

Constructing an Interdisciplinary Mentoring Framework for ELT Teacher Education and Teacher Development

Fátima Encinas Prudencio ¹, Verónica Sánchez Hernández ²*

1. Facultad de Lenguas, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Puebla México.

2. Facultad de Lenguas, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Puebla México.

* Corresponding Authors' Emails: fatimaencinas@gmail.com; veronica.sanchez@correo.buap.mx

Abstract – This paper explore previous research in organization and teacher education studies in an attempt to construct an interdisciplinary perspective (Allen & Eby, 2008) of these two disciplines on mentoring to inform in-service ELT teacher education, continuing education programs and research development in this field. We attempt to entangle the complexity of mentoring relationships in regard to emotional competence, situated required competences, career stage, personal development, family lens, gender, and cultural dimensions and how these effect the quality of developmental networks and relationships

Keywords: teacher education, mentoring, coaching, supervision

I. INTRODUCTION

Mentoring in education has been gaining momentum in the last decade (Fletcher & Mullen, 2012; Delaney, 2012) mainly due to worldwide educational reforms, which have been driven by epoch-making influences such as internationalization and the rise of new literacies. These reforms, developed based on technological development and the challenges of the knowledge society, have generated a need to reevaluate and reconceptualize teacher professional development as a “fundamental connection to teaching” (among others Bryant et al., 2008; Hattie, 2003; Ortega & Castañeda, 2009; Vélaz de Medrano & Vaillant, 2009; Espinosa, 2012) or professional capital (Hargraves & Fullan, 2012, p. 26).

However, there is a little research on mentoring in in-service and pre-service teaching contexts and specially for in-service ELT teachers in Latin America, particularly in Mexico. During these times of constant educational change, mentoring could become a bridge to promote sensible and more situated learning (on time and pertinent) for teachers so they can respond to contextual education needs. It can also become an option to support more autonomous individuals who seek to build their personal and career competences, gain new professional development as self-knowledge, and commit themselves to their personal and professional development in today's rapid pace of change. Furthermore, promoting mentoring relationships can turn out to be an alternative to education training courses and workshops which have been often been questioned due to their decontextualized nature and their limited response to teachers' actual needs.

Although the study of mentoring spans a wide range of disciplines (Eby & Allen, 2008), this paper only reviews organization mentoring studies because of their contributions

to this field as well as to education studies. Consequently, this paper is divided as follows: first, the paper traces the concepts of mentoring, coaching and supervision, organizational studies in mentoring at work, and mentoring in educational contexts. Secondly, and finally, the paper reviews mentoring in pre-service teacher programs.

II. MENTORING, COACHING AND SUPERVISION

Teacher situated learning is often related to supervision, mentoring and coaching. The conceptual space of these three concepts, however, often overlaps and each acquire different connotations depending on the discipline in which they are used. In education there was a significant interest in supervision during the 60s. By the 90s, the meaning of supervision had been disentangled from the other two terms. Although there have been attempts to revitalize it by classifying it as administrative, clinical, consultative, developmental, differentiated, instructional, and peer supervision (Oliva, 1993), the concept is more related to institutionalized asymmetrical relationships. Thus, while the research interest in supervision started diminishing, in practice it is still used extensively in Mexico, with attention moving towards mentoring and coaching. While these two terms are sometimes used interchangeably in education, a distinction seems to be gaining consensus at least in ELT: mentoring is said to relate to long-term professional development, whereas coaching has been associated with a specific goal situated in a teaching context aimed at improving performance in a task in a short-term framework (Delaney, 2012).

A source for this terminology confusion was the change of attitudes and expectations regarding the role of the mentor teacher, which occurred during the 1990s. Similarly to De Jager et al. (2004), we have defined the term “role” as being the expected behaviour within a “social position.” Roles and role expectations can change with the years. In the seventies and eighties, supervising teachers focused mainly on socialization of prospective teachers within the school organization by discussing day-to-day events, by giving advice, and by instruction and explanation. Field & Field (1994, p. 46) describes this role as follows: “...welcomed the students into the school, made sure they knew the ‘geography’ of the building, introduced them to the staff, told them where to buy their lunch, etc.” From introducing the prospective teacher to the way the school worked, mentoring gradually also came to include the encouraging new teachers to grow professionally through reflection on his or her own practice (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). This role shift also required that mentor teachers attend to prospective teachers’ present “concerns”. In the field of teacher education, this confusion is also rooted in three different social positions from which guidance activities can be undertaken:

First, when guidance activities are carried out by a member of the school staff who is mostly working in the classroom as a teacher. In the literature, this position is diversely referred to as “mentor” (Edwards & Protheroe, 2003; Orland-Barak & Klein, 2005; Stanulis & Russell, 2000; Wang, Strong & Odell, 2004) “mentor teacher” (Feiman-Nemser, & Parker, 1992; Strong & Baron, 2004), “school-based mentor” (Hughes, 1998; Timperley, 2001), “school teacher mentor” (Haggarty, 1995), “class teacher” (Dunne & Bennett, 1997; Edwards & Protheroe, 2003), “cooperating teacher” (Borko & Mayfield, 1995), “coach” (Engelen,

2002; Veenman & Denessen, 2001), “coach-teacher” (Edwards & Green, 1999), and “induction tutor” (Harrison, Lawson & Wortley, 2005).

Second, when a school staff or school district member who is not working as a teacher carries out guidance activities. Such a personnel is referred to as: “support teacher” (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992), “teacher tutor or professional tutor” (Turner, 1993), “associate-tutor” (Collison & Edwards, 1994) or “mentor” (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004; Orland-Barak, 2001; Wang et al., 2004). The term “teacher educator”, traditionally used for staff at teacher training institutes is currently also used for staff at the school district level who are involved in supervising prospective teachers (Feiman-Nemser & Featherstone, 1992; Orland-Barak, 2005).

The third role is when a teacher education institute or university carries out the guidance activities. They are not employed by the school where the prospective teacher is working and are usually referred to as “supervisors” (Zeichner, 1985) and “tutors” (Collison & Edwards, 1994; Haggarty, 1995).

This diversity of terms used in the literature to name the different social positions has caused confusion (Hennissen et al., 2008; Brenes et al., 2010). As shown in Table 1, this confusion is also found in the description of the teacher educators’ role in professional training in Mexico (Brenes et al., 2010 p. 17).

