QUT

QUTePrints
Open-access archive of QUT research literature

COVER SHEET

This is the author version of article published as:

Hansford, Brian C. and Ehrich, Lisa C. and Tennent, Lee (2004) Outcomes and perennial issues in Preservice Teacher Education Mentoring Programs . International Journal of Practical Experiences in Professional Education (PEPE) 8(2):pp. 6-17.

Copyright 2004 (please consult author)

Accessed from   http://eprints.qut.edu.au

OUTCOMES AND PERENNIAL ISSUES IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION MENTORING PROGRAMS

Professor Brian Hansford (Emeritus)
Centre for Innovation in Education
Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
Victoria Park Road
Kelvin Grove QLD 4059
AUSTRALIA
bc.hansford@qut.edu.au

Dr Lisa C. Ehrich
Senior Lecturer
School of Learning & Professional Studies
Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
Victoria Park Road
Kelvin Grove QLD 4059
AUSTRALIA
l.ehrich@qut.edu.au
ph: 61 7 3864 3038

Dr Lee Tennent
Senior Research Assistant
Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
Victoria Park Road
Kelvin Grove QLD 4059
AUSTRALIA
l.tennent@qut.edu.au
ph: 61 7 3864 3096

1

OUTCOMES AND PERENNIAL ISSUES IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION MENTORING PROGRAMS

Abstract

The growing body of literature on mentoring across a variety of professional disciplines such as education, medicine, nursing, law, business, and public administration is an indication of its high profile. This paper reflects our ongoing interest in the phenomenon of mentoring and takes as its focus, pre-service teacher education mentoring programs. In this paper we review a substantial body of the research literature that identifies the outcomes of mentoring for pre-service teachers and their mentors. We also consider some important perennial issues in the field experience / mentoring of pre-service teacher education programs which have implications for the quality of the experience for pre-service teachers.

OUTCOMES AND PERENNIAL ISSUES IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION MENTORING PROGRAMS

BACKGROUND

Traditionally workers in both the professions and trades learned skills and developed competencies through various types of apprenticeship models in the work environment (Ray, 2001). It was only in the last century that training for most professionals, such as nurses, teachers, pharmacists, surveyors and others, left the exclusive confines of the work environment and moved into tertiary education institutions. In most cases today, the initial training for particular types of professionals occurs in universities. As expected, the shift from an apprenticeship model to the tertiary education sector for the training of professionals brought with it an awareness of the critical role the field experience or the practicum plays in the development of novices (Dunn, Ehrich, Mylonas and Hansford, 2000). It is through field experience programs that learners are able to transfer knowledge and skills learned at university into practical settings. Indeed, much of the literature in the field (see for example, Dunn, et al., 2000; Goodlad, 1990; Stallings and Quinn, 1991) has identified field experience as a critical aspect of teacher education programs.

Central to these field experience programs are mentors, those experienced practitioners in the workplace, who play a pivotal part in helping students develop the practical skills, competencies and know-how required for effective practice. Within the profession of teaching, the supervising or mentor teacher's role is to 'supervise the

pre-service teacher's induction into the field and growth in professional attributes' (QUT Field Experience Office, n.d. p. 4) or as Feiman-Nemser (1996, p. 1) puts it, 'help novices learn new pedagogies and socialis[e] them to new professional norms'.

As writers in the field of mentoring we were aware that much of the mentoring literature has portrayed mentoring for pre-service teachers as a valuable and important learning experience. Yet, we were also aware from anecdotal discussions with pre-service teachers in our university, that the quality of the practicum can vary greatly amongst students and can range from being a valuable and intense learning experience to one where little learning, support and guidance occurs. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that the outcomes of the practicum experience for pre-service teachers are not always productive or desirable (Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, 1987; Kane, 1992). It was against this backdrop that we examined a substantial body of research literature to determine both the extent to which the 'dark side' (Long, 1997) and beneficial side of mentoring was apparent for pre-service teachers and their mentors. Our aim was to develop a more comprehensive picture of mentoring that would enable us to make more valid inferences about its potential to be an important contribution to pre-service teacher education programs.

