



The Teacher Mentor's Need for Pedagogical Instruction at Bethlehem University

Omar Mizel

Bethlehem University

Doi:10.5901/jesr.2017.v7n1p119

Abstract

The professional literature extensively discusses the needs of the student for emotional and cognitive development; this topic has been neglected in connection with pedagogical instruction. A prominent scholar who deals with this topic is A.H. Maslow (1956), who argues that we are all born with needs that direct us toward growth, development and self-realization. No systematic research studies have yet been conducted on the subject of the student's needs in this respect, and the lack of a methodical approach to that subject is sorely felt. The identification of these needs could increase collaboration and trust between the teacher training college and the school. The sample in the present study consisted of 15 teacher mentors – 9 males and 6 females – who participated in an action research study on the topic of pedagogical instruction. The central tools chosen for this study were interviews, documentation and observation of a course in the process of its being taught. The findings point to the difficulty teacher mentors encounter in the fulfillment of their needs, including even their basic needs, and to the result that the teacher mentors' feelings of alienation and their distrust of pedagogical instruction makes it hard for them to build a cooperative relationship. One of the recommendations is to develop an organizational structure that will invite all the participants in the pedagogical instruction encounter to work together so that they will all feel that they are vital to the success of their fellow participants.

Keywords: mentor, needs, Bethlehem, school, Arab, Palestine.

1. Introduction

1.1 The need for responding to the student's needs

Many researchers such as Rosso, Tolstoy, and Dewey and particularly scholars from the beginning of the 20th century to the present day extensively discuss various ways of responding to the student's needs. In order to enable students to realize their emotional and cognitive potential, there has been a growing use of humanistic psychology, which is based on the nurturing of respect and sympathy for all individuals and which expresses the belief in our natural capacity for becoming people with positive human values and which esteems our unique qualities (Aloni, 1988; Weinberg, 2011; Bell, 2010). A prominent scholar in this field is A.H. Maslow (1956), who argues that we are all born with needs that direct us toward growth, development and self-realization.

1.2 Maslow's hierarchy of needs

According to Maslow's theory of motives, there is a hierarchy of needs and a kind of pyramid can be created in order to distinguish between two principal groups of needs: lower level and upper level. This content-based theory is founded on the assumption that our needs are the basis of our motivation and it attempts to identify them. The hierarchy of needs enables us to understand our behavior in every context and it can create an environment that will be responsive to our needs. Similarly, an understanding of the hierarchy of needs emphasizes the vital importance of fulfilling basic needs so that we are free to concentrate on satisfying our upper level needs in this hierarchy. Thus, for example, Maslow's theory stresses the need for a proper physical existence, for comfortable learning and working conditions, for a personal sense of security, for a feeling of personal worth and for a sense of belonging so that we can achieve our self-realization or self-

actualization. When the feeling of satisfaction is undermined at any point in the hierarchy of needs, our ability to develop and advance toward self-actualization can be impaired. That is why pupils in a new educational framework who are not familiar with its educational figures and whose needs are not met will not find time to play with their friends (and to thereby realize their need for belonging). In order to more clearly understand the limits of this hierarchy, let us briefly review it in accordance with the various needs it encompasses.

2.1 Lower level needs: The lower level needs – which include physiological needs, safety needs and the need for love and belongingness, for appreciation and esteem – are termed by Maslow “deficiency needs”; other scholars refer to them as fundamental drives (Lavi, 1978; Sen, 2012; Wininger, 2010; Francis 2006). The essential characteristic of these needs is that, if they are not met, they become more and more pressing, resurfacing later and becoming increasingly stronger. However, if they are met, their driving power vanishes and the individual can move on to the meeting of higher needs (Keller, 1990; Wininger, 2010).

2.1.2 Physiological needs: Our primary drive is to ensure our existence through food, oxygen, water, sleep and movement.

2.1.3 Safety needs: After the physiological needs have been met, we are then driven by needs with a higher character of wellbeing: comfort and freedom from fear and concern for ensuring our future.