Table 1: Mentor/supervisor Titles used in Mexico

Mentor/supervisor Titles	Sites
Supervisor	In universities ; those working with student-teachers, or <i>practicantes</i> , in their <i>licenciatura</i> programs.
<i>Asesor</i>	In normales ; those working with student-teachers, or <i>practicantes</i> , in their <i>licenciatura</i> programs.
Mentor	In schools ; mentor teachers working with student-teachers, or <i>practicantes</i> , from the universities.
<i>Tutores/Titulares</i>	In schools , mentor teachers working with student-teachers, or <i>practicantes</i> , from the <i>normales</i> .
Department coordinator (<i>Presidente del academia</i>)	In secundarias and <i>preparatorias</i> , the English language department head responsible for the monthly department meetings
Peer observer/colleague/ more experienced teacher	In (same) schools /departments . A friendly peer teacher, often with more experience, who formally or informally mentors the novice teacher

III. MENTORING AT WORK: ORGANIZATIONAL STUDIES

Mentoring research in organizational studies (organizational psychology, management among others) initiated more than 3 decades ago with Levinson et al., (1978) work on the impact of mentoring on men’s development. Eight years later, Kram (1985) published

Mentoring at Work, which offered a theoretical foundation for understanding developmental relationships at work in both man and woman. Later there have been a raising number of mentoring studies and a number of current literature reviews account for this trend (among the most recent Ragins & Kram 2007; Allen, Eby, Poteet, O'Brien & Lentz, 2008; Eby & Allen, 2008). These studies have contributed to the understanding of mentorship relationships, the participants in the mentoring relationships, the context of the relationships and methodological research issues.

A. The Mentorship Relationship

Outcomes-Expected benefits and costs of mentoring: Most studies report a positive relationship between having a mentor and career outcomes (Kram, 1985; Bozionelos, 2004; Allen et al., 2004). Yet, scholars recognize that mentoring relationships have revealed a full range of positive and negative experiences, processes, and even outcomes (Eby & Alle, 2008; Fletcher & Ragins, 2007). Fletcher and Ragins (2007) relate Miller and Stiver's (1997) theory of growth-fostering interactions to mentoring by identifying "five good things" that occur for both mentors and mentee: motivation for learning in the relationship, empowered action, increased sense of worth, new knowledge and the desire for more connection (Miller & Stiver 1997). The authors also found that intention to mentor depended on whether the individual perceived more benefits or costs. Interestingly, those with less experience anticipated more costs than those with more experience. Finally, in this study, mentors tended to selected mentees that reminded them of themselves. Concerning the costs, Eby and McManus (2004) examined dysfunctional experiences that mentors report in mentoring relationships. They identified such negative relations like egocentricity, deception, sabotage, harassment, interpersonal difficulty, spoiling, dishonesty, passivity, performance below expectations, and unwillingness to learn.

Variation in range and degree in mentoring relationships: There is a significant variation in the range and degree of mentoring functions within and across relationships (Ragins & Kram, 2007). The distinction between career functions and psychosocial functions that relay on the quality of emotional bonds and psychological attachments in the relationship has inspired a number of studies (Kram, 1985). Both career and psychosocial functions predict mentees' job and career satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004). There are some studies that have found a third dimension of mentoring, role modeling (Scandura & Ragins, 1993).

Formal and informal mentoring: One of the factors effecting mentoring relationships is whether they were initiated formally or informally. Baugh and Fagenson-Eland (2007) observe that due to the characteristics of formal programs (expectations, time among others) long term relationships are less likely to occur in these programs than in informal mentoring relationships.

Mentoring relationships are dynamic and complex: Mentoring functions vary across the phases of the relationship and evolve through phases that reflect different experiences and patterns of interactions. Kram (1985) identified 4 phases: Initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. A wider perspective on mentoring relationships and outcomes leads to a

reflection on the process by which these relationships effect personal development and change. McGowan, Stone, and Kegan (2007) examine how stages of adult development both effect and are effected by mentoring relationships. Some of these relations enable both mentors and mentees to transition through increasingly complex stages of adult development.

Research in organization studies has been shifting from a cost-benefit perspective to a more professional and personal development one. Therefore, they have identified a significant variation in the range and degree of functions within and across mentoring relationships. These relationships are diverse, complex and dynamic, and evolve over time as the relationship matures and as both the mentor's and the mentee's develop.

B. Participants in the Mentoring Relationship

Individual differences in stages of development affect mentoring relationships: The mentee's maturity also plays a significant role in the mentoring relationship. There tends to be common characteristics across developmental stages such as the importance of trust and role modeling as well as significant differences depending on the mentee's developmental stage. Younger mentees tend to idealize mentors whereas older mentees learn from the mentors' struggles (Liang et al., 2008). Furthermore, Chandler and Kram (2005) assert that one critical and relatively unexplored factor is the mentee's developmental stage, which has implications for how he or she experiences relationships with formal or informal mentors. They use Robert Kegan's (1982) six-stage developmental theory to argue that individuals at various stages will differently experience developmental relationships and networks and they will best benefit from developers at higher stages of development. McGowan, Stone, and Kegan (2007) suggest that mentors at the "interpersonal stage" of development can support mentors only in providing direction, coaching, and advice. Due to their developmental stage, these mentors are not yet able to promote autonomy or creative thinking if it is not related to what they think is the correct way to advance.

Research about mentors: While relatively little attention has been placed on the mentor's side of the relationship (Ragins & Kram, 2007; Allen et al., 2008), these studies indicate that individuals who were interested in their own careers advancement were also more willing to support the careers of others. Allen found that helpfulness may be a better predictor of actual mentoring behavior because it has been associated with self-confidence and self-efficacy. Existing research also suggests that mentors look for mentee's with potential and willingness to learn.

Rigins and Kram (2007) conclude that one of the major paradigm shifts is the "increasing recognition of the dyadic and reciprocal nature of mentoring relationships and the critical role that mutuality and reciprocity play in relationship structure, processes, learning, and outcome" (p. 659). The acknowledgement of dyadic and reciprocal nature of these relationships is starting to have methodological implications for research on mentoring.

C. Mentoring Occurs within the Context of Developmental Networks

The field of mentoring now recognizes the decisive nature of context and the role it plays in shaping the different phases of mentoring relationships. As Ragins and Kram (2007) argue, “Context involves not only the system within which mentoring relationships are embedded but also the structure and medium by which mentoring relationships are enacted within and outside organizations” (p. 672). They consider that the first and most dramatic new paradigm in mentoring studies is associated to social network theory. These researchers found limitations of focusing research and practice on a single or primary mentor, and have increasingly re-explored Kram's (1985) original proposition about “relationship constellations” in which individuals rely upon not just one but multiple individuals for developmental support in their careers. The changing nature of the career environment has effected the context in which individuals' careers develop and has had direct implications for the developmental networks. Having the flexibility to learn by consulting with a variety of people about one's work (Higgins & Kram, 2001) and construct a developmental network is particularly significant in current competitive environments. A developmental network may be constituted by individuals who may or may not know one another, may work in several departments, organizations, and even in other cities or countries (Ragins & Kram, 2007). This new paradigm in mentoring research requires new theoretical perspectives and the network approach can provide distinctive lens to the exploration of a range of organizational phenomena at different levels.

