



International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in  
Education

## Understanding the Nature of Mentoring Experiences between Teachers and Student Teachers

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education</i>
Manuscript ID	IJMCE-04-2017-0028.R6
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	mentoring, teachers, student teachers, critical constructivism, initial teacher education

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## **Understanding the Nature of Mentoring Experiences between Teachers and Student**

### **Teachers**

### **Purpose**

Mentoring is widely recognised as an effective strategy for supporting the professional learning of teachers and student teachers across different educational contexts. Yet, its effectiveness in initial teacher education may be more widely conceived to take account of mentoring as a cultural practice, contributing to a change of professional learning habits and relationships towards collegiate and collaborative reflexivity. In this study, we explored the nature of mentoring experiences between teachers and student teachers, how these are embedded within the established professional learning culture of the school and the opportunities for mentoring to affect professional learning.

### **Design/Methodology/Approach**

Set within the context of a teacher education reform project in Scotland, involving student teachers, mentors and university tutors, the study adopted a critical constructivist theory stance to explore mentoring relationships. A sequential mixed methods approach informed the collection and analysis of data.

### **Findings**

Quantitative data point to a diversity of experiences of mentoring amongst teachers and student teachers. Qualitative data provide a nuanced account of participants' views of their mentoring experiences, pointing to opportunities for revisiting assumptions about learning in the classroom as well as questioning established professional learning patterns.

### **Practical Implications**

We conclude that mentoring relationships cannot be disentangled from a critical interrogation of the modes of relationships and values supporting professional learning in initial teacher education. Practical implications centre upon preparation and resources to develop mentoring as a tool for learning, embedded within the professional culture of the school.

### **Originality/Value**

The study reframes the concept of mentoring as a practice that does not simply reinforce professional expectations but seeks to redefine teacher professional learning, pedagogy and social relationships in school contexts.

**Keywords:** mentoring, student teachers, teachers, critical constructivism, initial teacher education

### **Introduction**

Mentoring is widely recognised as a strategy to promote professional learning in a variety of professional sectors (Aspfors and Bondas, 2013; Cosnefroy and Buhot, 2013; Kemmis *et al.*, 2014; Menon, 2012; Trevethan, 2017). In teacher education, mentoring programmes have been introduced to enhance teachers' professional experiences at different stages of their career, provide on-going and site-specific support for teachers' professional development (Korhonen *et al.*, 2017; Kougioumtzis and Patriksson, 2009; Menon, 2012) and increase the retention rates of beginning teachers (e.g. Koballa *et al.*, 2010; Korhonen *et al.*, 2017; Long, 2009; Menon, 2012). Mentoring in teacher education may contribute to enhancing both motivation and competence, with implications for the quality of young people's learning and development, globally (Peters, 2001; Tang *et al.*, 2015).

1  
2  
3 While mentoring in initial teacher education (ITE) is often portrayed as a dyadic and  
4  
5 unidirectional relationship, involving mentors supporting mentees to reach their goals, the  
6  
7 importance of creativity and collaboration amongst all participants involved in the learning  
8  
9 process, such as children and/or other professionals in the school, has also been documented  
10  
11 (Bradbury, 2010; Lofstrom and Eisenschmidt, 2009). Certainly, mentoring relationships between  
12  
13 two people can be collaborative; however, such collaboration may be limited to specific goals  
14  
15 and purposes, different from forging wider collaborative relationships which may bring  
16  
17 potentially new practices into existing settings (Aderibigbe, 2013, 2014; Aspfors and Bondas,  
18  
19 2013; Kaasila and Lauriala, 2010; Menon, 2012). Hence, as recently indicated by Izadinia  
20  
21 (2016), more research is needed to explore the extent and dimensions of collaborative mentoring  
22  
23 experiences by focusing on the values and understandings of mentoring from the perspectives of  
24  
25 teacher mentors and mentees.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Located within an ITE context in Scotland, this study sought to explore the nature of  
32  
33 collaborative mentoring relationships and how such relationships may be related to different  
34  
35 theoretical dispositions towards mentoring. The study is significant in that it contributes to the  
36  
37 developing body of knowledge about mentoring practices in ITE by offering further insights into  
38  
39 collaboration in mentoring and the implications for teachers' learning in professional contexts.  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **Context**

45  
46  
47 A study of mentoring relationships between student teachers and mentors was particularly timely  
48  
49 given the emphasis placed on mentoring practices in the Donaldson Review of Teacher  
50  
51 Education in Scotland, published in 2010. Donaldson's review recognised the importance of  
52  
53 mentoring, suggesting that it required "the redefinition of roles and responsibilities to include  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 increased reflection, collaboration and partnership” (p. 48), but also noted that “levels of  
4 satisfaction with the quality of mentoring could be improved further” (p. 51). Such a view is  
5 mirrored in England with a recent House of Commons briefing paper on initial teacher training,  
6 stating, “Mentoring across England is not as good as it should be” (Roberts and Foster, 2017 p.  
7 7). Donaldson also undertook a review of curriculum and assessment in Wales (Donaldson,  
8 2015), which stressed the need to develop ‘system capacity’, through an extensive and sustained  
9 programme of professional learning.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 In this regard, Mtika *et al.* (2014), reporting on a study about quality in teacher education  
20 in Scotland, remarked that teacher professional learning is grounded in productive partnerships,  
21 such as those between schools and universities. However, a gap in assumptions and expectations  
22 regarding priorities for teachers’ professional development is often at the heart of practicum  
23 problems (Bain *et al.*, 2017; Trevethan, 2017). So, one of the important aspects of the  
24 programme examined here, and which provided the context of this study, was the creation of a  
25 continuum of mentoring support for student teachers and beginning teachers spanning the  
26 undergraduate years and through to the first two years of induction and professional practice in  
27 schools. As explained in Korhonen *et al.* (2017, p. 154), the essence of the continuum approach  
28 is to “move away from over-emphasis on initial preparation by distributing teacher learning and  
29 professional development across career stages, and thus to support and promote the lifelong  
30 learning of teachers”. Such a framework has been advocated by others as a core premise to  
31 enhance teachers’ professional development (Geber, 2013; Hughes *et al.*, 2013).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 However, while the Donaldson Review (Donaldson, 2010) recognised that mentoring is  
50 essential for *both* new and experienced teachers, the translation of policy messages into practice  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 is notably shaped by deeply seated cultural assumptions and expectations about the nature and  
4  
5 practices of professional learning.  
6

7  
8 So, in the context of this study, mentoring was positioned as an integral aspect of teacher  
9  
10 professional learning in a partnership context. As such, mentoring was not simply conceived of  
11  
12 as a support mechanism for student teachers to become apprentices in schools, but as a  
13  
14 framework for strengthening mutual learning, integrated within a critical constructivist approach,  
15  
16 discussed later, which provided the basis for pedagogy and practice within and beyond ITE. The  
17  
18 investigation centred upon the nature of the mentoring *relationships* enacted by student teachers  
19  
20 and teacher mentors in the programme and the implications for professional learning.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **Theoretical Framework**