2.1.4 Love and belongingness needs: After the safety needs have been met and we have consolidated ourselves, we then aspire to become involved – as friends and partners in a formal or informal group – and we must know that others recognize us and want our company. We need relationships of friendship and love and we also need a social status within a group we feel we belong to.

2.1.5 Esteem needs: After our love and belongingness needs have been met, our drive shifts from the need to attain acceptance within the group to the need to contribute, to lead and to earn its esteem.

1.3 Upper level needs

Whereas the needs for appreciation and esteem, which are the peak of the lower level needs, are based on being loved and admired by others, the drive regarding the upper level needs is directed by our own individual standards (Glickman, 1990) in accordance with what we are capable of becoming and in accordance with our ability to fully tap our creative and productive potential. Loyalty to our own creed becomes a way of life leading to self-actualization or Maslow's concept that we can become what we must become (Glickman, 1990). The upper level needs are primarily cognitive and esthetic: the need to know, to research, to cope, and the need for order, beauty and balance in life. It is important to point out that the upper level needs, in contrast with deficiency needs, wither or lose their driving power precisely when they are not met; however, when they are met, they increase in scope and strength (Keller, 1990) and we are perceived as more human (Arieli, 1969; Sen, 2012).

Maslow's model of the hierarchy of needs is the very heart of humanistic education, which is concerned with the child's needs and learning motivation (Caspi, 1994; Lavi, 2000; Weinberg, 2001), and is recommended as a tool for understanding the management strategies of inspectors (Glickman, 1990) in the education system. However, it has not yet acquired sufficient status in the discussion of the needs of participants in pedagogical instruction, and this lacuna is especially felt in light of the special needs of each participant – vis-à-vis him/herself and vis-à-vis his/her partners – against the background of the vital need for an increase in the trust and professional collaboration between the training institution and the school (Beck, 2008; Ariav, 2008). This methodical lacuna is intensified in light of the fact that the meeting of needs and especially the idea of self-actualization are perceived by most teachers as being unrelated to the schoolroom (Caspi, 1994).

In light of the above, the present study intends to adopt Maslow's hierarchy of needs and to identify the needs of teacher mentors in order to help them become more effective in their pedagogical instruction of university students. Although the present research study is based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs, I am aware of the criticism that has been aimed at this model particularly from the methodological standpoint, for example: Can precise limits be established? When can we sense that an individual feels safe? When do we feel that we truly belong? In light of these important questions, there is room for clarifying with greater precision the manner in which I am using the hierarchy of needs, with the exclusion of physiological needs, which should be met outside the learning environment. This research study accepts Maslow's original distribution of needs, which begins with safety needs, contact and belongingness needs, the need for appreciation and the need for self-actualization.

Before dealing with the teacher mentor's hierarchy of needs, I will briefly review the essence of pedagogical instruction while focusing on the teacher mentor.

1.4 Pedagogical instruction

The professional literature (Ziv, 1991; Reichenberg, 1993; Siers, 2012) points to a number of approaches for identifying the different players in pedagogical instruction: The term “pedagogical instruction triangle” refers to three forces operating in the learning environment of pedagogical instruction: Pedagogical instructors, teacher mentors and student teachers (Reichenberg, 1993). This triangle has been termed by Murrel a “clinical triad.” The term “pedagogical instructor” refers to the representative of a training institution who is responsible for the professional training of the student teacher in the field, within the context of practical experience in the field and within the context of the pedagogical instructor’s own personal experience in the training classroom. The term “teacher mentor” refers to the teacher in the classroom where the student teacher is training; the teacher mentor, it should be pointed out here, serves as the student teacher’s mentor. The term “student teacher” refers to the student who is being trained in an institution of higher learning in order to receive certification as a teacher; the student teacher can also be called a “novice teacher” (Murrel, 2001). Since the present study focuses on the identification of the needs of the teacher mentor, it will not refer to student teachers or to pedagogical instructors but will instead center exclusively on teacher mentors.

