FROM ADAPTATION TO PROFESSIONAL GROWTH - A JOURNEY OF TWO PEDAGOGICAL GUIDES THROUGH THE PDS

Yehudit Salfati, Asnat Klaiman

Kaye Academic College of Education, 6 Azriel Nitzani St., Be'er-Sheva 8414201, Israel

Abstract

This self-collaborative study is a longitudinal study describing the journey of two pedagogical guides who were the first to lead training in the PDS model and served as critical members. The study examines the training experience, how we perceive it within the model, and ways to promote it. The research tools included: a personal reflection diary of each, documenting the joint conversations and dialogues with the coaching teachers. The study's findings indicated three main periods: the PDS model introduction phase, the implementation phase of the model, and the implementation phase as an integral part of the training for teaching. Also, two key aspects were identified in each period: the challenge of professional development of a professional learning community and the challenge of co-teaching. Despite our initial positions prior to entering the model, we were able to overcome the gap and experience an empowering experience that impacted us professionally as instructors. In this journey, we have moved from adapting to professional growth.

Keywords: *PDS, pedagogical guide, coaching teachers, co-teaching (teaching in pair), professional development*

1. INTRODUCTION

> "As a pedagogical guide, I was a little apprehensive about moving to a new model because I did not know what was expected of me in the job and whether I had the knowledge needed to carry it out properly. On the other hand, I felt it was an opportunity for my personal development as someone who could lead the connections between academia and the field, and influence better teacher training" (pedagogical guide 1).

Many studies examining the difficulties of beginning teachers have identified challenges in classroom management, coping with discipline, motivating students to learn, coping with personal differences, assessing achievement, parenting relationships, classroom organization, insufficient resources, and dealing with individual needs (Mintz 2018).

Teacher training programs fail to prepare future teachers for classroom reality; therefore, the renewal of training programs is necessary (Korthagen 2001). The consensus is that students need to be trained for teaching differently and to be better prepared for schoolwork (Gaudelli & Ousley 2009). In Israel, too, there is a feeling of dissatisfaction with the traditional model, and therefore the need arose to make a change by enhancing the partnership with the schools (Zilberstein, Ben-Peretz & Greenfeld 2006).

Munby, Russell & Martin (2001) distinguished between "knowledge of teaching" which emphasizes theoretical learning vs. "knowledge of teaching" which emphasizes practical experience. Beck (2008) based his theory of teacher training on Aristotle, who distinguished between theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge. Theoretical knowledge contributes to formulating a systematic system of claims (theory), while practical knowledge relates to a person's actions and behavior. Practical knowledge is divided into two: techné - this is a skill-art, which helps to realize goals external to the act itself, and phronesis - the wisdom of action that makes it possible to realize goals, which are an important part of the action itself. Teaching is a skill of unique nature because it deals with the application of all types of knowledge. But it should deal with both the wisdom of the act and the value aspects of the teaching. Therefore, the student's personality as an educator combining education, knowledge, skill, and intelligence should be nurtured. "Teacher training should be done in a unique and dedicated framework, based in academia and facing the field" (Beck 2008, p. 276).

Studies in the field show the need to move from theory-focused to practice-focused training (Zeichner, 2010, Wæge& Haugaløkken 2013). One alternative model that emphasizes practical training is the PDS Schools (professional development) model, first introduced in the Holmes Group report in 1986 (Holmes Group 1986). The model is based on collaboration between teacher training institutions and schools as well as creating a learning community that includes teacher training in academic institutions, schoolteachers, and students of teaching (de Roos, van der Heijden & Gorter 2010).

The PDS model has four main goals: Optimal training of new teachers; promoting the professional development of coaching teachers within the academic institution; studying the practical dimension of training; and improving student achievement (Abdal-Haqq 1998). To achieve these goals, the Ministry of Education in Israel has set standards such as professional learning of the partners, responsibility and experienced quality control of the teaching-learning processes, and commitment of all involved to the differential needs of students in schools (Ram 2014).

The training model in the PDS model is anchored in various elements such as:

1. Experience-based learning

Practical experience is an important element in training (Kolb 1984). Learning from experience occurs in a cyclical process that includes four stages: beginning the experience, activating reflection processes, building relevant concepts, and applying what is learned (Munby, Russell & Martin 2001).

2. Building learning communities

A learning community is a group of people with a common interest in learning a particular subject. A learning community strives to promote the collective knowledge of all of the group members and to enhance the personal knowledge of each individual in the group (Scardamalia & Bereiter 1994). Significant collaborative learning in a social context contributes to the process of perceptual change and enriches all partners (Nehring & Fitzsimons 2011). The learning community in the PDS model includes teaching students, coaching teachers, and pedagogical instructors from the academy, who work to deepen personal and group knowledge related to teaching-learning (Olson & Katz 2001).

