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Abstract
This study examined the nature of mentoring in Physical Education Initial Teacher Training (PE ITT) and how mentors and trainees in PE ITT from the Southern University Partnership established, maintained and ended their relationships over a fifteen-week school placement.

A qualitative approach was adopted and one Southern University four-year undergraduate course was selected as a single case study, within which six embedded units (mentor / trainee relationships) were studied over a fifteen-week school placement. Three mentors from three schools each worked with one year 4 and year 3 trainee on a final and intermediate placement respectively. The multi-technique approach used included guided reflection through semi-structured questionnaires and interviews and video recorded mentor / trainee meetings at the beginning, middle and end of the placements. This allowed for a wide-angle view of the relationships and generated rich data for analysis.

No clear definition of mentoring emerged in PE ITT. Mentors and trainees had not studied mentoring literature and found it difficult to articulate the nature of their practice and relationship. Mentors’ practice was not grounded in mentoring theory, planning was reactive and monitoring the quality of trainees’ attainment was not rigorous and often subjective. Mentors were aware trainees entered the placement at different stages of development, and differences in personality, knowledge, understanding and levels of confidence meant trainees progressed at different rates. Mentors and trainees recognised within their own relationships characteristics similar to Maynard and Furlong’s (1995) stages of trainee development and Walker and Stott’s (1993) stages in the development of mentor trainee relationships. Evidence showed that trainees became more confident and independent, and some undertook greater responsibility as the placement progressed. However, the extent to which trainees drove the relationship was questionable. In addition, although mentors and trainees became more familiar and at ease in each other’s company they remained primarily closed within the un-spoken boundaries of a professional relationship.

While there was opportunity for mentoring in PE ITT to go beyond Brockbank and McGill’s (2006) functionalist approach towards a more evolutionary approach, both limited time and inadequate facilitative skills of mentors and trainees curtailed this development. In meetings, mentors made no conscious use of active listening skills to improve the effectiveness of learning dialogues with trainees, which limited trainees’ depth of thought and analysis.

A number of recommendations emerged from the findings of this study. Further research is necessary into mentoring relationships within PE ITT partnership programmes. A Government policy is required that places obligations on schools to provide both adequate time for mentoring and funding for continuing professional development (CPD) in mentor education. Mentors in PE ITT should be prepared through a process of accreditation that may lead towards a higher degree with recognised status in schools as a skilled mentor. In turn, schools must fund CPD for mentors and raise the status of mentoring in PE ITT. Finally, university documentation must reflect the importance of greater status and protected time for mentors in schools.
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INTRODUCTION

The Researcher’s Biography

A brief overview of my life story is important to allow readers to engage with my background and values from the start of the research journey to its completion. My values inevitably impacted on my interpretation of the data and the co-construction of knowledge of mentor / trainee relationships within the Southern University\(^1\) partnership.

I was born and raised in the West Indies, and lived there until early adulthood. During the course of my youth and young adulthood in this white minority, male-dominated homophobic society, I became very used to, although never comfortable with, traditional ideals of education and ways of being. I saw things frequently from a different perspective and craved to be accepted with my differences, although I realised this would be difficult and probably unlikely.

With little money, my mother and I lived in an extended family setting, which had equally significant benefits and limitations. Whilst I felt very lucky to share a comfortable home and to be protected and cared for, at times I felt like a spare part that was tolerated. Thus, I carefully observed behaviour, listened to the views of others and adjusted to what appeared to me to be the acceptable norms of the ‘others’. As I lived in this setting for my entire school life, feelings of true ownership and empowerment eluded me in my early years, and throughout life I have aspired to achieve these life states.