This paper reflects our ongoing interest in the phenomenon of mentoring for pre-service teachers. To this end we report on the findings of a structured review of 52 research based papers that explore the outcomes of mentoring for pre-service teachers and their mentors. For the purposes of this discussion, we have defined a structured review as a pre-determined set of criteria, namely a set of coding categories, that is used to analyse research papers.

THE STRUCTURED REVIEW

The 52 research based papers reviewed for our investigation were taken from a larger database of educational mentoring papers compiled by the authors. This larger database consisted of a range of mentoring arrangements within educational contexts and included mentoring for pre-service teachers, beginning teachers, school principals, school and university students, and university staff (Hansford, Tennent and Ehrich 2003). The papers that comprised the large sample were located from a search of databases including ERIC, Austrom (AEI), PsycLIT and ProQuest utilising terms such as 'mentor', 'mentoring', 'teacher/s', 'education/al'.

The 52 reviewed studies were published during 1986 to 1999. All reported original research findings. Papers were coded for both factual and descriptive data. Factual data included country of origin, publication type (i.e. journal, conference paper, etc), sample size, methodology and data collection techniques. The great majority of pre-service mentoring studied reported findings in descriptive terms. This descriptive data were coded according to the positive and negative outcomes identified for the mentor, mentee and the organisation. The coding was based on the principles of content analysis (Weber, 199) and reported in this paper as frequencies and percentages

In this paper we focus our attention on the descriptive data only from the structured review. In particular, we report on the positive and negative outcomes of mentoring for pre-service teachers and their mentors. The following section of the paper discusses the positive outcomes of mentoring for both parties and then discusses the negative outcomes of mentoring.

POSITIVE OUTCOMES FOR PARTICIPANTS

[Insert Table 1 here]

As can be seen from Table I, 43 of the 52 studies reported positive outcomes for mentees and 23 studies reported positive outcomes for mentors. While this suggests that mentoring might be more beneficial to mentees than mentors, the imbalance is better explained by the nature of the studies and the specific questions each of the research papers addressed.

<u>Mentees</u>

Thematic analysis of the 43 studies revealed 15 categories of positive outcomes of mentoring for mentees or pre-service teachers. Of these, the most frequently cited positive outcome was the learning of new teaching strategies and enhanced subject knowledge.   This was evident in just under half of the studies (i.e. 21 or 49% of studies) that reported positive outcomes for mentees. For example, a pre-service teacher in a British study by Hardy (1999) said 'I gained a lot of subject knowledge on areas I was not experienced in' (p.182). Reports from 18 or 42% of the studies indicated that mentees also benefited from support, empathy and friendship from the mentoring relationship. In McNally and Martin's (1998) British study, seven of the eight mentors noted that giving 'support' to mentees included such things as counselling them, listening to them, and being sensitive to their needs and feelings. Kram (1985) refers to this type of mentoring function as 'psycho-social support'

An equal number of studies revealed that mentoring benefited mentees by allowing them to 'share ideas' and gain valuable 'feedback' on their work and performance.

These outcomes were reported in 15 or 35% of studies. A mentee teacher in a program in the United Kingdom for instance commented that her mentor 'came up with good comments when he observed [me] which helped me a lot' (Haggarty, 1995, p.35).

In ten or 23% of studies reporting positive mentee outcomes, improved self-esteem and enhanced confidence were viewed as benefits. Student mentees in an American study by Padek, Stadulis, Barton, Meadows and Padak (1994, p. 348), for example, claimed that being mentoring helped them gain confidence in themselves as people and potential teachers.   In a further nine studies (21%), 'induction at school' was reported as a positive outcome of mentoring. Induction was viewed as a positive outcome since it enabled student teachers to become socialised into the role and school culture and therefore learn more about the real-life demands of teaching.