27  
28 Mentoring is differently understood, conceptualised and theorised (Kemmis *et al.*, 2014) across  
29  
30 diverse professional contexts. These differences may lead to potential confusions, overlaps or  
31  
32 ‘borrowing’ of approaches that are derived from a variety of disciplines supporting distinct  
33  
34 practices. Kemmis *et al.* (2014) argued that what may be confusing about mentoring is not a lack  
35  
36 of theories but rather the existence of a plurality of theories. They explained further that  
37  
38 distinctive theoretical perspectives have been developed by scholars, each contributing selected  
39  
40 aspects. Drawing on an extensive literature review, Wang and Odell (2007) identified three  
41  
42 dimensions of mentoring: humanistic, situated apprenticeship and critical constructivist  
43  
44 perspectives. While the humanistic dimension is largely centred upon the psychological and  
45  
46 personal aspects, the other two perspectives offer more explicit cues on the nature of professional  
47  
48 relationships. More specifically, Wang and Odell (2007) brought to surface the normative  
49  
50 contexts in which professional relationships may develop, distinguishing between the  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 bureaucratic-managerial and the participatory-involved approaches. The first scenario points to  
4 asymmetric relationships between mentor and mentee, on the basis of either power or expertise;  
5 while the second scenario emphasises mutuality and voice. When applied to the context of the  
6 classroom, the bureaucratic-managerial dimension locates student teachers in the role of  
7 ‘visitors’ in the school, who are expected to facilitate classroom activities as strictly instructed.  
8 This conception would align broadly with conceptions of mentoring as an apprenticeship  
9 process, where novice and student teachers are guided to develop professional knowledge by  
10 mature and experienced teachers (Aderibigbe, 2014; Hobson and Malderez, 2013; Wang and  
11 Odell, 2007). In the same vein, Maguire (2001, p. 99) acknowledged that the process “sounds a  
12 sensible and practical way in which to induct and support novice teachers”. However, this author  
13 also noted that if mentoring is used as a means to induct beginning teachers into following  
14 standards, it may strain relationships and lead to situations where novice teachers may feel  
15 unwelcome or even bullied into conforming to an implicit model of what an ideal teacher should  
16 be like. Hobson and Malderez (2013) also reported that mentoring may hamper mentees’  
17 learning and professional development when mentors are judgemental while providing them with  
18 feedback on their practice.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Conversely, the participatory-involved process recognises the potential for student  
42 teachers to engage in joint decision-making with teachers about activities conducted both within  
43 the classroom and more widely in the school. Rather than focusing exclusively on the student  
44 teacher as a new learner, the participatory-involved process places emphasis on the quality of the  
45 learning environments for beginning teachers; such environments are deemed to be “empowering  
46 and enabling” by the extent to which they support mentees with opportunities to work together  
47 with others as well as develop skills to “do things for themselves” (Clutterbuck, 2004, p. 11).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Trevethan (2017, p. 221) argued that the essence of this collaborative model “is an  
4 understanding that close relationships and collaboration are valuable for both teacher and student  
5 teachers’ learning”. The model is also consistent with the constructivist perspective of mentoring  
6 where mentors and mentees can learn from each other to strengthen their professional  
7 development (Aderibigbe, 2014; Bradbury, 2010; Wang and Odell, 2007).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 Undoubtedly, a mentoring process guided by the apprenticeship disposition has its merits,  
15 in that student teachers can be inducted into school settings and assisted to understand the  
16 existing norms. However, it may not offer opportunities for student teachers to be creative and  
17 innovative if they have to comply with strict procedures (Shea, 2002). In contrast, Aderibigbe  
18 (2013) found that mentoring can be more beneficial and tends to encourage more creativity  
19 amongst mentors and mentees when characterised by dialogue and collaboration.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Taking these considerations into account, in this study we sought to further investigate  
29 the dimensions of collaborative mentoring in ITE, along with identifying factors contributing to  
30 their development. We draw upon earlier theoretical (Wang and Odell, 2007) and empirical  
31 (Aderibigbe, 2013) studies on mentoring as grounded in a critical constructivist approach, which  
32 is both participatory and collaborative in nature (Kemmis *et al.*, 2014) and supported by an  
33 egalitarian structure for creating knowledge in context (Kincheloe, 2005). From this perspective,  
34 we recognise that mentoring is a multi-faceted and complex activity that is associated with some  
35 other forms of relationships such as coaching, facilitating, counselling, and networking  
36 (Landsberg, 1996). All such activities include different forms of collaborative learning amongst  
37 participants (Bradbury, 2010; Kutsyuruba, 2012), yet underlie the centrality of mutual respect  
38 and dialogue as key dimensions in collaborative mentoring.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 In this regard, Fieman-Nemsar (2001) warned that collaborative dialogue may be  
4  
5 counterproductive if there is no room for the exploration of multiple standpoints. So, in the first  
6  
7 instance, collaborative mentoring processes may be characterised by a joint effort between  
8  
9 mentors and student teachers to examine pedagogical knowledge, share ideas and generate new  
10  
11 professional knowledge (Hughes *et al.*, 2013; Kincheloe, 2005; Kutsyuruba, 2012). Secondly,  
12  
13 reflective practice, as it was first advanced by Schön (1983), can challenge the dominant  
14  
15 technical–rational and positivist epistemological disposition which narrows down the  
16  
17 opportunities for knowing and learning. Thirdly, practitioners involved in collaborative dialogues  
18  
19 can challenge their own implicit understanding of what is deemed to be ‘regular practice’ to  
20  
21 explore different forms of professional practice and learning. In this sense, mentoring based on  
22  
23 the critical constructivist approach may blend guidance (that is given when necessary) with equal  
24  
25 participation in class, including coordination between teachers and student teachers.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 However, for a genuine collaboration informed by critical constructivist theory, mentors  
32  
33 and student teachers need to be well disposed to the basic values and principles of professional  
34  
35 collaboration (Hudson, 2013; Turner, 2013). For example, in this study, the term ‘equal  
36  
37 participation’ is not used to suggest equality of status between experienced teachers and student  
38  
39 teachers. Rather, it indicates equal participation where both teachers in the role of mentors and  
40  
41 student teachers as mentees are empowered to collaborate actively and to contribute to effective  
42  
43 teaching and learning. Consistent with this, Hobson and Malderez (2013) discussed at length the  
44  
45 need for micro-level commitment through which mentors and mentees are open to learning from  
46  
47 each other, valuing each other’s knowledge, responsibilities, and contributions throughout the  
48  
49 mentoring process. Paramount to the process of equal participation is clarity of beliefs and  
50  
51 perceptions about mentoring (Lofstrom and Eisenschmidt, 2009; Wang and Odell, 2002), so that  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mentoring practices can be more evidently located within particular theoretical and normative  
4 orientations. For example, Long *et al.* (2012) explained that pre-service teachers might  
5 sometimes believe that good teachers should be able to teach alone, and that mistakes should be  
6 hidden in order to indicate effective performance. Being with somebody else in the classroom  
7 may thus be perceived as being uncomfortable or intrusive. Conversely, Aspfors and Bondas  
8 (2013) reported on the overwhelming feelings of anxiety and frustration when teachers operate at  
9 a distance from each other and in isolation. The transition to becoming a professional teacher  
10 would thus entail a strengthening of relationships through collaborative mentoring, allowing  
11 space for critical and creative dialogues.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 In sum, drawing on the analysis of literature on mentoring, this study set out to examine  
25 the views of teachers (mentors) and student teachers (mentees) about their mentoring  
26 experiences, focusing on the nature and the extent of collaboration established between them and  
27 potentially with other relevant people, creating the conditions for extending professional  
28 dialogue (Bradbury and Koballa, 2008).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The following research questions guided the study:

- 36 i. To what extent is the mentoring experience defined as 'collaborative' in this context?
- 37 ii. What are the social, cultural and emotional factors shaping the nature of mentoring  
38 experiences in this context?  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 **Research Design**