3. Co-teaching

Various studies define the term “pair teaching” as the teaching of two or more people working together collaboratively. The collaboration yields results which could not have been obtained if each had been taught separately (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg 2007).

A study examining the impact of co-teaching on coaching teachers found that the co-teaching experience had a positive effect on teachers' professional development, brought new energies, and provided a catalyst for renewal and broadening of horizons (Gallo-Fox & Scantlebury 2016).

The student who teaches in the teaching model in the duo also benefits greatly. He experiences joint thinking with an expert teacher about the entire teaching process, from the lesson planning stage, the development of learning materials, to the rendering of meaningful reflection and drawing conclusions (Guise et al. 2017).

Co-teaching in pairs has five different models from the professional literature, and we have focused on three of them:

Serial instruction: One teaches, the other observes, referring to a specific goal defined in advance or supported by working among the students and helping them as needed.

Parallel teaching: Two teachers teach the same lesson to two separate groups. Prior to this format, early planning is necessary to allow for the same teaching quality.

Dialectical teaching: A term parallel to group teaching, whereby the students sit in groups. The teacher and the student help the students in the different groups (Friend & Bursuck 2009).

Co-teaching has many benefits for all partners, for coaching teachers, students, and pupils. However, it is a complex strategy. To reach its full potential, it is important to seek ongoing professional guidance (Lock et al. 2018).

According to Chitiyo (2017), teacher training programs should develop mandatory courses for future teachers focusing on co-teaching. Such courses will give them the conceptual knowledge required for joint teaching even before they are hired. The integration of students in practical teaching should be in classrooms where collaborative teaching is the primary model for training.

School principals prefer to absorb PDS training graduates because they are perceived as change agents and come to teaching with experience and a sense of confidence. Graduates of this training demonstrate better ability in lesson planning, clarifying lesson goals and objectives, creating motivation for learning, achieving student involvement, innovative teaching, and linking learning to prior knowledge (Ridley et al. 2005).

In view of the changes in teacher training in recent decades and the shift to training in the PDS model, the role of the pedagogical instructors has been significantly expanded. They become responsible for additional training areas such as peer training, creating learning communities, developing school culture, research, and educational leadership (Ran 2017).

Niklasson (2015) notes that there are different models of partnership from which the role of the pedagogical instructor is derived. It spans from easy-going commonality, relating to the placement of teaching instructors in schools, to a full partnership in which professional development schools are created as in the pedagogical guide role model. This varies according to the type of partnership.

As part of the workday, the pedagogical instructor in the PDS model is at the school for six to eight hours and performs various activities: student training, joint management of the learning community, ongoing dialogue with the school staff, participation in professional development and participation in unique school activities. The pedagogical instructors' areas of responsibility include a systemic aspect in which they are required to be involved in the professional development of the coaching-teachers, to build a personal program to promote each student, to encourage teaching-learning processes in the school, and more. The pedagogical guide also deals with assessment, feedback, and reflection aspects that require specialization (Gimbert 2001).

In view of the above, the purpose of this study is to examine our training experience, the way we as pedagogical instructors perceive it in the new model, and to find ways to promote it.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research questions

• How do we as pedagogical instructors experience, interpret, and shape our training in view of the tension created following the expansion of the role, in the transition from a traditional training model to the PDS model?

• How can we as partner pedagogical instructors advance our training in the new training model?

2.2. The research method

This study is a self-study in a qualitative paradigm. The interest in self-research among teacher educators stems from the desire to connect their pedagogical perceptions with the pedagogical practice, in order to better understand their teaching-learning processes (Loughran & Northfield 2005). Self-research focuses on the relationship between research and pedagogy, public and private, theory and practice (LaBoskey 2004). Self-research has no uniform definition, but there is agreement about its characteristics (Tidwell, Heston & Fitzgerald 2009). It is a study of the individual researching his actions, ideas, and sources of information; with the help of his experience, the researcher reorganizes his perception of his professional role (Samaras & Freese 2009).

The uniqueness of this study is that it was done as a self-collaborative study of two pedagogical instructors who each researched their work and wrote a reflective personal diary. We later teamed up for collaborative research, each contributing her perspective and reflecting on her friend's insights. We had conversations and documented them. We served as reflective societies to each other. The dialogue summoned support on the one hand and mutual criticism on the other.