Eight of the reviewed studies (19%) reported 'role modelling' and 'reflection' provided by the mentor as positive outcomes of mentoring for mentees.   For instance, a student teacher in Stanulis and Jeffer's (1995) American study commented that 'she learned so much' (p.19) from observing the way her teacher reacted sensitively to an interaction with a child in class. It was clear that this student's mentor teacher was an important role model for her. The same student teacher commented that reflecting and 'talking about my beliefs .. [and] teaching style have probably been the most beneficial things to me personally' from the mentoring experience (p.21).

'Encouragement of risk taking and independence' was also reported in six studies (or 14 percent) as a positive outcome for mentees. Commenting on the experience of participating in an internship program in Colorado, one participant stated, 'I learned to take risks that I never would have thought possible' (Kozleski, Sands and French 1993, p. 21).

Equal numbers of studies highlighted career related outcomes for mentees. For instance, in five or 12% of the studies, 'better or realistic preparation for career' and 'career advancement / affirmation' were reported by mentees as positive outcomes of the mentoring experience. As one mentee stated, the experience of being mentored 'helped me make my mind up that I really did want to become a teacher' (Padek et al 1994, p. 348)

Other positive outcomes reported in the studies included 'knowledge of school policies / procedures' (9%), interpersonal skill development (7%), 'professional development' (7%) and 'mutual respect / trust' (4%).

<u>Mentors</u>

Noted earlier, 23 of the 52 studies reported some positive outcomes for mentors. Table I presents the ten categories of responses that emerged from the analysis. Of these, the most frequently cited, evident in 61 % of studies, was 'reflection / reappraisal of beliefs and practices'. For instance a mentor teacher in Stanulis and Jeffers' (1995, p. 22) American study said she learned a great deal from the opportunity to analyze her own mentoring practice. Similarly, all of the eight mentor teachers involved in an internship program in Colorado (Kozleski et al, 1993, p. 19)

reported that the experience enabled them to question some of their practices and beliefs.

Following closely, 'professional development' was a positive outcome cited in 13 or 57% of studies. For instance, most of the mentor teachers in Herndon and Fauske's (1996, p. 40) study indicated they experienced some professional development / growth as a result of participating in the mentoring program.

'Collaboration, collegiality and networking' was also a frequently noted positive outcome of mentoring being reported in nine studies (39%). In Spargo's (1994) qualitative study, mentoring was seen as providing opportunities for collegiality and collaboration amongst mentors and mentees (Spargo, 1994).

The enjoyment of mentoring for mentors was also noted in some studies. Thirty-five percent of studies reported 'personal satisfaction / reward' while 30% of studies also indicated that mentoring was 'enjoyable / challenging / stimulating'. For instance, mentor teachers in a study by Padek et al. (1994) expressed satisfaction at having some impact upon their mentee's life and career choice.

Five of the studies (22%) reported that mentoring 'improved practice' for mentors. Other positive outcomes for mentors included 'profession recognition / respect' (17%), 'exposed to new ideas / trends' (17%), 'interpersonal skill development (13%) and 'role satisfaction' (9%).

As Table I reveals, several positive outcomes were common to both mentors and mentees. These outcomes were reflection, professional development, interpersonal skill development and improved practice.

NEGATIVE OUTCOMES FOR PARTICIPANTS

The review of studies revealed a plethora of negative outcomes arising from the mentoring programs. As can be seen from Table II, 25 studies reported negative outcomes of mentoring for mentees and 27 reported negative outcomes for mentors.

[Insert Table 2 here]

<u>**Mentees**</u>

From the analysis, 11 categories of negative outcomes for mentees emerged. As Table II indicates, the most frequently cited negative outcome to emerge related to mentors being 'critical / out of touch / defensive' to mentees. This outcome was evident in twelve studies (48%) in the sample. Two of the student teachers in Haggarty's (1995) British study of mentor-mentee pairs noted the difficulty in trying to talk to their mentors who were not amenable to new ideas or did not appreciate being questioned about their practices. As one student teacher said, 'but I couldn't question her [the mentor]. She has such strong opinions herself and it appears the Department has to do as she says' (p. 37).