1.5 Identification of the teacher mentor’s needs

Trautman (2000) has studied the development of the term “mentor.” Ostensibly, the term “teacher mentor” should have been self-understood: a teacher who mentors others – in our case, student teachers – but the mentor must do many things that are not self-understood, such as drilling and transmitting existing knowledge, working on the assumption that the student teacher possesses the knowledge to function as a teacher. In this case, this is theoretical knowledge acquired at the training institution. Thus, the teacher mentor is expected to be a collaborator, training student teachers and accompanying them on their first steps in the profession (Zozovsky, 2000; Rikard, 1996; Veal, 1998; Dunning, 2011). The professional literature claims there are certain expectations from the teacher mentor: Teacher mentors host the student teachers in their classroom and enable them to gain professional experience there. Despite the teacher mentor’s centrality in the training encounter between the student teacher and the class (Trautman, 2000), the teacher mentor’s role is not equivocally defined nor is it described in sufficient detail. Koerner (1992; 2007) expresses this lacuna by quoting a teacher mentor and presenting the dilemma this teacher mentor must contend with. The teacher mentor Koerner cites does not know what a teacher mentor is supposed to do and simply does what he always does in the classroom, hoping that this will work (Calderheard and Shomek, 1997).

In addition to not being clearly defined, the role of teacher mentors is expected to encompass an entire series of functions that, in many cases, are not much different from those that pedagogical instructors are supposed to fill (Koerner, 2007). Teacher mentors are expected to develop the pedagogical knowledge of student teachers through referral to sources of information, and through the development of the student teacher’s pedagogical judgment and his/her reflective, critical thought concerning his/her work. Of course, teacher mentors are also expected to actively support, encourage and develop the self-confidence of student teachers; to provide them with autonomy and to reinforce their feeling of belonging to their peer group (Calderheard and Shomek, 1997). From the systemic standpoint, teacher mentors are expected to supply student teachers with basic knowledge of the school’s regulations and policy, to establish contact with officials inside and outside the school and to maintain ongoing working relations with pedagogical instructors (Tocher-Saar, 2000). In addition to the lack of clarity regarding the teacher mentor’s role, there is no clear-cut definition of the training teacher mentors must undergo. From interviews conducted by Lathlean, Hagger and McIntyre (1977), it emerged that mentors did not know what their role entailed until they actually began working as teacher mentors. In many cases, there is the impression that, instead of learning primarily from a well-organized, structured training program, teacher mentors learn about their role mainly from haphazard encounters with information sources: instructions issued by pedagogical instructors, meetings with other teacher mentors, refresher training sessions offered by the training institutions (Lathlean et al., 1997) and chiefly their own practical experience (Bulman, Lathlean and Gobbi, 2014). Scholars (e.g., Calderheard and Shomek, 1997; Richardson-Koehler, 1988) define this kind of knowledge as intuitive knowledge based on trial and error. Another source of information is the personal example of the teacher mentor’s own teacher mentor during the former’s student teacher period. In light of the vagueness regarding the teacher mentor’s role and training, the present study will consider whether teacher mentors have the capacity for meeting the needs of student teachers stemming from their great expectations from their teacher mentors. Veal and Rikard (1998) argue that the basis for the meeting of the teacher mentor’s needs is the degree to which his/her work routine can be maintained. This routine includes certain fundamental elements: the (free) time dimension, as well as territorial space, and the teacher mentor’s

work schedule. That schedule naturally will include the additional tasks undertaken by the teacher mentor in the mentoring of student teachers and must be conducted in accordance with a tight, heavy and crowded timetable of classes and short recess times (Katzenmeyer and Moller, 2001). The shortening of the free time of teacher mentors creates tension and makes the management of their regular schedule more cumbersome (Burn, 1997). For this reason, teacher mentors will find it impossible to undertake new initiatives and participate in additional activities beyond the minimum required for their basic role as a schoolteacher (Ehrlich, 1989).