My education had all the elements of traditional teaching; it was ‘… disciplined, ordered, logical, analytical’ (Prashnig, 1998, p.6). Additionally, it had

\(^1\) The names “Southern Polytechnic” and “Southern University” are used throughout as well as in references and the bibliography to protect anonymity of the institution. Documents referred to under the name Southern University are authentic.
… low emotional impact, meaning derived from content, a strong emphasis on the 3Rs … stress on the auditory mode … belief that learning was difficult … strong association with failure … low learning motivation … emphasis on a quiet class, institutional rituals … little room for individuality. (Prashnig, 1998, p.6)

I struggled in this system and was rarely a happy learner. Learning was something I had to do to pass exams. Fear of harsh judgements and failure drove me to work very hard to get things ‘right’. I yearned for someone to understand my learning needs and me as a person. In my mind, I never achieved my potential and was never ‘good enough’. I lived in a ‘straight jacket’ and often silenced myself for fear of ridicule. I was painfully shy, felt different in many ways from those around me and frequently needed to escape from the daily routine of keeping up appropriate appearances and pleasing others. Despite my uncomfortable life state, I had to find a way to be successful. Talented in sport, I lost myself in training and competing and this boosted my self-image.

Such experiences showed me that I must attempt to recognise and embrace diversity of opinions and perspectives. I learned to value the humanistic and holistic vision of learning and recognised that

… wisdom comes from understanding how everything in life is inter-related [and] deeply respecting the learner unlocks inner-motivated learning. (Ikeda, 2001, p.i)

I have also come to believe that education should encourage learners to realise their potential and ‘… display their unique individuality with enthusiasm and vigour’ (Ikeda, 2001, p.xi). Additionally, I feel strongly that providing learners with educational experiences, which facilitate deeper understanding of themselves, of others and of the world, is a transformational process and should be at the heart of education (Kazanjian, 2001).

My mother struggled, but managed to find a way of funding my teacher education and first degree and in 1974 I entered the United Kingdom [UK] to do this at a female Physical Education [PE] College. To find my way in a foreign culture was difficult. Yet, much to my surprise, many of the difficulties I had experienced in the ex-UK colony were alive and well in my new environment. But this at least
provided some sense of familiarity. While the system of education was similar in many respects it allowed some greater freedom of expression and I gradually found more of a ‘voice’. During teacher preparation in the 1970s, emphasis was on education studies and teaching practice and so most of my time was spent in the University. While in schools, I was supervised by a member of the PE department who oversaw my practice and assisted me with my teaching. A college tutor visited the schools and monitored my progress. I most enjoyed exploring the ways in which theory related to practice. In the late 1970s and early 1980s I taught PE in the West Indies, coached tennis professionally in the United States of America [USA] and the West Indies, completed a Masters in the UK and then jointly ran a sports school in the West Indies. I was never totally settled and constantly sought a place to live where I felt accepted and at ease with myself. I knew this would not be in the West Indies.

In 1994 my business partner and I relocated the sports school to the UK. We worked with teachers in primary schools, assisted them with the implementation of the PE National Curriculum [PENC] and I took up a visiting lecturer post at Southern University. Later in 1997, after I had been granted UK citizenship, I became a full time lecturer at the University involved in initial teacher training [ITT], subject tutoring and link tutoring. This introduced me to mentoring in ITT. I had to hit the ground running and come to terms quickly with a system, which had changed significantly since the 1970s and continued to be in flux. There was no training for new subject and link tutors apart from two joint visits with a senior subject tutor who showed me how it was done. Teachers in schools were no longer supervisors who were responsible for overseeing teaching practice; they were now mentors with a greater responsibility for training. I studied the required standards trainees had to achieve together with the Government and University procedures, which schools, mentors and trainees had to follow. I observed what went on, gave feedback to trainees and mentors on elements of their practice and hoped I was getting it right. The more I did this the more I became confident that the practice as it was being conducted in schools neither reflected my concept of mentoring, nor represented my holistic values, nor demonstrated the ‘reflective practitioner’ rhetoric promoted by Government and the profession. Mentors and
trainees told me in very superficial terms what they did, which appeared to meet the requirements. However, trainees’ paperwork reflected limited recognition of the theory that underpinned practice and demonstrated limited reflection on the evaluation of pupils’ learning. Mentors’ reports on trainees were vague and in many instances unhelpful. Overall, mentors appeared to ignore feedback that encouraged them to facilitate trainees’ deeper reflection on practice. Hence, my subject tutor comments were repeatedly the same in placement after placement.