Lack of mentor support and guidance was the second most frequently cited negative outcome of mentoring and was reported in nine studies (36%). This was apparent in a number of studies where mentors reported that they were not informed about expectations or responsibilities and evident in studies where mentors adopted a laissez faire approach to mentoring.

Other negative outcomes to emerge included 'lack of mentor time' (6 or 24% of studies), 'lack of mentor training / understanding' (5 or 20% of studies) and 'expertise / personality mismatch' between the mentor and mentee (5 or 20% of studies). In a study of six mentor-mentee pairs in the United Kingdom, the mentee teachers noted that there was a shortage of time available to talk with mentors and for this reason they were therefore reluctant to seek too much help from them (Haggarty, 1995, p.39). Kane and Campbell (1993) noted that one of the common reasons teachers left the North West Articled Teachers Scheme in the United Kingdom was due to 'differences in philosophy, practices and in some cases personalities' (p.20) between mentors and articled teachers. These differences caused considerable difficulty for the novice teachers.

Equal numbers of studies (16%) reported further difficulties including 'lack of mentor interest', 'difficulty meeting' and 'ineffective / inappropriate mentor advice'. Difficulty in meeting with mentors was related in part to the overstretched nature of mentor's work and the limited time available for discussions with mentees.

Other negative outcomes reported in the reviewed studies for mentees included 'advice versus assessment conflict' (8%), mentees who were 'reluctant to seek help' (8%) and mentees who had 'feelings of inadequacy' (8%)

<u>Mentors</u>

Twenty-seven of the 52 studies reported negative outcomes of mentoring for mentors. Of these negative outcomes, nine categories emerged. The most frequently cited

negative outcome reported for mentors was lack of time. This was evident in 15 of the studies (56%). As an example, some mentor teachers in Campbell's study of mentor teachers in the United Kingdom (1995) reported difficulty in trying to divide time between pre-service teachers and the children in their care.

'Lack of training / understanding of the role' was the second most commonly cited negative outcome. This was reported in 11 studies (41%). As an example, a number of teachers in Herndon and Fauske's (1996, p. 39) study complained that they did not understand the demands of the mentoring program and the expectations set down by the university regarding student teacher responsibilities.

In ten (37%) of studies, mentors noted that mentoring was an 'extra burden / responsibility'. For instance, mentor teachers in Spargo's (1994) study were not given any time release for their participation in the program and consequently, mentoring was viewed as an additional burden for them.

'Professional expertise / personality mismatch' was evident in seven or 26% of studies. In these studies, it was clear that mentor and mentee expectations differed. As one mentor teacher stated, 'I am also concerned about his [the student teacher] allowing students to turn in late work .. [he] is still hesitant to make the kids totally accountable … I think kids should learn to follow rules' (Herndon and Fauske, 1996, p. 37).

Equal numbers of studies (5 or 19% of studies) revealed that mentoring was 'stressful / draining' for mentors and mentees created 'frustration' for mentors. Some mentor

teachers in Herndon and Fauske's (1996, p.33) study expressed annoyance with their student teachers. For example, one mentor teacher stated, 'I find it inexcusable for him not to be prepared' (p. 33)

A small number of studies indicated additional negative outcomes for mentors. These included 'lack of support / resources / encouragement' (11%), the challenge of 'balancing support and evaluation' (11%) and 'unrealistic mentee expectations' (7%).

A comparison of mentor and mentee negative outcome categories revealed some commonality across the two groups. Both mentors and mentees experienced problems stemming from the lack of mentor time, lack of mentoring training / understanding, and professional / personality mismatch. Additionally, both parties reported difficulties inherent in the dual role of mentor as provider of support / development and evaluator.