The guidance of student teachers to ensure their smooth integration in the teaching tasks in the teacher mentor's classroom requires considerable time and effort (Koerner, 1992; Dunne, 1993). Even if we assume that the student teachers have sufficient knowledge as to how to teach in their particular discipline as well as sufficient knowledge regarding timetable planning and sufficient understanding of the pedagogical sensitivities in the classroom where they will be doing their practical training, many weekly hours will still have to be spent on guidance in three main areas: cognitive, effective and systemic-organizational. If we take into account the fact that a significant percentage of the student teachers are still in their initial stages of training, they will naturally require considerable support and guidance, and this is especially true for student teachers with special needs.

In their research studies, Ehrlich (1989) and Lathlean et al. (1997) claim that, generally speaking, the guidance of student teachers takes place during short recess periods between classes, during a "window" in the teaching timetable or in a hasty meeting immediately before or after class. Because of the lack of congruence between the training institution's timetable and that of the school where the student teacher is training, the coordination of these two timetables is sometimes complicated or even impossible, with the result that an extra burden is created for the teacher mentor's own timetable. Nevertheless, many teacher mentors recognize the benefit of employing student teachers as teaching assistants who can also supply some of the teacher mentor's needs and help him/her in time-consuming tasks inside and outside the classroom (Givon, 1987; Edwards and Wilkins, 1997; Canter, 1997). The findings emerging from these studies describe how student teachers can sometimes help their teacher mentors: for instance, assistance in classroom work, in checking exercise books, in preparing work cards and presentations and in the checking of tests.

The teacher mentor's basic need for being accepted by his fellow team members, for belonging to the group and for social status is more problematic than it is in other professions because of the teacher's basic isolation and because of the accepted requirements for promotion in the teaching profession (Griffin, 1999). These needs could be met with the help of the student teachers engaged in practical work in the teacher mentor's classroom and with the help of the academic community, which requires the teacher mentor's services.

Formally speaking, all teachers are members of the teaching staff in their school and the "individualism" that teachers acquire during their years of teaching "behind the classroom door" can create a professional barrier (Griffin, 1999) between the teachers and other adults in their work setting (Sharan, 1990). This barrier can be penetrated sometimes outside the classroom when teachers develop new curricula (Sharan, 1990). The entry of student teachers and pedagogical instructors into the classroom where the teacher is alone with his/her students could create for the teacher mentor a unique identity group that is based on partnership and on team work between the student teacher and the teacher mentor and which is totally focused on professional, pedagogical and didactic issues arising in real time in the teacher mentor's classroom (Veal and Rikard, 1998).

According to Furlong et al., in addition to providing a way out from the professional isolation of teaching, the interaction between the student teacher and the teacher mentor opens the door to the mentor's joining and belonging to the academic community. This opportunity offers the mentor a channel for advancing his/her standing in the hierarchy of positions within the school beyond his/her usual promotion possibilities, which are primarily based on seniority (Lomsky, 1988). From the formal standpoint, the teacher mentor does not belong to the student teacher's university training team, is not an employee of the university, does not receive a salary from it, is not a member of its teaching faculty (Veal and Rikard, 1998) and is probably not considered to have a status equal to theirs. Sometimes the teacher mentor is perceived by pedagogical instructors as someone who simply "must be there" to supply a classroom and a group of schoolchildren (Slick, 1998) – in other words, someone who must be present when the student teachers engage in practical teaching work. However, it is not only from the formal standpoint that the teacher member is not part of the academic community's identity group nor is it from the standpoint of educational ideology or from the standpoint of work habits. In order to meet the above norms, teacher mentors are expected to participate in refresher and basic training programs offered at the training institutions (Williams and Bowman, 2000). Richardson-Koehler (1988) and Veal and Rikard (1998) point to the esteem needs of the teacher mentor who exerts optimal influence on student teachers, who are dependent on his/her evaluation and on his/her overall functioning in the classroom. Because of that dependence, the teacher mentor is an authoritative figure for student teachers. This authoritative position is expressed primarily in the