IV. MENTORING IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS: EDUCATION STUDIES

International research confirms that the most important factor contributing to students' success in school is the quality of teaching (Hattie, 2003; Bryant et al., 2008). It also corroborates that there are a number of factors that impinge the quality of teaching: such as teacher qualifications (certifications, diplomas) but do not guarantee teaching quality. Instead, high-quality teacher professional development built on collegiality and collaboration in and among institutions is what can actually contribute to student success (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). Furthermore, studies on English educational reform indicate reforms often fail because the whole system is not structured to support the intended reform. Thus, teacher situated learning through collegiality and collaboration seem to be a key component of quality in teaching and mentors play a key role in these learning contexts.

Table 2: Descriptions of specific mentoring and coaching models

(Lord, Atkinson & Mitchell 2008 p. 21).

Model	Description	Reference
Apprenticeship model	Mentor acts as the master teacher, conveying the rules and values, to be emulated.	Child & Merrill, 2003; Jones et al, 2005
Competence model	Mentor relates training and assessment to practice. Mentors perform the role of trainer,	Child & Merrill, 2003; Jones et al., 2005

	assessor and gatekeeper of the profession.	
Reflective model	Mentor adopts the role of critical friend who assists in the evaluation of teaching, to develop a reflective practitioner	Child & Merrill, 2003; Jones et al., 2005
Mentor as model	To inspire and to demonstrate	Hobson & Sharp, 2005
Mentor as acculturator	To help the mentee become accustomed to the particular professional culture.	Hobson & Sharp, 2005
Mentor as sponsor	To open doors and introduce the mentee to the right people. Power and control is not shared; the mentor has primary responsibility for managing the process. Directive styles such as coaching and guiding are used.	Hobson & Sharp, 2005; Robins, 2006
Mentor as provider of support	To provide the mentee with a safe place to release emotions or let off steam.	Hobson & Sharp, 2005
Mentor as educator	To listen, to coach and to create appropriate opportunities for the mentee's professional learning.	Hobson & Sharp, 2005
Development model	Non-directive styles such as counseling and facilitating are used. Balance of formal and informal arrangements. Personal and professional change through reflection.	Robins, 2006

As presented above in Table 2, mentoring models and experiences in education contexts vary significantly depending on their purpose and context. The United States, Great Britain, Israel and some other countries are increasingly implementing some version of school-based and district-wide mentoring which could become more of an evaluative activity than a process for promoting professional development and collaboration.

In some cases, like in the United States, mentoring has been essential to teacher retention (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004), with most mentoring programs therefore focusing on novice teachers' retention. Most of the mentoring research in this country, although limited, indicates that besides promoting teachers retention; mentor teachers in school-based teacher education has a considerable influence on how and what prospective teachers learn (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Geldens, 2007, Glickman & Bey, 1990). A number of these studies conclude that pre-service or beginning teachers who participated in some kind of guidance program had higher job satisfaction and commitment. Nevertheless, Ingersoll and Strong (2011) in a critical review of fifteen studies detected mixed and inconsistent findings. Most of the studies were uncritical as to the outcomes and tended to focus on what worked but not on why it worked or not. These researchers deemed that context matters and that the efficacy of the induction programs may depend on the school setting, the duration of the program and costs.

In Great Britain, mentoring projects started in 1992. Although their focus has been changing, their main focus is still on teacher development and professionalization. Lord,

Atkinson and Mitchel (2008) reviewed thirteen studies on mentoring and coaching in education in general and concluded that these relationships were critical for effectiveness. Furthermore, cross-sector and group working approaches to mentoring and coaching can promote change at another level and these activities will be even more influential when they are part of the organization or of a wider program of professional development.

These authors state that most of the thirteen studies reported an impact on organizational culture. Among the cultures and ethos engendered by mentoring and coaching are the research/learning culture, a reflective culture, and a collaborative culture. The main challenges they identified were: time and workload pressures and the demanding requirements of the mentor or coach role, ensuring positive support and challenge, understanding and expectations (divergent understandings and expectations can lead to conflict), gaining the commitment of school, the school culture and finally, the need to train mentors.

Another controversial issue is the relationship between teacher mentoring programs and education innovation processes. Wang (2001) explores the relationship between contexts of mentoring and mentoring practice drawing on data of US, UK, and Chinese mentor teachers who are expected to promote the kind of teaching promoted by education reformers. This study indicates that these practices have more differences between programs and countries than within the same program or country. It also highlights the importance of restructuring school contexts and supporting mentors in their mentoring learning process.

In English as Foreign Language (EFL) contexts the situation is different and responds to each country's education policy. There have been isolated efforts in different countries; except for Israel. Mentoring, in most cases, is implemented mainly to respond to education challenges today: the implementation of top-down innovations policies, need for English teachers and support for novice teachers. We have chosen four isolated efforts and the Israeli education system experience, which contribute to mentoring research in EFL contexts.

Bodoczky and Malderez (1997) as well as Arnold (2006) reported on mentor training for English teacher educators, the former in Hungary and the latter in the Middle East. Arnold (2006) explored a Mentoring program and confirmed some of the findings in the literature such as the great variability of mentor quality within the same context and the need for 'quality time' for mentor and mentee. Findings revealed that mentors approached the task from different perspectives depending on their observation and feedback expertise. Findings indicated most mentors did not use the relationship to learn about their own teaching. This study raised awareness about issues such as quality and type of mentor training, the complexity of mentor role and the need for support for mentors from within the school.

Although Shin (2012) does not research mentoring directly, the results of her study portray the difficulties of reform implementation as isolated efforts. Shin focused on the implementation of innovation policies in Korea and why novice Korean English teachers with near-native English proficiency shift their instructional language to Korean. The participants' responses indicated that the key influences were institutional constraints, school culture, and students' and teachers' beliefs about English teaching and learning. The novice teachers discard teaching English in English because no one else was doing it. Teaching in English

would have isolated the novice teacher from colleagues. This study raises questions on novice teachers' adjustment to the school environment and adjusting and adopting questionable school practices.

Mann and Tang (2012), in a collective case study on mentoring in Hong Kong, concluded that in the competitive school contexts where there was an accumulating pressure on novice teachers (such as being observed by parents, dealing with demotivated students: mentoring was seen by novice teachers as useful for their professional support and development. The participants, in this study, considered that factors, such as timetabling (for discussion, collaboration, and mutual observation) and proximity to supportive colleagues, were more important than whether the mentor was experienced. Mann and Tang conclude mentors played a key role in supporting these novice teachers who needed proper recognition within schools.

Over the last almost three decades, Israel has dedicated significant funding and resources to the implementation of their mentoring policy. Orland-Barak (2005) has investigated the implementation of mentoring in Israel and has published extensively on this topic. Her research within the field of Teacher Education and Professional Learning focuses on three interrelated agendas: Mentoring and mentored learning, second language teacher learning and curriculum development.

