can serve as teacher trainers even if they have no connection to the content or meaning of the model in terms of the concept of partnership in training, without responding to the need to expose students to various fields of educational activity, and without a clear outline of instructing students about proper planning and teaching applications. This finding requires clarification.

A similar trend was found with regard to the variable of the teacher trainers’ level of education. The findings do not show any differences among teacher trainers that can be attributed to their academic education. Teacher trainers who hold a master’s degree were not any more or less likely than those holding a bachelor’s degree to report on the dimensions of “partnership in training”, “exposing students to various fields of educational practice”, “planning and application of teaching”. This is also the case with regard to the length of the professional experience of the teacher trainers. Those with more than 20 years of teaching experience did not give higher or lower scores to any of these three dimensions of the model as compared to those with 15 years or less of experience with the PDS model.

The same trend continues with regard to the inclusion of teacher trainers in the tripartite of the pedagogic training sessions (pedagogical guide, students, and teacher trainers), which is supposed to take place towards the end of the days of practical experience in the schools. The findings indicate no differences in this context. This is also the case with regard to the dimension of “exposing students to various fields of educational practice”, or the dimension “planning and application of teaching”.

Regarding the number of students practicing with a teacher (two or three), the findings show no differences. That is, teacher trainers do not consider the number of students they train to be an element that adds to or detracts from the quality of partnership in training. The number of students does not result in more or less exposure to various fields of educational activity. It does not make it easier or harder to plan and implement teaching.

**Discussion**

 All ideas and concepts require an organizational infrastructure and resources in order to be implemented. The PDS model aims to creates links between the academic culture of educational training institutions and the culture of instructional and educational activity in schools. However, in view of the attitudes expressed by the teaching candidates and the teacher trainers, it can be argued that at the case study institution, there is no effective partnership, and the activity is not being implemented effectively. It seems that there is a deficiency in the occurrence of the recommended activities, and an unsatisfactory picture emerges.

 As stated above, the purpose of the current study was to examine the effectiveness of the PDS model of teacher training, and the correlations between the perceptions of the model held by teacher candidates and teacher trainers. It examines the extent to which the teacher candidates and teacher trainers perceive that the various identified dimensions of the model are manifest during the field practice in schools, and the connections between these perceptions. The findings show a weak assessment of the PDS model as making a contribution to training. Further, they indicate differences in the perceptions of the model held by teacher candidates and teacher trainers. The correlations between the perceptions of the dimensions of the model according to these groups show a mixed trend, including connections of relatively low intensity or a lack of connection.

 The findings indicate a lack of connection between overall perceptions of the teacher candidates and training teachers regarding the principle of creating a true partnership in training (Maskit & Mevurach, 2013). The data on the lack of exposure of teacher trainers to the content and meanings of the PDS model, and their lack of consistent adherence to the training sessions, indicate that the trainers’ performance is often flawed and inconsistent with the literature on PDS, according to which the instructor should be aware of the goals of the experience and possess holistic knowledge of teacher training in order to ensure meaningful experiences for teacher candidates.

Two facts are worth noting. One is the declaration of teacher candidates that they have not experienced any other training model. The second is the statement by most of the teacher trainers that they had not been previously exposed to the content or meaning of the PDS. The first of these findings illustrates that teacher candidates were not exposed to valid and accurate knowledge about the chosen training model chosen, no comparison was made to the traditional model, and no discussions were held regarding the professional opportunities that the model could provide them (Linton & Gordon, 2015). The second indicates that there was not appropriate selection of the teacher trainers (Zeichner & Bier, 2015). Further, they did not undergo any certification or training for this purpose (Avdor, 2013). This undermines the formality of mentoring and detracts from its positive influence (Bush, 2015).

In addition, the lack of connection between the dimension of “promotion of teaching profession”, as perceived by the teacher candidates, and the teacher trainers’ overall perception of the model indicates an omission of the first of the essential elements, which demands a comprehensive mission that is broader in outreach and scope than the mission of any partner, and which furthers the education profession and the responsibility of each partner to advance equity within the schools and, by potential extension, the broader community (NAPDS, 2008).

Moreover, the lack of correlation between the dimension of “exposing students to various fields of educational practice” (as perceived by the teacher trainers) and three dimensions of model as perceived by the teacher candidates indicates the omission of another essential element, namely that relating to a school culture that is committed to training of future educators and that embraces the active engagement of teacher candidates in the school community. Teacher trainers are expected to carefully and systematically observe teacher candidates during their field experience, and provide opportunities for guided experiences in implementing key teaching components (Parsons et al., 2016).

The correlations between the three dimensions of teacher trainers’ perceptions of the model and the teacher candidates’ perception of the dimension “empowerment through reflective feedback” are relatively weak. However, it may be argued that the teacher candidates willingly accept the teacher trainers’ feedback on their teaching performance and acknowledge and express their gratitude for the constructive criticism. Further, it can be argued that this was done at the request and instruction of the pedagogical instructors. An appropriate explanation for this finding may be that teachers narrow the sense of partnership when they provide feedback to students, in order to fulfill their professional obligation.