provision of professional guidance and subsequently emotional assistance. The very fact that teacher mentors are chosen by a pedagogical instructor to train students grants mentors a feeling of uniqueness and attests to their professional skills because teachers who are selected to serve as mentors are teachers with considerable experience and are generally considered good teachers and supportive figures (Fuchs, 2000). Nonetheless, in day-to-day terms, the encounter with the pedagogical instructor is not always satisfying and the pedagogical instructor's criticism of the student teacher's practical work in the classroom could cast a shadow on the teacher mentor's work and professional image (Veal and Rikard, 1998).

The professional literature (e.g., Williams and Bowman, 2000; Proefriedt, 1994) identifies needs for self-actualization and professional advancement but reports little if anything on the actual meeting of these upper level needs. Nor does it mention the realization of cognitive goals in the process of the teacher mentor's own training.

2. Methodology

The goal of the present study was to systematically examine the needs of teacher mentors, who play an active and central role in the training of student teachers at Bethlehem University and in the molding of their professional personalities; this examination of the mentor's needs was conducted in accordance with Maslow's hierarchy of needs. The identification of the needs of teacher mentors is based on the agenda of pedagogical instruction, on the professional literature and on interviews with 15 teacher mentors at the university. Similarly, use was made of observations and reflections in the course of discussions that took place in the classroom.

3. The Research Questions

1. To what extent are the safety needs of teacher mentors met in the context of pedagogical instruction?
2. To what extent are their belongingness needs met?
3. To what extent are their esteem needs met?
4. Does the inadequate meeting of these needs impact the pedagogical instruction?

4. The Method

The qualitative research approach was found to be suitable for the obtaining of the present study's goal. This decision stemmed from the pioneering character of the study in its attempt to concretely clarify the components of the term "needs."

5. The Sample

The sample consisted of 15 teachers – 9 males and 6 females – who participated in an activity research course taught by the researcher. The teachers taught the following subjects: Arabic, mathematics, English and history. Eight of them were homeroom teachers. Their seniority ranged between five and 15 years or more.

6. The Tools and the Process

The interview was chosen as the chief research tool because it could enable an in-depth probe of the teachers' personal viewpoint and because it could expose their feelings, creed and thoughts on the subject (Patton, 1990). The interview, which was structured and was therefore more methodical than an open interview, made it relatively easy to compare the statements of the interviewees. The questions and topics in the interview were diverse so that it would be possible to encompass all the various topics that might be connected to the issue of needs and pedagogical instruction, the assumption being that the teachers would not know precisely the direction of the interview. The reason for this approach was the danger that the interviewer might mislead the interviewees through an inconsistent use of terms, thereby influencing both the course of the interview and the responses of the interviewees. Each interview consisted of three central sections plus an information section focusing on details of the teacher mentor's background. In the first section, each interviewee was asked to describe in general terms his/her areas of responsibility in connection with the pedagogical instruction and to explain how these areas expressed themselves. In the second section, the teachers were requested to describe situations where the pedagogical instruction was effective and those where they were unable to meet what was expected of them. In the third section, they were asked to describe their difficulties and dilemmas in

pedagogical instruction situations and to focus on their personal needs.

7. The Processing of the Data

The analysis of the research data was conducted in accordance with the field grounded theory method used by Strauss and Corbin (1990); the data was systematically analyzed, the focus being on the interaction between existing theoretical knowledge on the phenomenon and the data that was gathered (Yin, 1984; 1993).

8. The Findings

The findings will be presented here according to the order of the research questions.