To explore the learning to mentor process, Orland-Barak (2005) explored her own understanding about the process of learning to mentor by comparing mentoring with acquiring a second language/ acquiring communicative competences. This author discussed teachers becoming mentors' transition period. She argued that teachers who start mentoring may follow patterns that have to do more with teaching than with mentoring. That is teachers can be 'lost in translation' when transferring teaching to their second language of practice (mentoring) due to the variety mentoring demands. She also discussed the issue of redefining professional identity and underlines the fact that just like learning to teach, learning to mentor seems to constitute a process of constructing an identity in the middle of more than one system of relations that can overlap or cause conflict in a certain education context.

In this same line of learning to mentor, Orland-Barak & Hasin (2010), in a collective case study, explored exemplary mentors' perspectives towards mentoring working in five different mentoring contexts in a higher education postgraduate course in Israel. Mentors' written narratives and case discussions were used to collect data. Although the mentors adopted different perspectives due to cultural, gender and professional experiences, two emergent themes emerged from the data: *accountability* and *boundaries*. The data revealed concern, insecurity and perplexity regarding the contradictory messages transmitted by the different participants: teachers, school principals, project leaders, and inspectors. They also expressed concern with the vague specifications of their role in the Israeli educational system. Mentors believed teachers, principals and inspectors had more defined roles within the system, so they were also concerned about the *boundaries* of their role as mentors. This study also indicated that a teacher- higher education course based on case-method pedagogy may become a secure and challenging context for mentors to discuss issues inherent to their

mentoring experiences. They need spaces to continue their own professional development and higher education can promote those development spaces.

Mentoring is often not differentiated from teaching, teachers are often asked to mentor newcomers into the profession based on their years of experience in the subject. There is a belief that experienced teachers are necessarily good mentors and this is not the case. Mentors need other competences (Arnold, 2006; Orland-Barak, 2005; 2010) These teachers pushed into mentoring roles often feel frustrated when they have to facilitate a new teacher's development with no training on their role or information on approaching and achieving the program's goals. In some cases, assigned mentors fail to see mentoring's potential to benefit their own professional development.

This researcher describes the mentoring policy, which has generated diverse mentoring programs in Israel implemented in the rapid, ongoing changes of the education system. These diverse programs respond to the changing needs and purposes of each institution; they range from individual to group mentoring, from internal school-based mentoring (the mentor is one of the school teachers) to external mentoring (appointed by inspectors or project leaders), and from regional mentoring according to districts to national mentoring (to promote curricular reforms at national policy level).

The policy of mandatory mentoring reveals a hidden curriculum where experienced teachers are often forced to mentor. However, mentoring and coaching interventions can also have a positive effect both at the personal, group and institutional level (Clutterbuck, 2007). This prescribed mentoring policy in public schools at the individual and collective teacher level has generated mixed reactions. While some teachers and institutions accept the policy (Mann & Tang, 2012) and report benefits, others question, resist and even reject these school policies (Hutinger & Mullen, 2007). Washburn-Moses (2010) studied state and district mentoring policies in the United States and their findings exemplify the great variability in mentoring practices, regardless of state or district policy and the limitations of traditional top-down approach in the policy implementation. So the author suggested an alternate model in order to ensure the implementation of mentoring by promoting collaborative work among stakeholders, who would set the policy, supervise its implementation and evaluate its results in order to implement effective mentoring programs for all novice teachers.

Most mentoring studies in schools report the implementation of formal top down policies. In higher education, however, most of the studies reported relationships which tended to be more informal, unstructured and multiple mentoring relationships - one mentor to more than one mentee or two or more mentors for a mentee (Aladejana, Aladejana & Ehindero, 2006; Darwin & Palmer, 2009; Xu & Payne, 2011). Aladejana, Aladejana and Ehindero (2006) investigated mentoring relationships in Nigeria. Mentees, in this study, identified certain benefits in the relationship, such as: serving as confidant; assistance in writing research papers; promotion; making social connections, opportunities for funding and/or external jobs and in certain contexts protection from victimization. They also identified some challenges in these relationships, such as: mentor's overprotection, the division of faculty into political groups, which maintained the status quo and inherited the mentor's opponents. This study concludes mentoring relationships can promote collaboration

but can also generate conflicts, which can affect both professors personally as well as the institution.

A kind of mentoring relationships implemented in few higher education institutions is multiple mentoring relationships. Darwin and Palmer (2009) reported on a mentoring circle experience in higher education. They found that one of the main challenges in implementing mentoring was matching mentoring partners and finding competent mentors. So, they implemented mentoring circles, which involved one mentor working with a group of mentees or groups of people mentoring each other. In, 2006, the authors facilitated the organization of mentoring circles in the University of Adelaide and twenty participants were involved over a 6-month period. After the experience, they used a focus group to collect data for an evaluation of the implementation. The participants in the focus group thought that mentoring circles were a valid method to use at this university; however, they thought time was one of the main constraints. They also raised issues such as the need for personalities to be compatible, the number of participants in the circle (a minimum of eight and a maximum of thirteen) and the benefits of cross-disciplinary memberships.

The participants reported the main benefits were: gaining different perspectives, learning from others, listening to opinions from those more senior in the university, meeting other professors and not feeling isolated. Nonetheless, the participants thought mentoring occurs informally and that is how it should be. The research seems to indicate that in education, there are differences in the implementation of a top down policy mentoring than when mentoring relationships are established more informally. Mandatory mentoring policies in schools can rise issues such as “accountability” and “boundaries” (Orland-Barak, 2010) and there are or will be others which will probably emerge from these conversations.

V. MENTORING IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHER PROGRAMS

In the last four to five decades, there has been an increasing interest on teacher learning and thus, on the teaching practice component in teacher education programs (Farrell, 2007; Richards & Farrell, 2011; Ong’ondo & Borg, 2011). The teaching practice or practicum is recognized as one of the most important components of the teachers’ initial education and their early development. Thus, the role of the mentor teacher has more recently been related with trend towards school-based teacher education. This shift can be attributed to four factors: increasing scientific recognition of the value of learning in the workplace (Eraut, 2000), criticism of the relevance of theory in teacher education programs as a preparation for practice (Koetsier & Wubbels, 1995), the teacher shortages faced by many countries (UNESCO, 2012), and the idea that teacher training is less expensive if it is done in the workplace (Caldwell & Carter, 1993).

In Latin America, most teacher education programs include teaching practicum courses or practicum. For example, some like the *Normales* in Mexico and most teacher in Colombia (Bonilla & Mendez, 2008) include a number of practicum courses along the pre-service teacher program in which student-teachers approach teaching since the first semesters of their professional education, first thorough observation and later gradually teach in

classrooms. Others, like in most ELT programs in universities in Mexico, are programmed in the middle or at the end after students have taken methodology courses. These ELT programs generally include two to three courses. In most cases, the first tends to focus more on observation and in the second course and in some cases the third; the student teachers have a more direct experience with teaching in an education context.