In self-collaborative research, co-workers help each other generate insights by reading the data collected by each researcher and resonating through mutual analysis, mirroring, and constructive criticism (Tuval, Barak & Gidron 2011). According to Louie et al. (2003), self-collaborative research has at least three significant benefits: increased social support, a high level of critical discourse following the creation of a culture of reflection, and a chance to create transferable knowledge.

2.3. Field of research and procedure

Our pedagogical training was done as part of collaborations of a large multicultural teacher training college in southern Israel, with elementary schools working under a reform of the Israeli education system called "New Horizon", which began operating in Israel in 2008. The reform is intended to lead to a change in the education system in four specific areas: strengthening the status of teachers and raising their salaries, providing equal opportunities for each student through individual hours to raise achievements and reduce gaps, improving the school climate, and expanding and empowering school principals. The introduction of the reform enabled the partnerships between the colleges and the field of education. It contributed to the advancement of the status and specialization of teachers (Ram 2014).

Our collaborative self-research lasted six years (2016-2022) and began from the transition from teacher training in the traditional approach, focused on theoretical training, to teacher training in the PDS model that emphasizes active experience in the field of education. We received the initial training for model training as part of the MOFET Institute (National Institute for Research and Development in Education). We also attended advanced training courses at our college and learning sessions with the entire instructor team.

It was our journey of development as colleagues, each on her own. We are both experienced instructors in teacher training with advanced degrees in education. In the traditional work model, the pedagogical instructor had contact only with the coaching teacher, especially when we watched the lessons the students were teaching. The students had no control over the schools, and the school administration was not involved in their training. This study accompanies the guidance in the new model (PDS) from its inception in our college and presents a different relationship with the partner factors.

For six years, we have been involved in research as mentors of 36 elementary school teaching students and ten coaching teachers who accompanied the students in six schools. These have been our indirect partners to the research.

Each of these years, we asked the students to write one reflection each week and upload it to a personal blog. We watched the lessons the students taught, had feedback conversations with the coaching teacher, and documented them. In addition, we also documented the dialogues we had with the coaching teachers within a learning community. The learning community included the coaching teachers, the representatives from the school administration, the teaching students, and ourselves as pedagogical instructors. The community convened five times yearly to promote shared learning in common areas of interest.

2.4. Description of the research tool

1. **Personal Reflection Diary** - Each of us wrote a personal reflection diary for six years. In the Journey Diary, we freely described our feelings, thoughts, and insights about the way of guidance and its effect on the tension between our perceptions and actual doing. We held a regular procedure of a joint meeting once every two weeks and documented the conversations. The conversations dealt with the insights of each of us on the guidance of the students and the teaching staff and served as reflective friendships with each other. The importance of the reflective diary is presented in McNiff (2002) as part of the methodological tools in qualitative research, such as a daily research diary, systematic writing of reflections, and practice. Recording and repetitive documentation of notes arose from a second reflection and contemplating thinking, and more.

2. **Reflection diaries of the student** - As part of the didactic workshop tasks, the students were asked to write a personal reflection diary each week and upload it to a blog on the course website. In the reflection diary, they were asked to refer mainly to experience. Each student wrote what was meaningful to her that week, without specific instruction.

3. **Documenting dialogues with coaching teachers** - Each year, we held five scheduled meetings with the coaching teachers. In addition, we held meetings as needed.

2.5. Data analysis

The data collected from the various research tools was analyzed by thematic analysis. According to Clarke & Braun (2017), thematic analysis is a method for identifying and interpreting meaning patterns that emerge from qualitative research data, which includes several steps: first reading the text and identifying recurring ideas; dividing the text into topics and naming them. At this stage, one returns from the themes to the text and the theoretical perspectives at its base and examines whether they reflect the totality of the meanings it conveys. At the stage of writing the findings, one considers the contribution of each theme to understanding the phenomenon, and then further tests with several of the study participants whether the themes actually reflect what they experienced. Data analysis is conducted in an inductive way.

We identified three main periods: the **first period** - the introduction phase of the new training model for colleges and schools; **the second period** - the stage of implementing the program and adapting to the entire training system in PDS; **the third period** - the phase of activation and production of insights from the PDS model.

In each period, we identified two key aspects:

1 .The coaching teachers and the learning community challenge professional development.

2. The co-teaching challenge in teaching training and teaching students.

2.6. Reliability

The data we collected from the range of research tools provided examples of critical themes regarding our training experience and how it may be promoted. As reflective societies, we have repeatedly examined our findings and interpretive analysis procedures and held a critical discussion of them (credibility among judges). At each stage, we returned to the raw data to ensure that the interpretation was aligned with the data.