48  
49 We acknowledge that mentoring processes situated in the context of student teachers' school  
50 experience as suggested here are complex, dynamic, and multi-faceted. Participants may need to  
51 practice skills, interactions and dispositions which might be different from those enacted to  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 support more conventional apprenticeship models. To try to capture the fluidity and variety of  
4 the social dynamics at play, a concurrent mixed methods design, informed by a pragmatic  
5 approach to knowledge, was adopted (Creswell and Tashakkori, 2007). The pragmatic paradigm  
6 holds that truth or reality is contingent upon the context inhabited by the participants and  
7 continuously constructed and reconstructed in the social world. Gray and Colucci-Gray (2010)  
8 argued that one single method or single paradigm may not be sufficient for research in conditions  
9 of complexity, as stakeholders may hold contrasting but valuable viewpoints. As such, it  
10 acknowledges the complex nature of research settings and the subjective views of participants  
11 (Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Creswell, 2003), particularly when researching changing  
12 relational dynamics which are shaped by socio-cultural practices and expectations. A mixed  
13 method approach was thus employed to provide a stepwise approach to the study, by charting in  
14 broad terms the areas of converging perceptions while teasing out factors and conditions  
15 accounting for what might have been different, personal *experiences* of mentoring in particular  
16 contexts.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 *Context*

39  
40 An important structural aspect of the teacher education programme supporting this investigation  
41 involved the incorporation of the mentoring process as part of ‘field experience’; by this it was  
42 intended that student teachers would adopt an inquiry stance, by observing and interrogating  
43 their practices through reflection and professional learning conversations with their mentors as  
44 well as other members of the educational community based in school. In order to ensure that  
45 student teachers were fully supported while on school experience, mentors were invited to attend  
46 continuous professional development (CPD) programmes during which they were introduced to  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the philosophical principles of the programme and provided with a field experience handbook to  
4 support and guide student teachers on placement. During the training sessions, teachers had the  
5 opportunity to seek out clarification about different mentoring practices and expectations  
6 concerning school experience. University tutors also met with mentors at the training sessions to  
7 get to know each other and clarify mutual roles and expectations, in line with the partnership  
8 model of ITE established in Scotland (Mtika *et al.*, 2014).  
9

### 17 *Sampling*

19 For this study, participants were selected through a criterion sampling approach to  
20 identify cases and people that met set criteria of interest (Patton, 2002). We focused on student  
21 teachers who participated in field experience placements in Year 3 and Year 4 while enrolled in  
22 their undergraduate teacher education programme, as they were required to stay on field  
23 experience for a longer period of time; they were actively involved in teaching and they would  
24 therefore have the opportunity to enact long-term partnerships with their mentor teachers and  
25 potentially, others in school. Similarly, those mentors who worked with the student teachers were  
26 recruited as part of the study on the basis of their experience of mentoring. Finally, a group of  
27 university tutors who were involved in designing the practicum was purposively selected to  
28 provide contextual information about the programme principles and practices and thus provide  
29 additional insight into potentially contrasting approaches and theoretical dispositions to  
30 mentoring. Tables 1a and 1b describe the demographic characteristics of the student teachers and  
31 mentors involved in this study.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 <Insert Table 1a here>  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 <Insert Table 1b here>  
4

5 From Tables 1a and 1b, we note that gender distribution, heavily female dominated, is  
6 reflective of the general demographics of the teaching profession in Scotland. We also note that  
7 the majority of the mentors have more than 10 years' teaching experience, while the majority of  
8 the student teachers are in their early twenties. This suggests a significant age gap between them,  
9 which will be discussed later.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 *Ethical issues*

20  
21 Given the 'high stakes' involved in carrying out research at a time which is often stressful for  
22 student teachers, as well as for mentors who are involved in supporting them, we tried not to  
23 exceed demands on time by fitting in as much as possible with the regular routines of the  
24 programme (as will be explained later). Data were collected by the first author who was not a  
25 tutor and was not directly involved in the design of the programme, a position which enabled  
26 participants to feel free from any expectation to please either a colleague or their tutor.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Participants were fully informed about the purpose of the study, and the ethical guidelines of the  
36 British Educational Research Association were followed to ensure their confidentiality and  
37 anonymity.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 *Data collection: quantitative strand*

46  
47 Questionnaires were first used to collect data from mentors (n=145) and student teachers (n=130)  
48 with a view to gaining baseline information for the more in-depth, qualitative analysis (Converse  
49 and Presser, 1986). The majority of Year 4 teacher mentors were able to attend one of the CPD  
50 sessions organised by the university and complete the questionnaire on site. The response rate  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 was 80%. Conversely, over 70% of the Year 3 mentors were not in attendance, so questionnaires  
4  
5 were sent to all Year 3 mentors who did not attend the CPD event with a prepaid envelope and a  
6  
7 covering letter to facilitate their response. The response rate for Year 3 mentor teachers remained  
8  
9 high at 76%.

10  
11  
12 For student teachers, both cohorts completed the questionnaires once they returned to  
13  
14 university after their field experience. For Year 3 student teachers, the response rate was higher  
15  
16 (85%) than for Year 4 student teachers (56%), potentially reflecting the added demands on Year  
17  
18 4 student teachers' time while in their final period of study at university.

### 21 *Qualitative strand*

22  
23  
24 Interviews were conducted with a small number of teachers (n=6), student teachers (n=7)  
25  
26 and university tutors (n=6), who were recruited by a voluntary expression of interest to be  
27  
28 contacted for follow-up sessions. As Kvale and Brinkmann (2009, p. 1) explained, the interview  
29  
30 “attempts to understand the world from the subjects' point of view, to unfold the meaning of  
31  
32 their experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations”.

33  
34  
35 A semi-structured interview was employed, which allowed the participants to express  
36  
37 their views and experiences without any restriction (Patton, 2002). The interviews lasted 40  
38  
39 minutes on average, were recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim.

### 41 *Data analysis*

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Quantitative data and qualitative data were analysed separately. Quantitative data were analysed  
48  
49 through descriptive statistics, while all qualitative data were reduced to manageable text through  
50  
51 systematic coding. Data were then divided into chunks of coherent text aimed at answering  
52  
53 specific questions related to the nature of collaborative relationships, after which consistent and  
54  
55

1  
2  
3 shared ideas amongst the participants were developed as themes (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). We  
4  
5 adopted a theoretically driven analysis, with themes emerging at the intersection of different  
6  
7 theoretical approaches to mentoring, namely the bureaucratic-managerial and the participatory-  
8  
9 involved, in order to uncover critical dimensions of power and expertise, as explained earlier. All  
10  
11 the quantitative and qualitative data were then merged for interpretation and discussion of key  
12  
13 findings.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