A. The Teaching Practicum

The teaching practicum, a central component in teacher education programs has been questioned both in *Normales* and in ELT teacher education programs. Reyes and Fortou (2009) in a study on pre-service teaching students' perceptions about the practicum courses in the *Normales* in Mexico, conclude that these tend to adopt common sense perceptions about teaching instead of constructing more in depth meanings. They also consider these teaching students' interventions in schools as "trials" that attempt to systematize limited learning and teaching processes whose intentions are not clearly formative. Furthermore, students lack of conceptual and methodological research competences do not promote the collection of data in the classroom, the analysis of these data and later in depth reflection, which could lead to professionalization.

Along the same lines, in a study on pre-service teacher students' experiences and expectations of their practicum in Cyprus, Kourieos (2012) stated the participants interpreted the practicum more as an assessment period in which their mistakes imply low grades instead of learning opportunities. The findings in this study also highlighted the prescriptive nature of the practicum, which allowed very little flexibility in approach and materials and promoted prescriptive practices, which were dictated by the classroom teacher or the TP supervisor with very little observation or feedback. Finally, the author states, "mentoring serves as a catalyst in student teachers' process of learning to teach" (Kourieos, 2012, p. 62). Kourieos concludes that a supportive and credible mentor must have knowledge of the subject matter and its methodology as well as the skills to give feedback and engage the student teachers in awareness-raising activities.

In both EFL and ELT contexts, cultural and contextual issues have generated concerns and misunderstandings in mentoring processes. Kullman (1998), grounded on his mentoring work with EFL teachers in Hungary, questions a narrow definition of "reflection" and states it will be interpreted in differently in different contexts. Likewise, Johnson (2003) in her study on the relationship between a native English speaking (NES) teacher working with a nonnative English speaking (NNES) student teacher in an MA Teaching English as a Second Language practicum in the United states found emergent themes related to language expertise, cultural ways of knowing and doing, and conflicting religious beliefs.

B. Dialogue in Mentoring

Russian literary critic and philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) described the ideological becoming of the individual as "the process of selectively assimilating the words of others" into one's own understandings of the world (p. 341). As we develop as educators,

the words of others inform our theories and beliefs, shaping our understandings. Dialogue exists as a crucial element of this development because it is through dialogue that we come to better understand our relationships with each other, and thus ourselves. Applied to the context of new teachers, they filter their experiences through the lens of others' ideas. As a result, throughout the ideological becoming of new teachers, the theories and feedback they receive from those around them are a central component of these dialogues. Therefore, as central players in the education of pre-service teachers, the words of university supervisors, as well as mentor teachers, exert considerable weight.

In a dialogical mentor-mentee relationship, observations and feedback sessions are positioned as opportunities for student teachers to receive constructive, supportive feedback rather than punitive moments intended to quantify teacher success. These sessions serve as a chance for the mentee and mentor to view the classroom as another text with which to dialogue, ensuring that the student feels supported and encouraged by a mentor who truly wants him or her to succeed. These types of qualitative discussions produce a deeper understanding of "what," while systems in which a student is evaluated quantitatively each time can turn into a tiny (and at times critical) snapshot of what happens in the classroom.

There are a number of studies, which investigate these interactions or "dialogues" between mentors and mentees in post-observation meetings in English language teaching programs. Some focus on the mentors' feedback, others on the interaction between both mentors and mentees and still others on mentees' narratives about their practice.

Although there are studies that suggest important benefits of the dialogues in mentoring (include 1-2 references), failures in dialogues have been reported, for instance, by Clutterbuck (2011) who states that '...a core skill for a mentor is to recognise when to lead and when to enable the mentee to lead discussions. One of the most common complaints by mentees is that the mentor talks at them, rather than engaging them in reflective dialogue. Less common, but equally dysfunctional, is the mentor who never gives advice and is unable to adapt style to the mentee's needs at the time'. In a research report, Smith et al. (2012) state that there is a lack of research in mentoring that demonstrates the efficacy of the dialogues in mentoring.

There are a number of studies, which investigate interactions between mentors and mentees in post-observation meetings in English language teaching programs. Farr (2003) studied interactions between graduate students and their tutors in an English language teaching program at an Irish university. Her analysis focused on tutors' use on minimal response tokens (e.g., "mmm," "yes," "OK") to express agreement and non-minimal tokens (e.g., "right," "exactly," "absolutely") to respond affectively, and overlaps and interruptions. Her findings revealed that tutors increased student teachers' self-reflection by not interrupting them and using minimal tokens as supportive responses. Vasquez (2004) also studied mentors' feedback and the language they used to mitigate criticisms and suggestions in post-observation meetings. Findings indicated that more experienced mentors used a range of positive adjectives, adverbs, and intensifiers to express approval (e.g. nice, good). Their discourse included longer turns with suggestions, advice, and non-evaluative descriptions of class events. However, teaching assistants did not perceive mentors' use of positive language

and politeness discourse markers as constructive criticism; they thought that their mentors' positive remarks did not help them improve their teaching.

Whereas, Vasquez and Urzua (2009) examined novice teachers' use of reported speech on concrete actions and reported speech on mental states in post-observation mentoring meetings in an intensive English program at an American university between ESL teacher graduate TAs and their mentors. Their findings indicate the emergence novice teachers' professional identity. The mentees' discourse revealed a frequent use of reported speech on concrete actions and on mental states. Novice teachers' reported actions to portray themselves as competent, resourceful, and in control of the class.

A critical framework has also been used to study post-observation interactions Hyland and Lo (2006) examined post-observation interactions between English student teachers and their university tutors during a teaching practicum in Hong Kong. Through interviews and recorded conferences, the researchers studied turn-taking, turn length, topic initiation, and feedback type. The analysis of tutors' speech revealed most of their interventions offered prescriptions, suggestions, and critique about the student teachers' practice. There were some positive interventions, which offered encouragement and praise; however, few comments invited student teachers to express their feelings. Most student teachers' turns provided information about their practice and accepted the tutor's comments. Thus, the interaction the tutors had a dominant role while student teachers had a more passive one. The authors also indicated that cross-cultural communication could have influenced the directness or indirectness in the interaction between the eight Chinese student teachers, two Chinese tutors, and two non-Chinese tutors.

There are other studies, which have focused on cross-cultural communication in post-observation interactions between mentors and NNES mentees. Kamhi-Stein (2000) has suggested the need to provide pre-service NNES teachers with opportunities to develop support networks where they could reflect on their language teaching experiences while being guided by an experienced NNES mentor. In the UCLA TESOL master's program, a practicum included a Web-based group to engage novice NNS English teachers in discussing issues and effective practices implemented by NNES experienced teachers or mentors (Kamhi-Stein, 2000).