According to Lincoln & Guba (1985), the variety of data types is designed to increase research reliability by examining the compatibility between research results and research tools.

Cross-referencing between all types of data, between the themes and interpretations that emerged from the analyzes of each of us showed, on the one hand, a considerable thematic similarity and, on the other hand, contributed to the enrichment and deepening of the data analysis.

3. RESULTS

From the data analysis, two thematic longitudinal mappings emerged on the timeline describing three periods in our pedagogical journey. The additional mapping is a content mapping that includes two main aspects: the professional development challenge and the co-teaching challenge.

3.1. The first period – The introduction phase of PDS model

3.1.1. The professional development challenges

According to the requirements of the model, the coaching teachers are asked to participate in the "Professional Development for Mentoring Teachers" course held at the college. One of the benefits of PDS training is the promotion of the professional development of tutoring teachers (Cozza 2010).

In the first stage, our challenge as instructors in the model was to integrate the coaching teachers into professional development courses since participation in the course is a condition for accepting the role of a coaching teacher. Therefore, despite the difficulties, we highlighted the benefits of a training course, and most of the teachers enrolled in advanced training and launched the first course. Our role as pedagogical guides was to mediate between the theory taught in the professional development courses

and the application in the field. As instructors, we faced something new that required additional resources.

> "When I explained to teachers the need to attend professional development courses, I learned how complex it is because of previous commitments. I made efforts to persuade teachers to change priorities and make time for professional development" (pedagogical guide 2).

We participated in meetings that took place as part of the professional development of the coaching teachers. For some of the meetings, the students were also invited so that we could hear the different voices of all the participants. In addition, we felt that while participating in the professional development course of the coaching teachers contributed to our professional development, it also required an additional investment of resources, especially time resources.

> "As an instructor, I attended a professional development course for coaching teachers. The participation was significant for me because I could hear the experiences of different coaching teachers and understand the needs of the field and address them within my role" (pedagogical guide 1).

> "I was not required to attend the course, but I chose on my initiative to attend it because the discussions included topics that contributed to my ideas for improving the training" (pedagogical guide 2).

3.1.2. The co-teaching challenges

One of the principles of the PDS model is co-teaching. In the traditional model, the training was done through the student observing the coaching teacher. When the student was teaching, the teacher and the pedagogical guide watched the lesson, at the end of which a feedback conversation took place with the student. The PDS model defines the teaching student as a second teacher in the classroom; he is asked to teach in partnership with the coaching teacher (Ram 2014).

When we introduced the coaching teachers to co-teaching, we experienced their reluctance. They argued that their intervention in class might hurt the self-confidence of the students. The students also feared that by perceiving the teacher's intervention, it would be interpreted as if they lacked knowledge of the studied subject. As pedagogical guides, we related to their concerns with understanding. We debated how to reflect on the importance of co-teaching; we explained the rationale and demonstrated a lesson of this nature to the teachers.

> "From the reflection papers my students wrote, I understood that they are afraid of the idea of co-teaching because students may think they do not know the material. In the didactic workshop, I demonstrated to them how I work in co-teaching with another pedagogical guide. Following the demonstration, I dispelled some overt and covert concerns" (pedagogical guide 1).

At this point, teachers continued to hold the notion that students should be allowed to teach the lesson without intervention, as was customary in the past when they themselves were students. Sometimes, they only did so when we, as instructors, attended an observational class.

> "I heard from several teachers that co-teaching impinged upon the students' self-confidence, but I explained to them again the importance of co-teaching as strengthening self-confidence in view of the students' feedback on this matter" (pedagogical guide 2).

At this initial stage, we felt that most of the coaching teachers had not yet internalized the concept of co-teaching, nor had they attempted to implement it.

3.2. The second period – The implementation of the program

3.2.1. Professional development challenge

At this point, we realized that our role had expanded to other pedagogical aspects. Ginzburg et al. (2004) noted the expansion in the position, which also included the creating of learning communities that aided the professional development of art teachers in a shared space. In addition, at Mälardalen University in

Sweden, the role of the pedagogical guide has been extended to the training of coaching teachers (Niklasson 2016).

> "I realized that within the framework of the role, I was expected to build a professional learning community in the school. As part of the traditional training, I was committed only to my students, and now I have a commitment to the coaching teachers as well; it is something new and challenging" (pedagogical guide 1).

We introduced to school principals the importance of developing a professional learning community that includes all participants. We set a schedule for community meetings and prepared a program tailored to the needs of the school and the needs of the students.