## 19 **Findings**

### 20 *Quantitative Data*

21  
22 The aim of the quantitative approach was to explore participants' perceptions of mentoring and  
23  
24 factors regulating the nature of their mentoring experiences. Specifically, student teachers were  
25  
26 invited to respond to options that described their mentoring experience and relationship with  
27  
28 their mentors, while mentors were asked to indicate their willingness, preparation, and  
29  
30 disposition to support student teachers.  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 As shown in Table 2, 75% of student teachers stated that they had a good relationship  
36  
37 with their mentors. Nineteen percent indicated that they had a fair relationship with their  
38  
39 mentors, while only 5% of them pointed out that their mentoring relationship was not good.  
40  
41 Further, the student teachers were asked to comment on whether they were able to achieve what  
42  
43 they considered to be important aspects of teaching and learning through mentoring support. As  
44  
45 can be seen in Table 2, 62% indicated that they were able to achieve their expectations, while  
46  
47 30% said they were able to partially achieve their expectations and 6% felt they did not achieve  
48  
49 their expectations at all. As we will discuss later through the qualitative analysis, students  
50  
51 'expectations ranged from having the opportunity to practice teaching (in line with the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 apprenticeship model) to hoping for a partnership with the teacher mentor and learn together  
4  
5 (more in line with the dialogical approach). Hence it may be possible that the expectations of  
6  
7 some students were easier to meet than those of others depending on the nature of the mentoring  
8  
9 process.  
10

11  
12 <Insert Table 2 here>  
13

14  
15 When considering the demographics of the mentors, we note that more than half of the  
16  
17 mentors had over 10 years of teaching experience. A good number of them also attended the  
18  
19 CPD events where they were able to gain knowledge about the programme and discuss their role  
20  
21 as mentors in preparation for student teachers' field experience. Also, many of them (57%) had  
22  
23 recent experience of supporting student teachers. Mentors were asked to indicate their prior  
24  
25 conceptions and feelings about mentoring, and the large majority was enthusiastic and  
26  
27 considered it beneficial, as indicated in Table 3.  
28  
29

30  
31 <Insert Table 3 here>  
32

33  
34 The results obtained from the questionnaires suggest that this group of mentors was well  
35  
36 disposed to the idea of providing mentoring support for student teachers. However, some student  
37  
38 teachers described their mentoring relationships as fair and not good. From the data, we might  
39  
40 speculate that those who had good mentoring relationships and achieved their expectations may  
41  
42 have been paired with mentors who were passionate about mentoring and found it rewarding.  
43  
44 Some of those mentors may also have given the student teachers the opportunity to be actively  
45  
46 involved in decision-making during their placement, as per the critical constructivist approach to  
47  
48 mentoring. Conversely, it may also be that student teachers who reported negative experiences  
49  
50 did not find sufficient opportunities for discussing practice; and even in the context of being  
51  
52 supported by an experienced teacher, their learning experience may have turned out to be more  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



akin to training by instructions, rather than through socially constructed professional knowledge.

The extent to which the relationships were influenced by the critical constructivist approach to mentoring cannot be clearly established at this level of analysis. Rather, a mixed scenario of approaches to mentoring was to be expected and was further explored in the qualitative data.

### ***Qualitative Data***

The qualitative data provide a more nuanced picture of the mentoring process and the factors responsible for the experiences described by the participants in this study. Three categories of mentoring relationships emerged as illustrative of the different forms of collaboration through mentoring in the classroom.

#### *Collaborative relationships*

Some of the evidence obtained from the interviews gives indication of collaborative relationships enacted in the classroom:

*We sort of plan each week together and sort of share for example, this time our topic is save the world so we shared what we would do within that topic. (Mentor 2)*

*It was quite a partnership because she would include me in what she was doing as well when she had the class, so that was good. (Year 3 Student Teacher 2)*

From the data, we can infer a sense of satisfaction expressed by these participants, as though the idea of a collaborative mentoring relationship fitted in with a set of mutually shared expectations.

A collaborative mentoring relationship in this case was developing alongside a form of participatory pedagogy. Similarly, this type of collaborative practice may suit a process of sustained and constructive debriefing, as commented by one student teacher:

1  
2  
3 *She would have time for me to sit down and if after I'd taken a lesson and she'd been*  
4 *there, she would always tell me kind of little positive things about what I was doing.*

5  
6  
7  
8 (Year 4 Student Teacher 2)

9  
10 Interestingly, in the quotation above, critique is offered within a climate of support. The mentee  
11 is not simply pointing to the value of gaining feedback on practice but also on the value of 'being  
12 there', making time for talking. A tutor also acknowledged positive transformation in student  
13 teachers' work and behaviour because of mentoring support:

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 *The kind of work that they're producing and the way that they're behaving when they're*  
20 *in school, has got better. (Tutor 2)*

21  
22  
23  
24 This finding suggests that collaborative mentoring relationships experienced by some  
25 participants in this study featured specific activities that align with critical constructivism. These  
26 activities include co-planning, co-teaching and cooperation between mentors and mentees in the  
27 classroom.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 34 35 36 *Different interpretations of collaborative relationships*

37  
38 Mentoring relationships were said to be collaborative as well as non-collaborative at other times,  
39 for example as mentioned by those participants who found it difficult to 'feel part' of the  
40 professional team:  
41  
42

43  
44  
45 *We were able to almost team teach in the second part, whereas in the first part, there*  
46 *wasn't a lot of collaboration there. I felt like I was on my own for quite a lot of it, there*  
47 *was not much collaboration there (B.Ed. 3 Student Teacher 4)*

48  
49  
50  
51  
52 A mentor also suggested that collaboration between student teachers and mentors needs to take  
53 place, but not in all circumstances:  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 *I think you need to collaborate sometimes in the classroom. (Mentor 1)*  
4  
5

6 The mentor's view might also be an indication that it is important to collaborate at various levels  
7 and in relations to various tasks, including sometimes in the classroom. Similarly, a tutor felt that  
8 collaborative relationships are noticed, but it may be difficult for such relationships to be enacted  
9 in all situations:  
10  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 *I think in the majority of cases that's working well. But I think, we'll never get to that*  
16 *point where we can say it's working in every case. (Tutor 2)*  
17  
18  
19

20 This data suggests that there are constraints on collaboration which may be why some of the  
21 participants maintained that their expectations were not fully accomplished:  
22  
23  
24

25 *In the second half, I think they were met. However, I don't think my expectations and my*  
26 *mentor's expectations were the same in the first half. (Year 3 Student Teacher 4)*  
27  
28  
29

30 These findings suggest that there existed a mixed and inconsistent scenario regarding the purpose  
31 and practices of mentoring relationships in this context. Most importantly, what appears to be  
32 foregrounded in participants' voices is the nature of professional learning that in some instances  
33 was not deemed to be enacted as a team approach. Rather, for some people, professional learning  
34 was either 'acquired/enacted' or 'yet to be acquired/not enacted', a dichotomy which sets a stark  
35 separation between professional experts and novices. Arguably, such dichotomy may be at the  
36 heart of student teachers' inability to feel 'inducted' and 'mentored' into a professional learning  
37 culture. In such situations, the professional learning culture is one of 'quiet acceptance' and  
38 endurance, with limited scope for critical appraisal, mutual reflection, and dialogue.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 *Non-collaborative relationships*  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 One of the tutors pointed to the need to acknowledge power in the classroom. This aspect is  
4 important when it comes to practice, for the student teachers need to feel able to take  
5 responsibility for their actions, while emphasising the role of mentors in monitoring and giving  
6 regular feedback to student teachers.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 *I would say however that there is an essential handover phase where the mentor has got*  
13 *to handover their class perhaps, to the student teacher, and they've got to signal trust.*  
14

15  
16  
17 (Tutor 5)  
18

19 Such notion of transfer of power is problematic for some teachers who may feel that they have to  
20 leave the class outright and thus forfeit their role of experienced professional and observer of  
21 student teachers:  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 *She wasn't in the classroom that much.* (Year 4 Student Teacher 1)  
27  
28