DISCUSSION

From the aforementioned analysis, mentoring was seen to provide benefits to both mentor teachers and pre-service teachers. The benefits for pre-service teachers could be grouped into two main areas: interpersonal relational outcomes and schooling based outcomes. The first category included psycho-social supportive outcomes (Kram, 1983) such as friendship, increased confidence, enhanced risk-taking behaviour, interpersonal skill development, and mutual respect and trust, while the second group included outcomes such as new / improved teaching strategies, induction at school, and knowledge of school policies and procedures. Positive outcomes were also apparent for mentors. An important benefit was that the

relationship with their mentees encouraged them to reconsider their practice. For instance, improved practice, the opportunity to reflect on their current beliefs and being exposed to new ideas were examples of the ways in which the relationship expanded their own views and practices. That reflection emerged as a significant outcome for both mentors and mentees (but to a lesser extent) was unsurprising given it has been described as the "'sine qua non' of the 'teacher-researcher', 'action research' and 'reflective practitioner'" movements" (Day, 1993, p. 1). In several of the studies, the mentoring process was identified as a vehicle for facilitating reflection since it provided opportunities for mentors and mentees together and alone to reflect upon their practice and their beliefs, reconsider what they are doing and why, and work towards improving their professional practice. Furthermore, mentoring was reported as providing enjoyment, professional recognition, role and personal satisfaction, and a sense of collaboration and collegiality for mentors.

As anticipated, mentoring was not without its problems or 'dark side' for mentors and mentees. The mentees or pre-service teachers' concerns about mentoring focused largely on matters surrounding the personal qualities of their mentors. For example, mentors who were out of touch / defensive, incompatible either professionally or personality wise, lacked support, time, understanding or training and interest, and provided inappropriate advice caused concern and problems for mentees. Similarly, mentors did not appreciate mentees who were incompatible in terms of expertise or personality or who held unrealistic expectations. Other negative outcomes identified for mentors related more to the mentoring process itself than the qualities possessed by mentees. For instance, mentoring was viewed as problematic because it was time

consuming, an extra burden, stressful, and caused difficulties because of limited support or resources.

Although the structured analysis identified a considerable number of significant outcomes for mentors and mentees, we will now focus on four perennial issues regarding pre-service mentoring.

<u>Supervision or mentoring?</u>

Lack of clarity surrounding the definition of terms used in the social sciences has long been cause for concern and the study of mentoring is no exception. Not surprisingly, very few of the papers in the database provided an operational definition of the concept of mentoring. It is noteworthy that the terms 'supervision' and 'mentoring' were often used interchangeably in the studies. In our sample, pre-service or novice teachers were assigned to schools for periods of teaching experience and were normally assigned a 'supervisor', or as many research papers stated a 'mentor'.

Yet, we would question whether 'supervision' equates with 'mentoring' in many field experience programs for pre-service teachers. The term, supervision, appears to have a much more hierarchical connotation than the term mentoring since it implies the right to control or direct another person or persons. However, our own personal observations in school settings, along with an examination of the literature in the field, would suggest that a number of supervisors of school-based field experiences do appear to perform their roles in a manner consistent with the principles that underlie mentoring. By principles of mentoring, we mean principles underpinning a positive interpersonal relationship characterised by the sharing of expertise, moral support,

trust, and where pre-service teachers are given guidance and opportunities to develop

by their mentor-teachers (Awaya, McEwan, Heyler, Linksy, Lum and Wakukawa

2003). It is interesting to note what might be described as a split in the literature. On

the one hand, some of the studies seemed to support the notion that pre-service

teachers be placed in a controlled and authoritative context, while, on the other, other

studies made a cogent argument that field experiences should occur in a 'mentored',

rather than 'supervised' context.

Mentors who abuse their power / position

Notable in our studies of the mentoring/supervision of pre-service teachers was

considerable comment regarding the use, or perhaps the misuse, of the

supervisor/mentor's power. However, a number of researchers have argued that the

practice of supervisory teachers or cooperating teachers 'directing' and 'controlling'

field experiences is not mentoring, nor does it necessarily provide trainees with the

most beneficial experiences. For example, Landay (1998), Stanulis and Russell

(2000) and Awaya et al (2003) contend that the mentoring of pre-service teachers

should not be based on rank or authority, but rather on mutuality, collaboration and

equality. In discussing a collaborative project between a faculty and a high school,

Landay (1998) made her views clear in the following comment.