> "I understood the establishment of a professional learning community; it is an important idea that can promote the coaching teachers, and myself as an instructor. I believe in the benefits of such a community, and I will do what is necessary to promote it" (pedagogical guide 2).

Following the meetings with the coaching teachers, we realized that we need to move on to the next stage, which includes our training for teachers and not just for students, as had been the case in the past. Although the new model requires a large investment, the significant involvement within the schools gives us, as instructors, a sense of satisfaction that justifies the investment.

> "I plan the professional development sessions in dialogue with the school principal. For example, we decided on one of the principles that would guide the teachers to implement a P.B.L. (project-based learning) approach combining innovative technology. I was happy to hear that the teachers were pleased with the instruction which the students had already studied in college" (pedagogical guide 1).

3.2.2. The co-teaching challenges

At this point, most teachers began to internalize the idea of co-teaching. We held a training session with the coaching teachers who did not yet know how to teach in a co-teaching model.

> "I initiated training for the coaching teachers who still had difficulty teaching together; I demonstrated teaching to them in a classroom. I also discussed this with them in the professional community meetings" (pedagogical guide 2).

We read professional literature on the subject and participated in a national forum that dealt with content related to training in the PDS model. We were exposed to the different models of co-teaching.

> "I studied the different co-teaching models and presented them at the joint meetings and professional conferences. I suggested that the teachers experiment with the different options and choose the model that suits them" (Pedagogical guide 1).

From our impression at this point, co-teaching is still only partially implemented. Despite this, we are beginning to see positive results.

> "I am under the impression that the students are beginning to enjoy the joint teaching. They report on joint planning of the lesson and a decrease in the level of anxiety regarding classroom teaching. This point reinforces my sense of satisfaction" (pedagogical guide 2).

3.3. The third period – The activation and production of insights from the PDS model

3.3.1. The professional development challenges

The professional communities we have established in the schools have become a significant part of the training. Despite expanding our role as mentors, we felt the satisfaction and empowerment of our professional development. As we experienced leading a learning community in the various schools, we understood its importance and made every effort to maintain it at pre-determined times.

> "I feel I am succeeding in leading a collaborative learning community. I have initiated learning sessions in collaboration with the college entrance teaching unit and the school principal.

> Sometimes external lecturers specializing in their field have been invited to contribute to the whole community's learning process" (pedagogical guide 1).

Our relationship with the school in the pedagogical aspect has expanded and deepened even beyond the elements of the training of the students and has created a shared commitment to all areas of the school's work where the training of the students is part of it. We feel we have a central role within the school.

> "Teachers from the staff asked me to guide them on a subject in the field of specialization (Bible) in which I take part at a national level. I had special meetings with the teachers, and I feel satisfied that they see me as a mentor for questions and improving their teaching methods" (Pedagogical guide 2).

3.3.2. The co-teaching challenges

At this point, we felt a sense of success because there was instruction by a pair of students and a coaching teacher in all the classes. The findings suggested that the success of the co-teaching depends on how it is implemented in the field. As the coaching teachers and students experienced this together, the co-teaching improved and was carried out routinely. In most classrooms, co-teaching has become part of the teaching-learning routine in the training process.

We were happy to see the collaboration between the coaching teacher and the student. The coaching teacher contributed her knowledge and experience to the lesson management, and the student brought innovation learned at the college.

> "As the teachers gained experience in teaching in duo, and as the students in the class treated it naturally, I saw that the teamwork was becoming routine in the classroom. I think the process is carried out optimally" (pedagogical guide 2).

In the various classes, co-teaching was done in different models:

> "Co-teaching at my school had differences between the classes. On my visits, I saw different models, and it was interesting and contributed mainly to providing an answer" (pedagogical guide 2).

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This collaborative self-study aimed to examine our experience as pedagogical guides in leading training in the PDS model as well as examining the way in which we may improve our shared guidance in the model. The research findings raised two main challenges: the professional development challenge and the co-teaching challenge over three periods.

The professional development challenge: We found that our role as instructors in the model is characterized by a heavy load compared to the traditional model in everything related to the professional development of the learning community. Ariav et al. (2006) also noted that the work of pedagogical guides is characterized by a sense of burden and stress. However, we found that despite the burden of expanding our role as mentors, we experienced empowerment and a sense of satisfaction from our professional development, the development of the coaching teachers and of the community as a whole. We conclude that pedagogical guides may experience empowerment and satisfaction despite the load. They should see the coaching teachers as full partnerships, promote dialogue between the partners, continue to specialize in their fields, and make room for the different voices that emerge from the shared discourse.