29 For this reason, some student teachers did not feel that collaboration occurred, even though in  
30 appearance they had the opportunity 'to practice teaching', as per traditional models of learning  
31 to teach. One student teacher explained,  
32  
33

34  
35  
36 *I haven't really seen much co-teaching in practice and because we didn't really do it on*  
37 *placement, it was either her there or me there.* (Year 4 Student Teacher 2)  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 Furthermore, some student teachers explained that they preferred to take the class alone because  
43 of a lack of clarity regarding their dual and mutual roles in the classroom:  
44

45  
46  
47 *I felt a bit like I had to establish my own identity with them, so if we were both in the*  
48 *classroom, I didn't really know what my place was, so I preferred to either take a group*  
49 *out separately or have the class to myself.* (Year 4 Student Teacher 2)  
50  
51

52  
53 Another student teacher explained that while she preferred to take the class alone, she would find  
54 it valuable to have the chance to be 'checked in' by the mentor once in a while. Without this  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 exchange, she believed, her professional learning remained unchallenged and pupils' educational  
4  
5 interest may have been at a risk:  
6  
7

8 *If I'm honest, there were a few times that I just gave them something a bit easier to mull*  
9  
10 *over instead of getting to know what I should be doing to help them move onto the next*  
11  
12 *step. (Year 4 Student Teacher 1)*  
13  
14

15 All this suggests that student teachers' expectations of some aspects of their mentoring  
16 relationships were variable. Additionally, a student teacher thought it was a mark of respect not  
17  
18 to be involved in classroom activities when a mentor is in control:  
19  
20

21  
22 *I didn't want to impact too much on like behaviour management when she was in control*  
23  
24 *of the class, 'cos then they might have felt like oh, I'm taking it away from the class*  
25  
26 *teacher. (Year 3 Student Teacher 2)*  
27  
28  
29

30 Probing further, it appears that this student teacher's decision not to collaborate with another  
31 teacher was rooted in previous experience. When she once tried to assist with the coordination of  
32  
33 pupils' activities, the deputy teacher supporting her in class in the absence of her mentor was not  
34  
35 well disposed to that approach:  
36  
37

38  
39 *After the lesson, she just said I prefer if you didn't do that, because some colleagues*  
40  
41 *might not appreciate it. (Year 3 Student Teacher 2)*  
42  
43

44 This finding may contribute to explain the reasons why some participants felt it would be fair to  
45 suggest that they did not achieve their expectations. As expressed more clearly by another  
46  
47 student teacher,  
48  
49

50  
51 *I think if I was to have a mentor who was supportive in letting me do the ways that I*  
52  
53 *would like to be as a teacher, then my expectations would be great of that placement.*  
54  
55 (Year 3 Student Teacher 1)  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 Generally, these findings seem to echo previous studies reporting that collaborative mentoring,  
4 which involves sharing of power and redefinition of roles in the classroom, may be challenging  
5 and difficult to enact. Interestingly, hindering factors seem to include structural and cultural  
6 arrangements within the hosting school as per “*some colleagues might not appreciate it*” (Year 3  
7 Student Teacher 2). Indeed, there seems to be confusion about the roles that mentors and student  
8 teachers can play in the same classroom and the nature of the pedagogy that may support  
9 collaborative and critically constructivist approaches.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 **Discussion**

23  
24 This study explored the nature of mentoring experiences between teachers and student teachers  
25 in an ITE context. Two research questions guided the investigation. In the first instance, the  
26 study considered dimensions of collaboration in mentoring relationships, which in this research  
27 context, was mainly conceived of as a dyadic interaction, amenable to study through an  
28 exploration of perceptions of mentoring held by teachers and student teachers. Drawing on the  
29 literature on mentoring (i.e. Wang and Odell, 2002; Hobson and Malderez, 2013), the argument  
30 for collaboration is an important one but one which relies upon the values and attitudes of  
31 teachers and student teachers. Hence, the second research question underscored the social,  
32 cultural, and emotional factors underpinning collaboration. The study was focussed on furthering  
33 understanding of the extent to which mentoring relationships enable space for inquiry, within an  
34 ethos of participation, this being the basis for more expansive forms of collaboration which may  
35 involve other people, pupils and colleagues, in the school. We will deal with each aspect in turn.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Generally, findings show that mentoring between teachers and student teachers appears to  
52 be characterised largely by collaboration, which was taken as a grounding principle of the new  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 programme. From the data, a collaborative mentoring experience is exemplified by joint  
4  
5 decision-making and debriefing undertaken by mentors and student teachers who are actively  
6  
7 involved in planning and teaching activities. For instance, one student teacher explained that he  
8  
9 was involved in decision making process in the class. Similarly, Year 4 Student Teacher 2  
10  
11 indicated that her mentor would always sit with her to provide her with constructive feedback on  
12  
13 how she could improve after she had taken a lesson. Debriefing is considered an important  
14  
15 element of the scaffolding process in the mentoring relationships enacted in this context. This  
16  
17 finding may explain why 75% of student teachers thought their mentoring relationships were  
18  
19 good, and 65% felt they were able to achieve their expectations. Kincheloe (2005) contended that  
20  
21 critical constructivism strives for egalitarian approaches to create professional knowledge in a  
22  
23 context. Thus, our findings suggest that mentoring relationships based on joint decision-making  
24  
25 are essential not only for effective teaching and learning but also reinforcing previous studies  
26  
27 affirming that teachers and student teachers can learn from each other to further develop their  
28  
29 professional knowledge and skills through mentoring processes (Aderibigbe, 2013; Hughes *et*  
30  
31 *al.*, 2013; Kemmis *et al.*, 2014; Margolis, 2007).

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 However, it is important to note that the enactment of genuine collaboration in mentoring  
39  
40 is influenced by people's knowledge, experiences and dispositions (Hudson, 2013; Trevethan,  
41  
42 2017; Wang and Odell, 2002). As revealed in our quantitative data, 71% of the teachers were  
43  
44 looking forward to mentoring student teachers, and 51% also perceived such an endeavour to be  
45  
46 beneficial. In addition, the data suggest that most teachers involved in this study were willing to  
47  
48 engage in collaborative activities with student teachers. Consistent with this, Lopez-Real and  
49  
50 Kwan (2005) advised that teachers involved in a mentoring process must be intrinsically  
51  
52 stimulated to support others. Not surprisingly, Tutor 3 explained, "*The willingness to collaborate*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *is there, so that's been impressive*". This finding highlights the importance of the experience of  
4  
5 mentors in a particular context for effective mentoring relationships to take place (Kanan and  
6  
7 Baker, 2002; Lofstrom and Eisenschmidt, 2009). Arguably, in the educational context, a  
8  
9 commitment to sharing knowledge and practices is of uttermost importance, as findings  
10  
11 underscore the need for mentors and student teachers to engage actively in collaborative  
12  
13 investigations in order to better understand what may be different teaching and learning needs  
14  
15 (Lofstrom and Eisenschmidt, 2009; Schön, 1987; Wang and Odell, 2002). However, an over-  
16  
17 emphasis on professional consensus may stifle professional learning. Hence, a critical  
18  
19 perspective on mentoring would encourage experienced teachers to engage in bilateral dialogues  
20  
21 with respect for multiple viewpoints (Fieman-Nemsar, 2001), while student teachers would need  
22  
23 to demonstrate their commitment to learning from others through mentoring (Hobson and  
24  
25 Malderez, 2013). Such dispositions are deemed to strengthen collaboration and can help to avert  
26  
27 the mentoring relationship from becoming a bullying exercise as described by Maguire (2001) or  
28  
29 a judgemental process (Hobson and Malderez, 2013).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 That said, there were significant differences in the way mentors set out the ground rules  
37  
38 for their engagement with student teachers on placement. While collaboration may be said to  
39  
40 exist at least in principle in some cases, mentoring relationships could be significantly different  
41  
42 in relation to professional learning practices. For instance, our data pointed to constraints on  
43  
44 collaboration, indicating that collaboration may be seen as a task, enacted for some purpose, as  
45  
46 opposed to being a guiding principle for professional and pedagogical practice. Moreover, there  
47  
48 may be important differences in the professional learning ethos guiding teachers working with  
49  
50 different groups of pupils. As our qualitative data revealed, some student teachers had a  
51  
52 collaborative experience at some stages and felt like outsiders at other stages.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Hence, such findings would also suggest that, to some participants, collaboration is neither consistently nor deeply rooted in critical constructivist values such as egalitarianism, co-learning and co-participation (Hughes *et al.*, 2013; Kincheloe, 2005; Kutsyuruba, 2012; Trevethan, 2017). Perhaps this explains why 19% of the student teachers felt they only had ‘fair’ relationships with their mentors (Table 2). Findings underscore the need for clarity about concepts used in mentoring relationships (Aderibigbe, 2013) to avoid a state of confusion as explained in Kemmis *et al.* (2014).