> [w]e hoped it would be an instance of mutual mentoring where we all taught
>
> and learned from one another. To do that, we had to resist several common
>
> research practices. One was the practice of "studying down," where people in
>
> more powerful positions in institutional hierarchies are the "researchers," and
>
> "the subjects" are those with less institutional power—an outdated model of

teaching and learning that reserves the role of teacher for those in the highest

status in a hierarchy and the role of learner to those with the least status (p.62).

It is customary in pre-service teacher training for the novice or trainee teachers to be assigned to both a school and supervisor for their field experience or practice teaching experiences. These 'assignments' are typically only two/three weeks per semester in length. Consequently, the trainee is not a permanent employee at the school and is involved in a temporary assignment where reports or grades are generated by the supervisor. For this reason, it is not a setting where supportive mentoring is likely to flourish automatically. As anticipated, the structured review highlighted the tension that sometimes exists in the mentoring role between support, on the one hand, and assessment on the other. It appears that the tension between support and evaluation is exacerbated in situations where there is a lack of understanding about the mentoring role and where an honest, open and trusting relationship has not developed between the two parties.

Despite these problems, our review indicated that most supervisors were regarded by their pre-service teachers as highly competent. As noted previously, the majority of studies (i.e. 43 out of 52) reported at least some positive outcomes for mentees. The underlying issue seems to be whether we are describing mentoring? The length of these teaching placements, the observation of a small number of lessons, the assignment to a particular setting and person (with virtually no choice in the matching process) make it very difficult for experienced teachers to do little but to direct and control the context in an endeavour to provide the novice with some useful experiences.

Workload and Allied Issues

The data collected in our examination of mentoring of pre-service teachers indicates that both the trainee teachers and their supervisors were concerned about the allocation of time for mentors to carry out their role. Reports in many of the studies examined indicated that supervisors commented on the lack of time to attend to the particular task, the lack of understanding of the role and the extra burden in their workload. Some of the supervisors also viewed mentoring as stressful and frustrating. The trainee teachers made comments about their mentors/supervisors being critical, out of touch, failing to provide support and guidance and their lack of training. Given that both the teacher trainees and their supervisors were aware of problems, it is interesting that so many of the studies reported positive outcomes for both parties. Yet at the foundation of so many of the studies is the issue of workload. While schools and teacher training institutions continue to follow the current model of school-based supervision, it seems that mentoring will continue to be less than ideal until such issues as workload, training for mentors, time allocation and adequate remuneration of mentors are addressed.

Learning for pre-service teachers

To a large extent, the research relating to the mentoring of pre-service teachers focuses on the central performers in the relationship, namely, the supervisor/mentor and the trainee teacher. This focus is understandable given that mentoring is an interpersonal relationship. There are certainly many studies that indicate the practical, field-based teaching experiences are considered the most valuable and pertinent by pre-service teachers (Dunn et al. 2000). Yet Feiman-Nemser (1996) has raised the

question as to what novice teachers learn as a result of mentoring. Is the 'learning' a short term, or immediacy effect, built around the assumption that the novice gains a feeling of greater security as a consequence of 'tips' and 'advice' from an experienced teacher regarding classroom survival received from the experienced teacher? Or is the 'learning' deeper than this, leading to novice teachers developing a philosophy of teaching? School systems and tertiary education institutions may be somewhat concerned to know that some school-based mentors promote norms and practices that limit reform (Feiman-Nemser, Parker and Zeichner, 1993), or that by the misuse of power, there are mentors who impede, rather than stimulate, pre-service teachers' professional growth (Fairbanks, Freedman and Kahn, 2000).   It seems that the quality of the learning in the practicum for pre-service teachers is contingent largely upon the skills, competencies and other qualities of the supervising teacher and the building of a relationship that is forged between and not forced upon the two key parties.