Dahan et al. (2010) emphasized that each participant should bring her or his knowledge and expertise and share it with others. Elder (2019) proposed to expand the scope of the partnership, train the coaching teachers in the academic framework, and give the school more responsibility in creating a commitment between the two factors. Cozza (2010) also suggested that experts in the various fields of knowledge in colleges should share their professional knowledge and experience with the coaching teachers. According to Calderwood (2000), the responsibility for the growth processes lies with all the

participants, who construct for themselves the processes of learning and development. Community is a necessary component of successful change processes in schools.

During our work on running the learning community, we realized that community members were learning to identify difficulties and challenges and render original solutions. So gradually, we began to let go and allow for the confrontation of community members even without our presence. We conclude that the pedagogical guide's leadership is essential in the early stages, but later on, one can let go and allow self-coping.

Moreover, van As (2017) found that members of the learning community can identify gaps, find ways to resolve them, and thus take responsibility for their learning. They can conduct activities, offer solutions, learn new skills, and invite expert guests to promote their development.

Co-Teaching: Research findings showed that as instructors, we experienced a significant challenge in leading the process of co-teaching. We had to deal with misconceptions about coaching teachers and students, and so we experienced partial success. The findings indicated that teachers who collaborated with us better implemented the co-teaching. Co-teaching has improved in a large part of the experience classes and has become natural conduct that allows everyone to bring their strengths and personalities to the teaching so that both parties benefit and enrich each other. Beck (2008) noted that the student's place is not to imitate the teacher but to learn while teaching so that mutual influence is possible.

We conclude that it was right for us to do everything possible to advance the teaching concept in the duo proposed in the PDS model, as one of the important principles in teaching training. We noticed that the co-teaching gave the students a sense of competence that comes from experiencing teamwork alongside an experienced teacher, who can back them up with any mistake or loss of control. A sense of security and an enhancing of ability may better prepare them for teaching their classes and perhaps even reduce dropouts from the education system. According to Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox & Wassell (2008), co-teaching invites a work environment for professional development in which the instructing teacher and the student work together. This teamwork enables the student to learn well and strengthens the clinical experience.

We conclude that the pedagogical guide should have multiple experiences of joint practice as part of the training for teaching. Levental et al. (2020) showed that collaborative practice-based experience contributed directly and indirectly to students' perceptions of teaching, the role of the teacher, the education system, and the importance of practice for teaching training.

A study conducted in Ireland found that teachers and students were satisfied with the teaching in duo and expressed a willingness to continue teaching in the future (Prizeman 2015).

In conclusion, our training experience as pedagogical guides, who first experienced training in the PDS model, was an instructive and empowering experience as the training in the model gave the role additional meaning. Each of us dealt differently with the tension in the gap between the previous role perception and the new role perception. Each year we gained more experience that gave us confidence, so we moved from the stage of adaptation to that of professional development. However, there is still a long way to go, and it requires of us as pedagogical guides to continue developing, specializing, examining the model, and offering suggestions for improvement.

5. RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS

- It is recommended that the pedagogical guides conduct action research or self-research. In self-study, it is advisable to adopt the notion of a critical friend.
- It is important to develop a professional learning community and set fixed dates for meetings to enable them to take place regularly and effectively. It is recommended that the community include all partners.
- We recommend establishing a nationwide learning community that will include pedagogical guides and coaching teachers, occasionally inviting representatives of the Ministry of Education,

academics, and lecturers from the fields of specialization of students. Such a community may raise material issues for discussion and conduct learning and evaluation processes on a broader and more in-depth scale.

6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Despite our systematic documentation and conduct as critical societies, it should be considered that the research was based on our collaborative self-research and expressed the interpretation of situations based on our background and personal experience. Other pedagogical guides may interpret things differently. Therefore, it is recommended that additional instructors operating according to the model also review the study conclusions.

The study was conducted in six elementary schools, all located in one city, with all teaching students coming from the same geographical area. It is possible that the similar characteristics of the schools and the students influenced the findings.

7. RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Our research focused on the existence of a professional learning community and co-teaching, so it is advisable to examine additional aspects of training in the PDS model. We recommend encouraging collaborative self-research of pedagogical guides in order to conduct a comparative study with the current research.