Finally, the data also show that mentoring experiences of some participants could only be described as non-collaborative. From the questionnaires, it transpires that some teachers did not look forward to supporting a student teacher (7%) and some of them also considered it to be an imposition. Not surprisingly, a student teacher explained that her mentor “*wasn’t in the classroom that much*” (Year 4 Student Teacher 1). Enactments of non-collaborative mentoring, however, may not be due to factors peculiar to the mentors alone. Some student teachers were not willing to collaborate with mentors in the classroom, perhaps because they felt that qualified teachers need to teach alone (Long *et al.*, 2012). Such beliefs are common, as for most student teachers the image of a professional teacher is foregrounded as the sole figure responsible for learning in the class; yet Aspfors and Bondas (2013) reported that teaching is a profoundly collegiate activity, with feelings of anxiety and frustration commonly reported when teachers are at a distance from each other. Thus, it seems essential to note that even though student teachers would learn from having to coordinate class activities alone, it is necessary for them to learn from others. As the data also indicate, the presence of teachers in the class could aid student teachers’ learning.

1  
2  
3 In practice, findings seem to point to the need to revisit mentoring beyond dyadic  
4 interactions directed towards the achievement of specific objectives or goals. A key aspect in this  
5 process is the importance of sustained engagement between ITE providers and schools in trying  
6 to clarify what collaboration in mentoring between teachers and student teachers really entails,  
7 such as seeing mentoring as part of an expansive professional learning culture which includes  
8 other people, colleagues, and pupils, and which is extending across the professional learning  
9 space. Such ideals, however, need to contend with the practicalities of teachers attending  
10 professional development sessions, which are vital in enabling teachers to gain preparation for  
11 students' field experience (Hudson, 2013; Wang and Odell, 2002). As indicated earlier, some  
12 mentors (28%) were unable to attend the events in preparation for student teachers' field  
13 experience, and this may have contributed to their inability to support and work collaboratively  
14 with student teachers. Professional development activities and information sessions held in the  
15 evening would in fact impact teachers' own personal schedules, which raise some new and  
16 unexpected dimensions of the study. For example, there is scope here for designing and  
17 researching models of professional development for teachers which may be better suited for  
18 introducing new practices in mentoring.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Strengthening understanding of mentoring in ITE would also encompass the need for  
41 further clarity regarding different orientations to mentoring and how these may relate to an  
42 inquiry-based, exploratory approach in student teachers' field experience. In this view, it is  
43 important to distinguish between the micro-level of action in the classroom (e.g. co-teaching, co-  
44 planning) and the meso-level of collaboration such as sharing values, principles, and ideas. We  
45 suspect that these levels may be interrelated. For example, co-planning may lead to a discussion  
46 of principles and values; however, it may not necessarily be so if an idea of learning to teach as a  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

craft comes to dominate. In this scenario, collaboration may be reduced to handing over information to put into practice, and dialogue restricted to supervision enacted by the expert on the novice. The different scenarios for mentoring relationships highlighting the intersection between professional learning and socio, cultural and emotional dimensions as they emerged as part of this study, are summarised in Table 4.

<Insert Table 4 here>

Relating common mentoring practices to social, cultural and emotional dimensions of professional learning, as summarised in Table 4, was the focus of our second research question, seeking to contribute further clarity about the role of mentoring in ITE. As indicated earlier, mentoring in teaching practice is fraught with difficulty for both student teachers and teachers and even more so due to the overlap between the dual roles of teachers serving as mentors, being both and at one time sharing ideas with the student teacher and taking responsibility for what happens in their own classroom. Findings from this study, however, clearly show that being a mentor who effectively meets student teachers' learning expectations is more than just providing student teachers with instructions or feedback on given practice. Mentoring is foregrounded as an embodied and deeply emotional practice, involving the ability to make oneself receptive to others, as well as being able to exert self-control when necessary, in order to allow for innovation and new perspectives which may emerge via mutual trust. While limited in scope, evidence from this study suggests that such personal qualities of collaborative mentoring may surface through specific pedagogies, hence the need to look further into ways of teaching that encourage critical, constructivist practices. For example, Table 4 highlights different approaches to mentoring student teachers in the classroom. Amongst those, our data point to practices which encourage sharing and acceptance of other people's ways of being as conducive to viewing the classroom as

1  
2  
3 a genuine site of inquiry, yielding opportunities for questions, development of new practices and  
4  
5 evaluation.  
6

7  
8 Most notably, this study suggests that such characteristics of mentoring, as dialogical,  
9  
10 embodied and emotionally aware, when deployed in an educational context, can prepare the  
11  
12 ground for the creation of sustained dialogical spaces, involving all partners and extending across  
13  
14 the continuum of relationships amongst teacher educators, student teachers, mentor teachers and  
15  
16 their colleagues (Mtika *et al.*, 2014). This aspect is critical to teachers' professional  
17  
18 development, but it is also critical in understanding how to build 'system capacity' (Donaldson,  
19  
20 2015) and the dilemma of partnerships between ITE providers and schools (Bain *et al.*, 2017;  
21  
22 Trevethan, 2017).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Conclusion**

29  
30 As evidenced in the discussion, findings from this study echo previous studies found in the  
31  
32 literature which highlighted opportunities and challenges of mentoring in ITE. Adding to  
33  
34 previous research, emphasis in this study was placed upon an established model of partnership  
35  
36 aiming to support student teachers' learning through their experiences in the 'field'. So, broadly  
37  
38 defined, the field would necessarily entail deeply seated cultural and professional norms that  
39  
40 account for a diversity of working practices and relationships in every school. As our data show,  
41  
42 collaboration took different forms in practice, and establishing consistent learning practices was  
43  
44 difficult to do within the narrower boundaries of the classroom. Hence, the key message that this  
45  
46 study wishes to put forward concerns the recognition of mentoring as a multi-faceted activity,  
47  
48 but most centrally, that mentoring may be both a process leading to an outcome (e.g. practising a  
49  
50 skill) and an opportunity to develop new positions on knowledge, by engaging with learning  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 from others, as well as helping others to learn. In this view, dialogues between all parties  
4 involved in supporting student teachers should aim at building relationships, sharing ideas and  
5  
6 developing shared understandings, moving well beyond the confines of the classrooms.  
7  
8  
9