Regarding the first question on the extent to which the teacher mentor's safety needs were met, 11 of the 15 teachers responded that they felt that this need was not met because of their onerous workload and because of the short recess periods that did not allow them to give the student teacher effective instruction and which put the mentors under pressure, hurt their work routine and created friction within the school; as a result, instead of being a part of the instruction process, the student teachers became a burden. One of the teachers explained this situation in some detail: "One of my students would always come late because she lived far away; she was also weak in Arabic. I was forced to guide and instruct her much more than what is usually expected. I couldn't take this pressure and I had to correct the way she was handling the lessons. In the end, I told her instructor that I could not train this student any further." In contrast with teacher mentors with such stories, one of the teachers thought that the student teacher's presence was a blessing and that the student teacher helped the situation rather than presenting a threat: "In a classroom of 40 pupils, it is always good to have someone who can share the work with you, who can substitute for you when the need arises and who allows you to spend more time with the weaker students."

Alongside the advantages of student teacher assistance, it should be stressed here that not all teachers are prepared to hand over some of the teaching chores to a student teacher because they feel that they are thereby losing precious classroom time – in the end, they will have to re-teach that material. The chief fear is that the inclusion of student teachers in the day-to-day teaching chores could hurt the timetable, particularly before exam times. The mentors argued that the student teachers contribute nothing to the classroom, that they sometimes even are a disruptive factor and that they cause a delay in the teaching process and thus in the learning sequences.

From the findings, it emerges that the teacher mentors' safety needs are based on the maintenance of routine inside and outside the classroom and thus the student teachers create an unavoidable discrepancy. In terms of the time dimension, there is a conflict between the need to prevent a serious reduction of the teacher mentor's limited time and the needs of the student teacher, who requires in-depth and time-consuming pedagogic instruction. The findings also point to the fact that, within the territorial space of the classroom, a discrepancy is created between, on the one hand, the need to preserve what is already known, what is already familiar and what is safe and anticipated and, on the other hand, the needs of the student teacher to initiate, to innovate, to use the trial and error method, to make conclusions from his/her mistakes and to try again. The conclusion is that, when all the teacher mentor's safety needs are met, it can be assumed that the student teacher's needs cannot be met.

Regarding the second question on the extent to which the teacher mentor's belongingness needs are met, 10 of the teachers mentioned their feeling that they did not belong to the subject and that their loyalty was first and foremost to the school instead. Most of the interviewees claimed that this was a one-time occurrence and that it was the university's problem, not theirs. One of the teachers argued, "When I receive a very good student, it is worth my while because he/she brings new ideas and activities from the university that I am not familiar with. I put aside some of the material and, in many cases, the student teacher instructs me – for instance, how to use a computer. I simply learn from the student teacher and I feel good about that." On the other hand, in some cases, there is a lack of harmony between the teacher mentor and the student teacher; in such situations, the teacher mentor knows that, when the student teacher teaches the class, the pupils will learn absolutely nothing – in other words, for the teacher mentor, the student teacher is a disturbing influence, is someone who just does not belong and is perceived as a total stranger. Another teacher said, "The pedagogical instructor shows up, gives a few instructions and then leaves. I am with the student teacher all the time and the student teacher feels that he belongs more to me than to the instructor from the university."

When we study the teacher mentors' feeling of belonging, it appears that there are many facets. Regarding the student teachers, the teacher mentor's interaction with them and, in general, their need for his/her advice, knowledge and guidance could perhaps provide the teacher mentor with a feeling of partnership and belonging despite his/her

professional isolation. However, it is also clear that this interpersonal interaction does not always proceed so harmoniously and does not always rescue the teacher mentor from his/her professional isolation. Most of the teachers claimed that the instruction given by the pedagogical instructor representing the training institution does not always promote a feeling of belonging. They argued that they hosted the pedagogical instructor in their classroom and that he/she was therefore only a temporary guest; thus it was impossible to have any feeling of belonging. The pedagogical instructors come from another culture altogether, which is called in the professional literature a "different culture"; as a result, the teacher mentors feel even more strongly the lack of any sense of belonging.