REFERENCES

1. Mintz, J 2018, 'A Comparative Study of the Impact of Enhanced Input on Inclusion at Pre-Service and Induction Phases on the Self-Efficacy of Beginning Teachers to Work Effectively with Children with Special Educational Needs.' *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 45 no. 2, pp. 254–274. doi: 10.1002/berj.3486.
2. Korthagen, FAJ 2001, *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. [online] New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. <http://hdl.library.upenn.edu/1017/13673>.
3. Gaudelli, W & Ousley, D 2009, 'From clothing to skin: Identity work of student teachers in culminating field experiences.' *Teaching and Teacher Education, vol. 25 no. 6,* pp. 931–939.
4. Zilberstein, M, Ben-Peretz, M & Greenfeld, N eds. 2006, *The partnership between colleges and schools - the Israeli story*. Tel Aviv: Mofet Institute (HEB).
5. Munby, H, Russell, T & Martin, AK2001, *Teachers' knowledge and how it develops. Handbook of research on teaching*. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, pp. 877–904.
6. Beck, S 2008, 'Is there any unnecessary training? On the uniqueness of academic teacher training.'In: D Kfir & T Ariav, eds., *The Teaching Crisis: Towards Revised Teacher Training*. Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute and Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing (HEB), pp. 225–247.
7. Zeichner, K 2010, 'Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education.' *Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 61 no. 1-2, pp. 89–99.
8. Wæge, K & Haugaløkken, OK 2013, 'Research-based and hands-on practical teacher education: An attempt to combine the two.' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, [online], vol. 39 no. 2, pp. 235 – 249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2013.765195>.

9. Holmes Group (US)1986, *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes group,* Rockefeller Foundation, N.Y.: Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI.
10. de Roos, SA, van der Heijden, MH & Gorter, RJ 2010, 'Professional Development Schools and Early Childhood Education: Interactive Skills of Students, Playgroup and Kindergarten Teachers.' *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, vol. 18 no.1, pp. 15–28.
11. Abdal-Haqq, I 1998, *Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence*. Thousand Oaks. CA: Corwin Press, a Sage Publications Company.
12. Ram, E 2014, *'Academy-Class' partnership to strengthen teaching - concluding conceptual policy document*. [online] Jerusalem: RAMA (National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation), Ministry of Education Manages Teaching Employees, Israel, pp. 25–27. <https://cms.education.gov.il/EducationCMS/Units/Rama/HaarachatProjectim/Academy_Class.htm?WBCMODE=presentationunpubl> [Accessed 2016].(HEB)
13. Kolb, DA 1984, *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. [online] Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. <http://www.learningfromexperience.com/images/uploads/process-of-experiential-learning.pdf> [Accessed 31 May 2006].
14. Scardamalia, S & Bereiter, C 1994, 'Computer support for knowledge-building communities.' *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, vol. 3 no. 3, pp. 265–283.
15. Nehring, J & Fitzsimons, G 2011, 'The professional learning community as subversive activity: Countering the culture of conventional schooling.' *Professional Development in Education*, vol. 37 no. 4, pp. 513–535.
16. Olson, DR & Katz, S 2001, 'The fourth folk pedagogy. Understanding and teaching the intuitive mind: Student and teacher learning.' In: B Torff, & RS Sternberg, eds., *Understanding and Teaching the Intuitive Mind*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 243–263.
17. Bacharach, N, Heck, TW & Dahlberg, K 2007, 'Co-Teaching in Higher Education', *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)* vol. 5 no. 3. doi: https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v5i3.1298
18. Gallo-Fox, J & Scantlebury, K 2016, 'Co-teaching as professional development for cooperating teachers.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 60, pp. 191–202.
19. Guise, M, Habib, M Thiessen, K & Robbins, A 2017, 'Continuum of co-teaching implementation: Moving from traditional student teaching to co-teaching.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 66, pp. 370–382.
20. Friend, M & Bursuck, WD 2009, *Co-teaching Approaches. Including Students with Special Needs: A Practical Guide for Classroom Teachers*. 5th ed. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
21. Lock, J, Rainsbury, J, Clancy, T, Rosenau, P & Ferreira, C 2018, 'Influence of co-teaching on undergraduate student learning: A mixed-methods study in nursing.' *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, vol. 6 no. 1, pp. 38–51.
22. Chitiyo, J 2017, 'Challenges to the use of coteaching by teachers." *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, vol. 13 no. 3, pp. 55–66.
23. Ridley, DS, Hurwitz, S, Hackett, MRD & Miller, KK 2005, 'Comparing PDS and campus-based preservice teacher preparation: Is PDS-based practice really better?' *Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 56 no. 1, pp. 46–56.
24. Ran, A 2017, 'The Role of the Pedagogical Guide, Selected Models from Ireland, the Netherlands, Israel, Singapore, and Sweden.' *Inter-College Information Center, Mofet Institute*. (HEB).
25. Niklasson, L 2015, 'When is a reorganization of practicum in initial teacher education implemented? Administrator perspectives.' *Global Journal of Human Social Sciences. Linguistics & Education*, vol. 15 no. 12, pp. 31–41.