10 In Scotland, the Donaldson Review (Donaldson, 2010) is still providing the hallmark  
11 policy for high-quality teacher education grounded in strong mentoring practices. Policy is a  
12 significant factor in orienting teacher professional development and research towards  
13 collaborative mentoring. Currently, however, significant changes in the policy context in  
14 Scotland are shifting the focus from teacher professional learning to ‘closing the attainment gap’  
15 for pupils. Substantial funding is being redirected towards schools, yet with unclear links to the  
16 nature and quality of the education of teachers (Bain *et al.*, 2017; Seith, 2017). This study  
17 responds to such most recent policy by reiterating the need for a strongly collaborative and  
18 critical constructivist approach to mentoring if we are to educate and develop the type of  
19 teachers, both pre-service and in-service, and pupils who can respond to the complexities and  
20 uncertainties of current times. Further research should focus more directly on exploring the links  
21 between mentoring and the development of dialogical and inclusive pedagogies; for example, a  
22 longitudinal or ethnographic approach may be devised to explore the nature of mentoring  
23 relationships vis-à-vis the attainment gap. Scotland still has a chance to focus on mentoring and  
24 collaborative inquiry as a means to strengthen a critically reflexive professional culture.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 **References**

48  
49 Aderibigbe, S.A. (2013). Opportunities of the collaborative mentoring relationships between  
50 teachers and student teachers in the classroom: The views of teachers, student teachers  
51 and university tutors. *Management in Education*, 24 (2), 70-74  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Aderibigbe, S.A. (2014). Collaborative mentoring pedagogy in initial teacher education: Lessons  
4 from a Scottish context. In J. Cheryl and L. Orland-Barak (Eds.), *International Teacher*  
5 *Education: Promising pedagogies* (Part A) (Advances in Research on Teaching, Volume  
6 22) (pp. 383-401). United Kingdom: Emerald.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 Aspfors, J. and Bondas, T. (2013). Caring about caring: newly qualified teachers' experiences of  
13 their relationships within the school community. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and*  
14 *practice*, 19 (3), 243–25.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 Bain, Y., Bruce, J. and Weir, D. (2017). Changing the landscape of school/university partnership  
20 in Northern Scotland. *Professional Development in Education*, 43 (4), 537-555.  
21  
22  
23  
24 Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1966). *Social Construction of Reality*. England: Penguin Books  
25 Ltd.  
26  
27  
28  
29 Bradbury, L. U. (2010). Educative Mentoring: Promoting Reform-Based Science Teaching  
30 Through Mentoring Relationships. *Science Education*, 94 (6), 1049-1071.  
31  
32  
33 Bradbury, L.U. and Koballa JR., R.T. (2008). Borders to cross: identifying sources of tension in  
34 mentor–intern relationships. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24 (8), 2132–2145.  
35  
36  
37  
38 Clutterbuck, D.C. (2004). *Everyone Needs a Mentor: Fostering Talent in Your Organisation*,  
39 Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London  
40  
41  
42 Converse, J.M. and Presser, S. (1986). *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the standardized*  
43 *questionnaire*, Sage series, No 63. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.  
44  
45  
46  
47 Cosnefroy, L. and Buhot, E. (2013). Workplace learning impact: an analysis of French-  
48 secondary-trainee teachers' perception of their professional development. *Teachers and*  
49 *Teaching: theory and practice*, 19 (6), 679–694.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods*  
4  
5 *Approaches (Second Edition)*. California: Sage Publications.  
6  
7  
8 Creswell, J.W. and Tashakkori, A. (2007). Editorial: Differing perspectives on mixed methods  
9  
10 research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(4), 303-308.  
11  
12 Donaldson, G. (2010). *Teaching Scotland' Future – Report of a review of teacher education in*  
13  
14 *Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive. Available:  
15  
16 <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/337626/0110852.pdf> (Accessed on  
17  
18 20/04/2011).  
19  
20  
21 Donaldson, G. (2015). *Successful futures. Independent review of Curriculum and Assessment*  
22  
23 *arrangements in Wales*. OGL.  
24  
25  
26 Fieman-Nemsar, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: designing a continuum to strengthen  
27  
28 and sustain teaching. *Teacher College Record*, 103 (6), 1013-1055.  
29  
30  
31 Gray, D. S. and Colucci-Gray, L. (2010). 'Challenges to ITE research in conditions of  
32  
33 complexity'. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36 (4), 425- 439.  
34  
35  
36 Geber, H. (2013). Can mentoring decrease the brain drain of academics from Africa? *Procedia -*  
37  
38 *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 215 – 220.  
39  
40  
41 Glaser, B. G., and Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for*  
42  
43 *Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.  
44  
45  
46 Hobson, A. J. and Malderez, A. (2013). Judgementoring and other threats to realizing the  
47  
48 potential of school-based mentoring in teacher education. *International Journal of*  
49  
50 *Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 2(2), 89-108.  
51  
52  
53 Hudson, P. (2013). Strategies for mentoring pedagogical knowledge. *Teachers and Teaching:*  
54  
55 *theory and practice*, 19 (4), 363–381.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Hughes, M.T., Parker-Katz, M. and Balasubramanian, A. (2013). Learning to teach literacy  
4 through collaborative discussions of student work. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and*  
5  
6 *Practice, 19* (5), 543–558.  
7  
8  
9  
10 Izadinia, M. (2016). Student teachers' and mentor teachers' perceptions and expectations of a  
11 mentoring relationship: do they match or clash? *Professional Development in Education.*  
12  
13 *42*(3), 387-402  
14  
15  
16  
17 Kaasila, R., & Lauriala, A., (2010). Towards a collaborative, interactionist model of teacher  
18 change. *Teachers and Teaching, 26* (4), 854-862.  
19  
20  
21 Kanan, H.M., and Baker, A.M. (2002). Palestinian Novice Teachers' Perception of a Good  
22 Mentor. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 28* (1), 35-43.  
23  
24  
25  
26 Kemmis, S., Heikkinen, H.L.T., Fransson, G., Aspfors, J. and Edwards-Groves, C. (2014).  
27 Mentoring of new teachers as a contested practice: Supervision, support and collaborative  
28 self-development. *Teaching and Teacher Education. 45*, 154-164.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Kincheloe, J.L. (2005). *Critical constructivism*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.  
34  
35  
36 Koballa JR., T.R., Kittleson, J., Bradbury, L.U., & Dias, M.J. (2010). Teacher Thinking  
37 Associated with Science-Specific Mentor Preparation. *Science Education, 94*(6), 1072-  
38  
39 1091.  
40  
41  
42 Korhonen, H., Heikkinen, H.L.T., Kiviniemi, U. and Tynjala, P. (2017). Student teachers'  
43 experiences of participating in mixed peer groups of in-service and pre-service teachers  
44 in Finland. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 61*, 153-163.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 Kougioumtzis, K. and Patriksson, G. (2009). School-based teacher collaboration in Sweden and  
50 Greece: formal cooperation deprivatized practices and personalized interaction in primary  
51 and lower secondary schools. *Teachers and Teaching, 15* (1), 131-154.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Kutsyuruba, B. (2012). Teacher induction and mentorship policies: the pan-Canadian overview.

4  
5 *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 1 (3), 235-256.