CONCLUSION

Formal mentoring is widely established in many professions. Irrespective of why the programs were introduced, there is substantial evidence that mentoring can have beneficial outcomes. In relation to pre-service teacher education, however, there is much room for improvement. Many of the changes that we believe should be made cost money and this is where the problem commences. To recruit, train and adequately remunerate mentors is a further burden on already scarce resources. As Zeichner (1990) and Reid (1994) have indicated, the field experience holds a marginal status in university programs attracting only limited funding and recognition. It is our opinion that education departments, individual schools and teacher education facilities recognise that the status of mentoring of novice teachers must increase to a more

productive level. However, it is likely to be some years before the required changes are implemented. To a considerable extent, this stems from a knowledge that the current models of 'supervised' field-experiences work moderately well, and may be relatively cost effective given the outcomes.

At this juncture, it is important to identify the limitations of the present study. Firstly, the research papers were based on a particular span of years (1986 to 1999). Secondly, they were sourced from a limited number of English language online databases. Undoubtedly, this method of data collection limited the data that was available to us. Thus, our findings need to be considered in the light of the scope and time-frame of our study and therefore approached with some caution. Despite these limitations, we believe that our study contributes, at least in part, to the growing knowledge base on mentoring for pre-service teachers.

References

Awaya, A., McEwan, H., Heyler, B., Linsky, S., Lum, D., and Wakukawa, P. (2003) 'Mentoring as a journey', *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 19, 45-56.

Campbell, A. (1995) 'The mentoring school: Tensions and dilemmas for primary schools', *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 2, 6-13.

Day, C. (1993) 'Reflection: a necessary but not sufficient condition for professional development', *British Educational Research Journal*, 19*,* 43-93.

Dunn, S., Ehrich, L., Mylonas, A. and Hansford, B.C. (2000) 'Students' perceptions of field experience in professional development: A comparative study', *Journal of Nursing Education*, 39, 393-400.

QUT Field Experience Office (n.d.) *Field experience policies and guidelines*. Brisbane: Faculty of Education, QUT:

Fairbanks, C.M., Freedman, D., and Kahn, C. (2000) 'The role of effective mentors in learning to teach', *Journal of Teacher Education,* 51, 102-112.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1996) **'**Teacher mentoring: A critical review', ERIC digest, ERIC database, ED397060. *Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education*. Washington, DC. Retrieved August 20, 2003 from http://www.ericfacility.net/database/ERIC_Digests/ed397060.html

Feiman-Nemser, S. and Buchmann, M. (1987) 'Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation', *Teachers College Record*, 87, 49-65.

Feiman-Nemser, S., Parker and Zeichner, K. (1993) 'Are mentor teachers, teacher educators'? In D. McIntyre, H. Haggger and M. Wilkin (Eds.), *Mentoring: Perspectives on school based teacher education,* London: Kogan Page, 147-165.

Goodlad, J.L. (1990) *Teacher for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Haggarty, L. (1995) 'The complexities of effective mentoring in initial teacher education', *Mentoring and Tutoring,* 2, 32-41.

Hansford, B., Tennent, L. and Ehrich, L.C. (2003) 'Educational mentoring: Is it worth the effort?', *Education, Research and Perspectives*, 30, 42-75.

Hardy, C. A. (1999) 'Preservice teachers' perceptions of learning to teach in a predominantly school-based teacher education program', *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* 18*,* 175-198.

Herndon, K.M. and Fauske, J.R. (1996) 'Analysing mentoring practices through teachers' journals', *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24, 27-44.

Kane, R. (1992) 'Missing links: Constrains on the utilisation of propositional knowledge in the classroom practice of pre-service student teachers during practicum', Paper presented at the twenty-second Annual Teacher Education Conference, Ballina, New South Wales.

Kane, I. and Campbell, A. (1993) 'Mentor and mentor-training in the North West Articled Teacher Scheme', *Mentoring,* 1, 16-22.

Kozleski, E.B., Sands, D.J. and French, N. (1993) 'Preparing special education teachers for urban settings', *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 16, 14-22.

Kram, K. (1983) 'Phases of the mentor relationship', *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 608-625.

Kram, K.E. (1985*) Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, Il: Scott Foresman.