26. Gimbert, BG 2001, 'The power of multiple mentoring in the context of a professional development school: E Pluribus Unum - out of many, one.' [online] The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Seattle, WA. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED455211.pdf>.
27. Loughran, J & Northfield, J 2005, 'Framework for the development of self-study practice.' In: ML Hamilton, ed., *Reconceptualizing Teaching Practice: Self-Study in Teacher Education*. Routledge: Falmer Press, pp. 22–34.
28. LaBoskey, VK 2004, 'The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings.' In: *International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices*. Dordrecht.: Springer, pp. 817–869.
29. Tidwell, D, Heston, M & Fitzgerald, L eds. 2009. *Research methods for the self-study of practice*. Switzerland: Springer Science & Business Media.
30. Samaras, AP & Freese, AR 2009, 'Looking back and looking forward: An historical overview of the self-study school.' In, *Self-study Research Methodologies for Teacher Educators, Professional Learning, vol. 7*. [online] Brill Sense, pp. 1–19. <https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789087906900/BP000002.xml> [Accessed Jan. 2009].
31. Tuval, S, Barak, J & Gidron, A 2011, 'Negotiating a team identity through collaborative self- study.' *Studying Teacher Education*, vol. 7 no. 2, pp. 201–210.
32. Louie, BY, Drevdahl, DJ, Purdy, JM & Stackman, RW 2003, 'Advancing the Scholarship of Teaching through Collaborative Self-Study.' *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 74 no. 2, pp. 150–171.
33. Mcniff, J 2002, *Action research principles: Principles and practices.* Routledge Falmer.
34. Clarke, V & Braun, V 2017, 'Thematic analysis.' *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, vol. 12 no. 3, pp. 297–298. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613.
35. Lincoln, YS & Guba, EG 1985, *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
36. Cozza, B 2010, 'Transforming teaching into a collaborative culture: An attempt to create a professional development school-university partnership.' *The Educational Forum*, vol. 74 no. 3, pp. 227–241. doi: 10.1080/00131725.2010.483906
37. Ginzburg, H, Dahan, H, Kfir, D, Shagy, H & Shagy, T 2004, 'The role of the pedagogical guide in the school regarding professional development: The course of action research in the years 2001-2002 and its consequences.' *Initiative Pages: Journal of Educational Initiatives in Teacher Training*, vol. 3, pp. 9–30 (HEB).
38. Niklasson, L 2016, 'Administrators communicating change in initial teacher education: Communication efforts during restricting partnerships.' *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 4 no. 11, pp. 73–79.
39. Ariav, T, Hayosh, T & Prayteg, A 2006, 'The role of mentoring teachers and kindergarten teachers in the PDS partnerships with the schools and kindergartens in Kadima-Zoran.' *Formative Evaluation Study Beit Berl Academic College, the Research and Evaluation Unit.* (HEB).
40. Dahan, A, Dror, A, Klieger, A, Sagi, H, Auster, H & Sagi, T 2010, 'The Role of the Pedagogical Instructor in Teacher Training according to the PDS Model in the Secondary Track at Beit Berl Academic College.' *Initiative Pages*, vol. 6, Moffat Institute, Tel Aviv. (HEB).
41. Elder, BC 2019, 'Using PDS to create sustainable, inclusive education practices: A roadmap for school-university partnerships.' *School-University Partnerships*, vol. 12 no. 1, pp. 22–35. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1220177.pdf.
42. Calderwood, PE 2000, *Learning Community: Finding Common Ground in Difference*. New York: Teachers College Press.

43. van As, F 2017, 'Communities of practice as a tool for continuing professional development of technology teachers' professional knowledge.' *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, vol. 28 no. 2, pp. 17–430. doi: 0.1007/s10798-017-9401-8.

44. Scantlebury, K, Gallo-Fox, J & Wassell, B 2008, 'Coteaching as a model for preservice secondary science teacher education.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 24 no. 4, pp. 967–981.

45. Levental, O, Naifeld, E, Kharanbe, S & Amasha, M 2020, 'Experience changes perceptions: Arabic-speaking students' perceptions regarding the PDS model and teacher training.' *International Education Studies*, vol. 13 no. 2, p. 115. doi: 10.5539/ies.v13n2p115.

46. Prizeman, R 2015, 'Perspectives on the co-teaching experience: Examining the views of teaching staff and students." *Reach*, vol. 29 no. 1, pp. 43–53.