Another issue which is constantly raised among NNES and NES mentors when working with NNES mentees is feedback about their English skills especially when the mentoring situation involves NES mentors and NNES mentees. There seems to be little research on NNES feelings about receiving feedback regarding their English skills. Bayliss and Vignola (2007) reported that English-speaking novice L2 French teachers in an immersion program in Canada had mixed feelings about receiving feedback regarding their French skills. The participants, in this study, thought that they were willing to accept positive feedback on their use of French; however, this kind of feedback, even when delivered positively, made them less confident as teachers.

To conclude, over the last two decades there has been a growing interest in narrative studies in second language teacher education (Johnson & Golombek, 2011). These studies, in foreign language teacher education have just started to indicate how the field understands and

supports the professional development of foreign language teachers generally NNES in different educational contexts.

VI. DISCUSSION

Our main purpose in this article was to explore previous research on mentoring in organizational and education studies in order to stimulate our and others thinking and research about mentoring relationships in pre-service teacher education and teacher professional development.

Mentoring is now often defined as a personal, long-term developmental relationship, which is embedded within the career context (Ragins & Kram, 2007). Traditionally it has been defined as a relationship between an older, more experienced mentor and a younger, less experienced mentee. This view, however, has been changing and besides the dyadic mentor-mentee relationship today mentoring can imply multiple mentorships or developmental networks. It is a dynamic complex relationship, which exists on a continuum of quality that reflects a full range of positive and negative experiences, processes, and outcomes (Fletcher & Ragins, 2007). Mentors and mentees construct their professional identities within a specific context in an attempt to promote the mentees' learning and socialization within their organizations and professions. It is a journey in which both mentor and mentee or, in the case of mentoring circles (Darwin & Palmer, 2009) or constellations of relationships (Higgins & Kram, 2001) learn by engaging individuals and groups in reciprocal learning, networking, and sponsoring (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) both personally and professionally (Kram, 1985).

The studies reviewed in this article indicate that we now have more tools to better understand the importance of acknowledging that mentoring involves a wide variety of developmental relationships (peer mentoring, group mentoring, cross-organizational mentoring, cross-cultural mentoring, and e-mentoring) and that these relationships combine to form an individual's developmental network. We also recognize that each developmental network is unique due to its surrounding context, the other network members, and the actions they all take. This implies each network may offer individuals different opportunities for learning processes, practices, and results. The results of these mentoring studies also indicate causes of flawed mentoring as well as high-quality mentoring relationships. The flawed relationships in education seem to be mainly due to lack of quality time between mentors and mentees (Arnold, 2006; Atkinson & Mitchel, 2008) as well as issues with institutional culture and support (Atkinson & Mitchel, 2008; Orland-Barak & Hasin, 2010; Mann & Tang, 2012). In addition, we now realize the complexity of mentoring relationships and how emotional competence, situated required competences, career stage, personal development, family lens, gender, and cultural dimensions affect individually and collectively the quality, processes, practices and results of developmental networks and relationships.

As a final point, some of these studies (Aladejana, Aladejana & Ehindero, 2006; Orland-Barak & Hasin, 2010; Shin, 2012, among others) highlight the role of the culture of the institutional contexts in which the mentoring relationships take place.

VII. FUTURE RESEARCH

This leads to three priorities in mentoring research in education. The first is to explore and explain how diverse mentoring relationships (peer, group, cross-organizational, cross-cultural, and e-mentoring) complement each other within developmental networks. The second is to understand how participating in these developmental networks influences participants' future personal and professional development stages. Finally, we need to study how mentoring relationships and developmental networks enhance or could enhance education in specific contexts in order to promote quality in education in general.

Ragging and Kram (2007) offer four key recommendations for mentoring research which we will adapt for education into five possibilities for future research. First, the need for more research that includes both mentors and mentees in peer, group, or e-mentoring relationships instead of focusing on only one side of the relationship, either the mentee or the mentor. Second, the need for more research, which elucidates learning to mentor processes in specific contexts (Orland-Barak, 2005, 2010; Arnold, 2006). Third, the need to employ qualitative and observational research methods, which can uncover the rich variety of processes, practices and results of mentoring relationships. The acknowledgment that multiple forces shape mentoring relationships has led to study different perspectives and voices which, in turn, required looking for a wide range of methodological tools such as "critical moments", "mentoring episodes", "tipping points" and communication patterns. Fourth, the call for more longitudinal research in order to understand how mentees and mentors, relationships and networks change over time. As a final point, the need to examine the wide range of developmental relationships that occur within and outside institutions. These relationships can be more of three different natures: supervisory, mentoring or coaching nature. They can be organized as the classic mentoring relationship or in peer, group or network relationships and have different characteristics such as formal, informal and electronic.

REFERENCES

- Achinstein, B., & Barrett, A. (2004). Framing classroom contexts: How new teachers and mentors view diverse learners and challenges of practice. *Teachers College Record*, 106, (4), 716-746.
- Aladejana, A., Aladejana, F., & Ehindero, S. (2006). An Analysis of Mentoring Relationships Among Teachers: A Case Study of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 4, (1), 20-30.
- Allen, T.D. and Eby, L.T. (2007). *Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach*. London: Blackwell.

- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., O'Brien, K. E., & Lentz, E. (2008). The state of mentoring research: A qualitative review of current research methods and future research implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73, 343-357.
- Allen TD, Eby LT, Poteet ML, Lentz E, Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (1), 127–136.
- Arnold, E. (2006). Assessing the quality of mentoring: Sinking or learning to swim? *ELT Journal*, 60, (2), 117–124.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.
- Baugh, G. & Fagenson-Eland, E. (2007). Formal mentoring programs: A “poor cousin” of informal relationships. In B. R. Ragins and K. E. Kram (Eds.). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice*, pp. 373-399. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Bayliss, D., & Vignola, M. (2007). Training non-native second language teachers: The case of Anglophone FSL teacher candidates. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/LaRevue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, 63 (3), 371–398
- Bodoczky, C., & Malderez, A. (1997). The INSET impact of a mentoring course. In-service teacher development. In D. Hayes (Ed.) *In-service teacher development: International perspectives*, pp. 50–60. Hertfordshire, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Bonilla, S. X. & Méndez Rivera, P. (2008). Mentoring in pre-service teaching: from reflection on practice to a didactic proposal, *Revista Actualidades Pedagógicas*, 52.
- Borko, H. & Mayfield, V. (1995). The roles of the cooperating teachers and university supervisor in learning to teach, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11 (5), 501-518.
- Bozeman, B. & Feeney, M. K. (200). Toward a useful theory of mentoring: A conceptual analysis and critique. *Administrative and society*. 39 (6), 719 - 739.
- Bozionelos, N. 2004. Mentoring provided: Relation to mentor's career success, personality, and mentoring received. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64 (1), 24-46.
- Brenes, M., Cabral, L., Delgado, I., Encinas, F., Salazar, G. & Sanchez, V. (2010). *A resource guide for TEFL Mentors and supervisors*. Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla.
- Bryant, D., Downer, J., Hamre, B., Howes, C., Pianta, R., & Soliday-Hong, S. (2008). *Ensuring effective teaching in early childhood education through linked professional development systems, quality rating systems and state competencies: The role of research in an evidence-driven system (White Paper)*. Charlottesville, VA: National Center for Research in Early Childhood Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ncrece.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2008/09/ncrecewhitepaper2008.pdf>