6  
7 Kvale, A. and Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews (Second Edition) – Leaning the craft of*

8  
9 *qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oak CA: Sage Publications Inc.

10  
11 Landsberg, M. (1996) *The Tao of Coaching: Boost Your Effectiveness at Work by Inspiring and*

12  
13 *Developing Those Around You*. Harper Collins, London.

14  
15 Lofstrom, E. and Eisenschmidt, E. (2009). Novice teachers' perspectives on mentoring: The case

16  
17 of the Estonian induction year. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25 (5), 681-689.

18  
19 Long, F., Hall, K., Conway, P. and Murphy, R. (2012). Novice teachers as 'invisible' learners,

20  
21 *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18 (6), 619-636.

22  
23 Long, J. (2009). Assisting beginning teachers and school communities to grow through extended

24  
25 and collaborative mentoring experience. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*,

26  
27 17 (4), 317-327.

28  
29 Lopez-Real, F. and Kwan, T. (2005). Mentors' perceptions of their own professional

30  
31 development during mentoring. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 31 (1), 15-24.

32  
33 Maguire, M. (2001). Bullying and the Postgraduate Secondary School Trainee Teacher: an

34  
35 English case study. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 27 (1), 95-109.

36  
37 Margolis, J. (2007). Improving relationships between mentor teachers and student teachers:

38  
39 Engaging in a pedagogy of explicitness. *The New Educator*, 3 (1), 75-94.

40  
41 Menon, M.E. (2012). Do Beginning Teachers Receive Adequate Support from Their

42  
43 Headteachers? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40 (2), 217-231.

- 1  
2  
3 Mtika, P., Robson, D. and Fitzpatrick (2014). Joint observation of student teaching and related  
4 tripartite dialogue during field experience: Partner perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher*  
5 *Education, 39*, 66-76.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods (3rd Edition)*. Thousand  
11 Oaks: Sage.  
12  
13  
14 Peters, M. (2001). National education policy constructions of the 'knowledge economy':  
15 Towards a critique. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 2*(1), 1–22.  
16  
17  
18  
19 Roberts, N. and Foster, D. (2017). *Initial teacher training in England*. Briefing Paper, Number  
20 6710. House of Common Library.  
21  
22  
23  
24 Shea, G.F. (2002). *Mentoring (How to Develop Successful Mentor Behaviours), Third Edition*.  
25 California: Crisp Publications Inc.  
26  
27  
28 Seith, E. (2017). New route into teaching in Scotland could bypass universities. *Times Education*  
29 *Supplement, 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2017*. Available at: [https://www.tes.com/news/school-](https://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-news/new-route-teaching-scotland-could-bypass-universities)  
30 [news/breaking-news/new-route-teaching-scotland-could-bypass-universities](https://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-news/new-route-teaching-scotland-could-bypass-universities)  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner - How professionals think in action*. London:  
36 Maurice Temple Smith Limited.  
37  
38  
39  
40 Tang, S.Y.F., Wong, A.K.Y., & Cheng, M.M.H. (2015). The preparation of highly motivated and  
41 professionally competent teachers in initial teacher education. *Journal of Education for*  
42 *Teaching, 41* (2), 128–144.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Trevethan, H. (2017). Educative mentors? The role of classroom teachers in initial teacher  
48 education. A New Zealand study. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 43*(2), 219-231.  
49  
50  
51 Turner, M. (2013). Beyond the 'good teacher': guiding pre-service teacher reflections on  
52 culturally diverse students. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 19* (1), 78–92.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Wang, J. and Odell, S.J., (2002). Mentored Learning to Teach According to Standards-Based  
4 Reform: A Critical Review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 481–546.  
5  
6

7  
8 Wang, J. and Odell, S. J. (2007). An alternative conception of mentor-novice relationships:  
9 learning to teach in reform-minded ways as a context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*,  
10 23(3), 473-489.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 Author Biographies

18  
19 Semiyu Aderibigbe completed his PhD study in the School of Education at the University of  
20 Aberdeen, United Kingdom. Currently, Semiyu teaches in the General Education Department,  
21 Mount Royal University (Canada) and the School of e-Education at Hamdan Bin Mohammed  
22 Smart University (UAE). His research interests include mentoring and peer coaching, critical  
23 constructivist pedagogy, teacher education, citizenship education, educational leadership and  
24 blended learning.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Donald Gray is a reader in the School of Education at the University of Aberdeen. Formerly a  
36 biology teacher, he has a background in science education, curriculum development and  
37 educational research. Donald's research focuses on science and sustainability issues,  
38 environmental education and outdoor learning as well as more general research related to teacher  
39 education.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Laura Colucci-Gray is a senior lecturer in Science Education and Sustainability Education in the  
50 School of Education at the University of Aberdeen. Laura holds a first degree in natural sciences  
51 awarded and a doctorate in science education. Her research is located at the intersection between  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 teacher education, pedagogical innovation and the epistemological reflection on science,  
4  
5 particularly with regard to the field of science technology studies and sustainability debates.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1a:** Demographic characteristics of the student teachers (n=130)

Distribution of student teachers by		Participants	Percentage
Gender	Male	5	4
	Female	124	95
	<i>Not stated</i>	1	1
Age	20–24	106	82
	25–29	12	9
	30 and above	12	9

**Table 1b:** Demographic characteristics of mentors (n=145)

Distribution of mentors by		Participants	Percentage
Gender	Male	6	4
	Female	138	95
	<i>Not stated</i>	1	1
Qualification	First Degree	67	46
	Postgraduate Diploma	32	22
	Master's Degree	17	12
	Others	19	13
	<i>Not stated</i>	10	7
Years of teaching experience	1–5	27	19
	6–10	25	17
	11–15	17	12
	16–20	19	13
	20 and above	51	35
	<i>Not stated</i>	6	4

**Table 2:** Student teachers' views on their mentoring relationships and expectations (n=130)

Student teachers' views:		Participants	Percentage
Mentoring relationships with their mentors	Good	98	75

	Fair	25	19
	Not Good	6	5
	<i>Not stated</i>	1	1
Achievement of their expectations (i.e. what they considered important in mentoring as a process through which they develop personal and professional knowledge)	Yes	80	62
	Partially	39	30
	Not at all	8	6
	<i>Not stated</i>	3	2

**Table 3:** Mentors' views about mentoring and CPD attendance (n=145)

Mentors' views:		Participants	Percentage
How they felt about supporting student teachers	I look forward to it	103	71
	I think it would be beneficial	78	54
	I do not look forward to it	10	7
	I do not see myself as somebody who can support the student teachers	10	7
	I feel it is an imposition	1	1
Experience of supporting a student teacher in the past five years	Yes	83	57
	No	60	41
	<i>Not stated</i>	2	1
Attendance at the CPD event in preparation for the student teachers' field experience	Yes	103	71
	No	41	28
	<i>Not stated</i>	1	1

**Table 4:** Summary of dimensions of collaboration in mentoring

Features of classroom practice	Type of mentoring relationship	Socio-emotional dimensions of professional learning
Handing over the class and providing feedback	Expert/novice	Control and alienation
Selection of practical activities, such as joint planning and coordination of classroom activities	Master/apprentice	Instruction and guidance
Open tasks, inviting contributions from others, and including debriefing	Collegiate	Participation and legitimisation
Positive dispositions towards learning with others	Peer support	Equal participation and mutual support
Close presence and empathy, as 'being there' with others	Dialogical and non-dychotomic	Inclusion and empathy