Regarding the third question on the extent to which the teacher mentors feel that their esteem needs are met, three of the teachers stated that they felt that the student teachers give them a feeling of esteem. One of the teachers (who has been teaching for five years) went so far as to say: "A large percentage of the student teachers who were with me during the lessons said to me that they actually had come to learn from me how to be teachers and that their practical work in my classroom was the one thing that had taught them how to be teachers." Four of the teachers stated that they felt they were esteemed in their school because they had been found suitable not only to teach children but also to train student teachers. On the other hand, seven of the teachers noted that they felt the complete opposite because any teacher can be a teacher mentor and because that role is neither important nor prestigious. One of the teachers (who teaches Arabic) claimed: "I know teacher mentors who themselves need guidance and training and who were chosen simply because the principal wanted them." Four of the teachers argued that the student teachers bring with them new ideas and new initiatives, especially in the field of technology, and that reinforces them (the teacher mentors) and pushes them to make changes – something that adds to their feeling of being esteemed.

Generally speaking, the findings point to the fact that daily exposure to the teacher mentor enables the student teacher to become familiar with the teacher mentor's work close at hand and to esteem it. Nevertheless, criticism was heard on more than one occasion from the student teachers to the effect that their observation of the teacher mentor's work aroused in them unpleasant memories that the teacher mentor was replicating. One of the teachers (who teaches English) said: "I was stunned when one of the student teachers told me, 'You remind me of the time I was in school and the teacher would scream at the pupils. This really frightened me.'"

9. Summary and Conclusions

It would seem that the present traditional structure of guidance frequently creates obstacles that prevent the filling of the teacher mentor's basic needs – and thus his/her upper level needs as well. The meeting of the teacher mentor's safety needs involves many difficulties – because of the application of a territorial border by the student teacher and the pedagogical instructor to the teacher mentor's learning setting and because of the "robbing" of the teacher mentor's free time due to his/her commitment to the student teacher; as a result, the teacher mentor's feeling of self-confidence is impaired because he/she feels that his/her time is being "robbed" and that strangers are entering his arena for a defined period of time.

Regarding the need for belonging, this need can be met only partially because of insufficient involvement and insufficient partnership on the part of both the student teachers and the pedagogical instructor in the assumption of responsibility for the teaching in the classroom. Probably the lack of equality in terms of partnership when one compares the student teachers and the pedagogical instructors with the teacher mentors does not always allow the student teachers and pedagogical instructors to fully appreciate the significance of the teacher mentor's work and thus to fully esteem it.

The lack of esteem from the teacher mentor's "guests" and the very structure of pedagogical instruction prevent the teacher mentor from engaging in interaction with the pedagogical instructor and with the student teachers and from entering into a dialogue with them that could ensure professional development.

A traditional basic assumption is that the student teacher learns the theoretical foundations of teaching in the training institution (that is, the university) and acquires practical experience with the help of the teacher mentor's professional experience. However, there is a substantive difference between knowledge that is acquired in a theoretical manner and knowledge that is acquired through its application. Whereas theoretical knowledge can be learned at a distance from the natural learning environment of the teaching process, practical knowledge can be learned through training and personal experience only in real time in the natural environment of the teaching process. Only the latter kind of knowledge will become active and potent and it is in effect the true disclosure of the theoretical knowledge.