- Caldwell, B. J., & Carter, E. M. A. (Eds.). 1993. *The return of the mentor*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Chandler, D. E & Kram, E. K. (2005) Applying an adult development perspective to developmental networks. *Career Development International*, 10 (6/7), 548–566.
- Child, A. & Merrill, S. (2003). Professional mentors' perceptions of the contribution of school/HEI partnerships to professional development and school improvement. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 29 (2), 315-324.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2007). An International perspective. In B. R. Ragins and K. E. Kram (Eds.). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice*, pp. 633-651. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Clutterbuck, D. (2011). *Why mentoring programmes and relationships fail*. Clutterbuck Associates: USA
- Collison, J., & Edwards, A. (1994). How teachers support student learning. In I. Reid, H. Constable, & R. Griffiths (Eds.), *Teacher education reform: Current research*, pp. 131-136. London: Paul Chapman.
- Darwin, A. & Palmer, E. (2009). Mentoring circles in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28 (2), 125-136.
- Delaney, Y. A. (2012). Research on mentoring language teachers: Its role in language education. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45 (1), 184-202.
- De Jager, H., Mok, A., & Sipkema, G. (2004). *Grondbeginselen der sociologie* [Basic principles of the sociology]. Groningen, the Netherlands: Wolters.
- Dunne, E., & Bennett, N. (1997). Mentoring processes in school-based training. *British Educational Research Journal*, 23(2), 225-237.
- Eby, L.T. & Allen, T.D. (2008). Moving towards interdisciplinary dialogue in mentoring scholarship: An introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72 (2), 159-167.
- Eby, L. T., & McManus, S. E. (2004). The protégé's role in negative mentoring experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65 (2), 255–275.
- Edwards, J. L., & Green, K. E. 1999. Persisters versus nonpersisters: Characteristics of teachers who stay in a professional development program. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/1a/5c.pdf
- Edwards, A., & Protheroe, L. (2003). Learning to see in classrooms: What are student teachers learning about teaching and learning while learning to teach in schools? *British Educational Research Journal*, 29 (2), 227-242. doi: 10.1080/0141192032000060957

- Engelen, A. 2002. *Coaching binnenstebuiten; een onderzoek naar coaching van docenten door docenten* [Coaching inside out. A study into coaching for teachers by teachers]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nijmegen, Nijmegen University Press.
- Eraut, M. (2000). Non-formal Learning and Tacit Knowledge in Professional Work. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70 (1), 113-136.
- Espinosa, J. (2012) La constitución de las prácticas de profesionalización de formación de docentes en México. *Perfiles Educativos*, 36 (143), IISUE-UNAM.
- Farr, F. (2003). Engaged listenership in spoken academic discourse: The case of student tutor meetings. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2 (1), 67–85.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2009). The novice teacher experience. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*, pp. 182-189. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Feiman–Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 17-30.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Featherstone, H. (1992). *Exploring teaching: Reinventing an introductory course*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M.B. (1992). A comparison of two U.S. programs for beginning teachers. *NCRTL special Report*. Michigan State University.
- Field, T., & Field, B. (1994). *Teachers as Mentors: A Practical Guide*. London: Falmer
- Fletcher, S. J. & Mullen, C. A. (2012). *The Sage Handbook of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*. Sage
- Fletcher, J. K. & Ragins, B. R. (2007). Stone Center Relational Cultural Theory: A window on relational mentoring. In B. R. Ragins and K. E. Kram (Eds.) *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice*, pp. 373-399. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Geldens, J. J. M. (2007). *Leren onderwijzen in een werkplekleeromgeving. Een meervoudige casestudy naar kenmerken van krachtige werkplekleeromgevingen voor aanstaande leraren basisonderwijs* [Teacher Education in a workplace learning environment. A multiple case study to determine the distinctive characteristics of powerful workplace learning environments within primary teacher education]. Helmond: Kempellectoraat Hogeschool de Kempel.
- Glickman, C. & Bey, T. (1990). Supervision. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*, pp. 549-566. New York: Macmillan.
- Haggarty, L. (1995). *New Ideas for Teacher Education: A Mathematics Framework*. London: Cassell.
- Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*. New York: Routledge

- Harrison, J., Lawson, T., & Wortley, A. (2005). Mentoring the beginning teacher: Developing professional autonomy through critical reflection on practice. *Reflective practice*, 6 (3), 419-441. doi: 10.1080/14623940500220277
- Hattie, J. (2003). *Teachers Make a Difference: What is the Research Evidence*. Paper to Australian Council for Educational Research Annual Conference.
- Hennissen, P., Crasborn, F., Brouwer, N. Korthagen, F. & Bergen, T. (2008). Mapping mentor teachers' roles in mentoring dialogues. *Educational Research Review*, 3 (2), 168-186.
- Higgins, M.C., & Kram, K.E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26 (2), 264-288.
- Hobson, A. and Sharp, C. (2005). Head to head: a systematic review of the research evidence on mentoring new head teachers. *School Leadership and Management*, 25 (1), 25-42.
- Hughes, M. (1998). Developing the use of qualitative analysis to describe and explore the effectiveness of post-observational discourse between school-based mentors and students in teacher education. *In Paper presented at the European conference on educational research*.
- Hutinger, J. & Mullen, C. (2007). Supporting Teacher Leadership: Mixed Perceptions of Mandated Faculty Study Groups. In Saran Donahoo, Richard C. Hunter (Eds.) *Teaching Leaders to Lead Teachers (Advances in Educational Administration)*, 10, 261-283. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Hyland, F., & Lo, M. (2006). Examining interaction in the teaching practicum: Issues of language, power and control. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 14 (2), 163-186.
- Ingersoll, R., & Kralik, J. (2004). The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says. *ECS Research Review: Teaching Quality*, 1-24. Retrieved February 17, 2014, from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/127
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233. doi:10.3102/0034654311403323.
- Jones, M., Nettleton, P., Smith, L., Brown, J., Chapman, T. and Morgan, J. (2005). 'The mentoring chameleon - a critical analysis of mentors' and mentees' perceptions of the mentoring role in professional education and training programmes for teachers, nurses, midwives and doctors.' Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Glamorgan, Pontypridd, 14-17 September [online]. Available:<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/143672.doc> [12 November, 2008].
- Johnson, K. (2003). Every experience is a moving force: Identity and growth through mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 787-800.

- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2011). The transformative power of narrative in L2 teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 1-24.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. (2000). Adapting U.S.-based TESOL education to meet the needs of nonnative English speakers. *TESOL Journal*, 9 (3). 10–14.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press
- Koetsier, C. P. and T. Wubbels. (1995). Bridging the gap between initial teacher training and teacher induction. *Journal of Education and Teaching* 21 (3), 333-345.
- Kram, K. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman
- Kullman, J. (1998). Mentoring and the development of reflective practice: Concepts and context. *System*, 26, 471–484.
- Kourieos, S. (2012). The impact of mentoring on primary language teacher development during the practicum. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 15. Winter 2012. Available:
https://www.google.com.mx/search?q=Kourieos+THE+IMPACT+OF+MENTORING+ON+PRIMARY+LANGUAGE+TEACHER+DEVELOPMENT+DURING+THE+PRACTICUM+Stella+&oq=Kourieos+THE+IMPACT+OF+MENTORING+ON+PRIMARY+LANGUAGE+TEACHER+DEVELOPMENT+DURING+THE+PRACTICUM+Stella+&aqs=chrome..69i57.19702j0j8&sourceid=chrome&espsv=210&es_sm=122&ie=UTF-8 [15 May, 2014].
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. A., & McKee, B. (1978). *Season's of a Man's Life*. New York: Knopf.
- Liang, B., Spencer, R., Brogan, D., & Corral, M. 2008. Mentoring relationships from early adolescence through emerging adulthood: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72 (2), 168-182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.11.005>
- Lord, P., Atkinson, M. and Mitchell, H. 2008. *Mentoring and coaching for professionals: A study of the research evidence*. London: TDA.
- Mann, S., & Tang, E. 2012. The role of mentoring in supporting novice English language teachers in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46 (3), 472-495.
- McGowan, E. M., Stone, E. M., & Kegan, R. (2007). A Constructive-Developmental Approach to Mentoring Relationships. In *The handbook of mentoring at work: theory, research, and practice*, pp. 401–426. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Miller, J. B. & Stiver, I. P. (1997). *The healing connection: How women form relationships in therapy and in life*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Oliva, P. (1993). *Supervision for Today's Schools*. (Fourth ed.). New York: Longman.
- Ong'ondo, O. C. & Borg, S. (2011). We teach plastic lessons to please them: The influence of supervision on the practice of English language student teachers in Kenya. *Language Teaching Research*, 15 (4), 509-528.

- Orland-Barak, L. (2005). Lost in translation: Mentors learning to participate in competing discourses of practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56 (4), 355-366.
- Orland-Barak, L. & Klein, S. (2005). The expressed and the realized: Mentors' conversation and its realization in practice. *Teach Teach Educ*, 21 (4), 379-402. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2004.05.003
- Orland-Barak, L. (2010). *Learning to mentor as praxis: Foundations for a curriculum in teacher education*: New York Springer.
- Orland-Barak, L., & Hasin, R. (2010). Exemplary mentors' perspectives towards mentoring across mentoring contexts: Lessons from collective case studies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 427–437.
- Ortega S. y Castañeda, M.A. (2009). El formador de formadores en México: entre la escuela y la academia. In Velez de Medrano and Vaillant (Ed.) *Aprendizaje y desarrollo profesional docente*. <http://www.oei.es/metas2021/APRENDYDESARRPROFESIONAL.pdf>
- Ragins, B. & Kram, K.E. (Eds). (2007). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Publications.
- Reyes M. E. & Fortou, M. B. (2009). Los procesos de significación de la práctica docente: una mirada desde los alumnos normalistas. X Congreso Nacional de Investigación Educativa. Veracruz, Veracruz, 21 al 25 de septiembre de 2009. *Memoria Electrónica*.
- Richards, J. C. & Farrel, S. C. (2011). *Practice teaching: A reflective approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Robins, A. (Ed.) (2006). *Mentoring in the early years*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Scandura, T.A., & Ragins, B.R. (1993). The effects of sex and gender role orientation on mentorship in male-dominated occupations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43(3), 251.
- Shin, S. K. (2012). It cannot be done alone: The socialization of novice English teachers in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46, (3), 542-567.
- Smith, A., Sanders, M., Norsworthy, B., Barthow, S., Miles, L., Ozanne, P., & Weydeman, C. (2012). Maximising learning dialogue between workplace mentors and students undertaking professional field-based experiences. *Research Report*. Ako Aotearoa National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence.
- Stanulis, R.N. & Russell, D. (2000) 'Jumping in': trust and communication in mentoring student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16 (1), 65–80.
- Timperley, H. (2001). Mentoring Conversations Designed to Promote Student Teacher Learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 29 (2), 111-123.
- Tharp, R. G. & Gallimore, R. (1988). The redefinition of teaching and schooling (Chapter 1: 13-26), A theory of teaching as assisted performance (Chapter 2: 27-43) in *Rousing*

minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context. New York. Cambridge University.

- Turner, M. (1993). The Role of Mentors and Teacher Tutors in School Based Teacher Education and Induction. *British Journal of In-service Education*, 19 (1), 36-45.
- Strong, M., & Baron, W. (2004). An analysis of mentoring conversations with beginning teachers: Suggestions and responses. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 47-57
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2012). The global demand for primary teachers-2012 update. *Information Bulletin* 10.
- Vasquez, C. (2004). Very carefully managed: Advice and suggestions in post-observation meetings. *Linguistics and Education*, 15, 33–58.
- Vasquez, C., & Urzua, A. (2009). Reported speech and reported mental states in mentoring meetings: Exploring novice teacher identities. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42 (1), 1–19.
- Veenman, S. & Denessen, E. (2001). The coaching of teachers: Results of five training studies. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 7 (4), 385-417.
- Vélaz de Medrano, C. y Vaillant, D. (Coord.) (2009). *Aprendizaje y desarrollo profesional docente*. España: Fundación Santillana.
- Wang, J. (2001). Contexts of mentoring and opportunities for learning to teach in comparative study of mentoring practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17 (1), 51-73.
- Wang, J., Strong, M., & Odell, S.J. (2004). Mentor-novice conversations about teaching: A comparison of two USA and two Chinese cases. *Teachers College Record*, 106 (4), 775–813.
- Washburn-Moses, L. (2010). Rethinking mentoring: Comparing policy and practice in special and general education. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 18 (32) Retrieved [May 14, 2014], from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/716>
- Xu, X., & Payne, S. C. (2014). Quantity, quality, and satisfaction with mentoring: What matters most? *Journal of Career Development*, 41, 507–525.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1985). Preparation for elementary school teaching. In P. Burke and R. Heideman (Eds.), *Teacher competence: Issues in career-long teacher education*, pp. 2-97. Springfield, IL: Thomas.