Landay, E. (1998) 'Mutual mentoring: Designing and teaching a linked university / secondary school course on literacy', *English Journal* (High school edition), 88, 59-64.

Long, J. (1997) 'The dark side of mentoring', *Australian Educational Research,* 24*,* 115-123.

McNally, P. and Martin, S. (1998) 'Support and challenge in learning to teach: The role of the mentor', *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education,* 26, 39-49.

Padak, N.D., Stadulis, J.K., Barton, L.E., Meadows, F.B., and Padak, G.M. (1994) Mentoring with future urban teachers*, Urban Education*, 29, 341-353.

Ray, J. (2001) 'Apprenticeships in Australia: A concise history'. In N. Smart (ed.) *Australian Apprenticeships: Research readings*. Leabrook, SA: NCVER, 15-41.

Reid, J.C. (1994) *Nursing education in Australian universities: Report of the national review of nursing education in the higher education sector – 1994 and beyond.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Spargo, H. (1994) 'What's in it for the mentor? The benefits of mentoring for experienced teachers'. Paper presented at the Australian Teacher Education Conference, Brisbane, Australia.

Stallings, J.A. and Quinn, L.F. (1991) 'Learning how to teach in the inner city', *Educational Leadership*, 49, 25-27.

Stanulis, R.N. and Jeffers, L. (1995) 'Action research as a way of learning about teaching in a mentor/student teacher relationship', *Action in Teacher Education,* 16, 14-24.

Stanulis, R.N. and Russell, D. (2000) '"Jumping in": Trust and communication in mentoring student teachers', *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 16, 65-80.

Weber, R.P. (1990) *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Zeichner, K. (1990) 'Changing directions in the practicum: Looking ahead to the 1990s', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 16, 105-131.

TABLE I   Positive Outcomes of Mentoring for Mentees (Pre-Service Teachers) and
mentors (Field Experience Teachers)

Mentees	**N=43**	**%**	**Mentors**	**N=23**	**%**
New teaching strategies / subject knowledge	21	49%	Reflection / reappraisal of beliefs	14	61%
Support/empathy/friendship	18	42%	Professional development	13	57%
Sharing ideas/ problem solving	15	35%	Collaboration / collegiality / networking	9	39%
Feedback/constructive criticism	15	35%	Personal satisfaction / reward/growth	8	35%
Confidence / self esteem	10	23%			
Induction at school	9	21%	Enjoyable / challenging / stimulating	7	30%
Reflection	8	19%			
Role modelling from mentor	8	19%	Improved practice	5	22%
Encouragement of risk taking / independence	6	14%	Professional recognition / respect	4	17%
Better / realistic preparation for career	5	12%	Exposed to new ideas / trends	4	17%
Career advancement / affirmation	5	12%	Interpersonal skill development	3	13%
Knowledge of school policies / procedures	4	9%	Role satisfaction	2	9%
Interpersonal skill development	3	7%			
Professional Development	3	7%			
Mutual respect / trust	2	5%			

TABLE II   Negative Outcomes of Mentoring for Mentees (Pre-service teachers) and Mentors (Field Experience Teachers)

Mentees	N=25	%	Mentors	N=27	%
Mentors critical / out of touch / defensive	12	48%	Lack time	15	56%
Lack of mentor support / guidance	9	36%	Lack of training / understanding of the role	11	41%
Lack of mentor time	6	24%	Extra burden / responsibility	10	37%
Lack of mentor training / understanding	5	20%	Expertise / personality mismatch	7	26%
Expertise / personality mismatch	5	20%	Stressful / draining	5	19%
Lack of mentor interest/ commitment	4	16%	Frustration with mentee	5	19%
Difficulty meeting	4	16%	Lack of support / resources / encouragement	3	11%
Ineffective / inappropriate mentor advice	4	16%	Balancing support and evaluation	3	11%
Advice vs assessment conflict	2	8%	Unrealistic mentee expectations	2	7%
Reluctant to seek help	2	8%			
Feelings of inadequacy	2	8%			