The expectations from the teacher mentor, who is supposed to train student teachers in real time while teaching his/her own pupils are not always met, especially when the teacher mentor's needs are also not met. The time devoted to

guidance and/or his/her guidance skills in connection with the student teacher are not at all equal to the time and skills spent on the teaching of his/her pupils. As a result, in many cases, a vacuum is created in the traditional approach and the student teachers have no teacher mentor who can teach them the practical work of teaching. However, in our opinion, the teacher mentor need not be the central force in the guidance process; instead, the pedagogical instructor should be allowed to lead the entire process because the pedagogical instructor is the sole player here who is responsible for the integration of the two kinds of knowledge – what is taught at university and what is learned through practical experience. Furthermore, the pedagogical instructor is the sole player here who can explain the process of teaching through the theory because the knowledge acquired through personal experience is produced in the classroom's melting pot. In addition, the pedagogical instructor knows the student teacher not only from the scholastic standpoint but also at the personal level; thus, unlike the teacher mentor, the pedagogical instructor can identify, if necessary, the student teacher's inhibitions and can support him/her in real time in accordance with the student teacher's specific needs.

To sum up, it would be preferable if the model of leadership in the process of pedagogical instruction were led by the pedagogical instructor in light of an approach that sees all the participants in the process of pedagogical instruction as partners in a team that is learning about teaching and whose goal is to create a dialogue about the production of knowledge. This is the new organizational model that we are proposing so that the needs of all the participants can be met. The model should be tested through field research from three standpoints – planning, implementation and evaluation – all of which should focus on structural and professional aspects. Until this happens, our intermediate recommendations are that the academic institution must examine the needs of the teacher mentors, who must be reinforced through monetary grants, refresher courses and teaching in academic settings, especially with regard to the subject of the pedagogical workshop. In addition, this research study recommends that a thorough examination be conducted with regard to the entire guidance triangle – the pedagogical instructor, the student teacher and the school.

References

- Beck, S. (2008). Is training superfluous? On the uniqueness of the academic training of teachers. In: D. Kfir and T. Ariav (eds.), *The Crisis of Teaching: Toward a Change in Teacher Training* (Educational and Pedagogical Policy Series). Pp. 251-280.
- Lavi, Z. (2000). *Is education possible in the era of post-modernism?* Tel Aviv: Poalim Library.
- Lomsky-Peder, A., and Kahane, R. (ed.) (1988). *Portrait of the Artist in Israeli Society: Source Analysis* (Israel – A Society in the Making, 4). Jerusalem: Akademon.
- Ziv, S. (1991). The teacher mentor in teacher training: Problems and Directions in Coping. Pages, 13, 24-31.
- Zozovsky, R. (2000). Growth of role perception among teacher mentors in the course of their training. Pages, 31, 113-126.
- Bulman, C. J., Lathlean, I. & M. Gobbi (2014). The process of teaching and learning about reflection: research insights from professional nurse education. *Studies in Higher Education* 39(7), 1219-1236.
- Koerner, M. E. (1992). The cooperating teacher: an ambivalent participant in student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1), 46-56.
- Lathlean, I., Hagger, H. & McIntyre, D. (1997). Skills of mentoring in initial teacher education. In: D. McIntyre (Ed.) *Teacher education in a new context: The Oxford internship scheme* (pp. 134-144).
- Marbach, A. (1989), *Development locating information in books in the fifth grade of the elementary school* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Sheffield, Sheffield.
- Maslow, A. H. (1956). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Row and Harper.
- Murrell, P. C. J. (2001). *The community teacher: A new framework for effective urban teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: a field study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(2), 28-34.
- Slick, S.K. (1998). A university supervisor negotiates territory and studies (teacher education and teacher as researchers). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(4), 306-315.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basic of grounded theory methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Trautman, P. I. J. (2000). Mentoring, social interaction, and transformations: Overview and framework. In D. J. McIntyre & D. M. Byrd (Eds.). *Research on effective models for teacher education* (pp. 132-135). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Veal, M. L. & Rikard I. (1998). Cooperating teachers' perspectives on the student triad. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(2), 109-119.
- Williams, D. A. & Bowman, C. L. (2000). Reshaping the profession: One teacher at a time. In D. J. McIntyre & D. M. Byrd (Eds.) *Research on effective models for teacher education* (pp. 173-187). Thousand Oaks, California, Corwin Press.