As noted previously, one of the declared objectives of the PDS model among partner institutions is to share responsibility for engaging in ongoing investigation of teaching practice, with the aim of enriching teacher training and student achievement. This is research in action. However, the ratings provided by the teacher candidates and teacher trainers to relevant items in the two questionnaires is low to moderate. The responses of both groups show that this goal is not expressed during the course of the experience and is has not become the norm. We argue that the responses to this item reflect a professional preference or a research bias. Students in their second or third year at Al-Qasemi Academic are not required to study theoretical teaching courses. Further, in practice, teachers are enrolled in professional development courses and are not asked to conduct such studies as part of their regular duties and responsibilities, although it is highly desirable that they do research on their work. This issue requires examination in future studies.

In summary, the discrepancy in the assessment of the contribution of the PDS model and the differing scores and values ​​attributed to questionnaire items that describe similar activities indicates a poor design of the practical experience and disharmony between teacher candidates and teacher trainers. If this is the case, the program based on the PDS model loses many of its fundamental benefits in relation to the intended and desirable expectations. This poorly functioning relationship indicates a missed opportunity to be flexible in many procedural aspects. This suggests a need to think in a focused way about the method in its entirety. The current situation at Al-Qasemi College reduces functional efficiency and indicates a lack of preparedness and readiness among those in the various roles. The current conduct reduces functional efficiency. There is a need to examine the trends of dissatisfaction among teacher candidates, teacher trainers, and pedagogical instructors and explore ways to bridge them. This can be done through research with a qualitative approach.

**Research Limitations**

The first limitation of the current research is that it examines only the perspectives of teacher candidates and teacher trainers. The views of pedagogical instructors, principals and other key stakeholders are not considered in this study. Future research should include the perceptions of PDS among other stakeholders. Nevertheless, the findings reported here raise several interesting possibilities. For example, future researchers may examine the meaning of incompatibility in the PDS model. In addition, future studies may investigate why teacher trainers in the PDS model fail to manifest the expected partnership and their behavior is no different from those working in the traditional model.

The second limitation is that the current research was not able to specifically address the question as to why no integrated investigative community was created at the college. Further, it did not address the question of why there is not greater enthusiasm for the teaching profession among teacher candidates. Future studies should strive to more fully address these questions.

A third limitation of this study is the small number of respondents. In any study, a measurement error can be embedded in the questionnaires used to quantify the issues. Therefore, the findings presented are not conclusive evidence. In future research, it would be appropriate to use a larger sample.

It would be advantageous for future studies to use an integrative approach combining qualitative and quantitative methods, which would enable triangulation.

**Practical Applications and Recommendations**

1. The PDS model should be institutionalized. The stakeholders at the college and in the field must develop appropriate interactions and diligently follow the trend towards partnership around a shared vision as a clear blueprint for making the necessary and desirable changes in the Arab education system in Israel.
2. Pedagogical instructors should implement the PDS model culture among principals, teacher trainers, and teacher candidates. They must ensure that the design and meaning of the model is effectively expressed and that a consensus is established regarding the goals in order to ensure the desired outcomes.
3. The PDS model should offer mutual benefits. Therefore, the necessary time should be allotted to build a partnership that will be able to utilize the resources at the disposal of the program, especially the resources needed for the professional development of teacher trainers.
4. The findings of the study indicate a lack of willingness to participate among the teacher trainers. This affects the process of forming a partnership. Therefore, at the beginning of the implementation of the program based on this model, meetings and joint activities must be held consistently in order to establish partnership and trust.
5. Concerning the continuation of PDS research, those engaged in education, teaching, and teacher training must provide analysis and general and specific findings regarding the process and quality of cooperation, outputs, and perspectives of different professionals within the PDS.

**Conclusion**

In light of the findings, the program appears to be superficial and unsatisfactory at the case study institution. The path to successful implementation of the PDS model is neither simple nor smooth. The model offers multiple practical and significant directions for educational renewal. However, there are several key challenges to properly implementing the model. In light of the findings, it appears that there is a need to deepen the cultural capital of PDS training in the Arab education system.

Two general questions arise. The first pertains to which activity best exemplifies implementation of the model towards development of institutional leadership in order to make schools and classrooms better places for training candidates for teaching. The second pertains to how to transform pedagogic guidance into the product of an organizational culture that emphasizes pedagogic and educational processes. It should be noted that it is important to use the PDS model to establish an authentic partnership with educational institutions, and especially to expose of teacher trainers to the content and meaning of the PDS.

The model requires a clear delineation of roles and a strong commitment. It is to be hoped that those responsible for implementing the model will be able to discover within the “multi-tone symphony” appropriate paths towards overcoming the challenges and realizing the potentials presented to them. Among teacher trainers, there is a need for greater empowerment and active involvement. The vision should be to nurture and sustain activities that express the potential inherent in the PDS model.