Additionally, I became aware that the needs of trainees and mentors were seldom met for a variety of reasons and, often, relationships were poor. Trainees on intermediate and final placements frequently complained about poor mentoring and the quality of the mentor / trainee relationship. One year 4 trainee who reflected on her intermediate placement experience said

I need to feel that I can go to him [mentor] and talk to him and just say look I’m struggling or whatever the situation is, and like when I was on placement last year I wouldn’t go and ask for help … I hated it, I didn’t like it.

Similarly, another spoke about difficulties experienced on intermediate placement when a member of the PE department became jealous of the time the mentor spent with her. She claimed the teacher took it out on her; she criticised her teaching and put her down at every opportunity. As a result the trainee avoided the mentor even ‘at the cost of appearing rude’.

To add to my confusion, I found, increasingly, discrepancies in the views of colleagues. Whilst some accepted as sufficient what I regarded as very limited evidence of reflection, others expressed similar frustrations to the ones I experienced with practice in schools. Furthermore, the University advised subject tutors not to alienate mentors and schools by being too demanding, for fear that schools would decide to withdraw from the partnership. To compound the issues further, the Office for Standards in Education [Ofsted] inspectors demanded to see detailed paperwork that demonstrated reflection on practice. Consequently, in preparation for Ofsted inspections, tutors checked that practice in schools
demonstrated the requirements through special Ofsted preparation visits to
schools just prior to inspections.

I became frustrated quickly with a system that did not, in my view, function
effectively and which resulted in tremendous variation in practice. Although
mentor education may have been one way of developing the work of mentors,
there were only two annual mentor-training days. These focused only on
developments in the subject and updated mentors on Government policy, Ofsted
inspections and University procedures.

Whilst my holistic and humanistic values readily allowed me to embrace the
reflective practitioner rhetoric and welcome mentoring, I was very unclear and
became disillusioned quickly about the practice. This disillusionment and
frustration with the system led to the research reported in this study. I was initially
drawn to explore what I passionately believed to be a lack of awareness and
concern for the interpersonal aspects of the mentor / trainee relationship. Initially,
I proposed to study mentors’ use of counselling skills for building relationships
with trainees. However, as I carried on reading and discussing my thoughts with
fellow professionals, I began to discover that I would have to extend my focus in
order to better understand the context and nature of the mentoring process before
establishing whether or not particular attention should be given to mentors’ use of
counselling skills.

For this study I needed firstly, to examine my own values and the impact they
were having on my interpretation of the system; secondly, to examine the ITT
context and mentoring literature to learn more about the concept of mentoring and
to find out how others perceived the learning relationship between mentors and
trainees in ITT and thirdly, to examine in greater depth interactions between the
mentors and trainees. I thought this would give me a more accurate picture of
mentoring in ITT and the relationship between the mentor and trainee in the
Southern University partnership. I believe this process demonstrated in part the
impact of my background and experience. My fear of having my views judged
harshly taught me to gather information and to look and listen before speaking-out
or acting. I knew I needed a more accurate picture before I could feel confident
about making bold statements and taking action. I had to be prepared also to accept and respect the existence of multiple perspectives.

I accepted that as a practitioner, who had no authority to make changes to the system, I had to find an effective way of working within it. My goal at the start of this research journey was therefore, not to change the system in any way, but to better understand how things worked. To do this I needed to develop knowledge and awareness of the nature of mentoring and mentor/trainee relationships through becoming a questioning insider. This, I hoped, would help not only me, but also others involved in Physical Education initial teacher training [PE ITT].

**My perception of the situation prior to the start of the research**

What follows here is a review of my understanding of the situation within PE ITT as I became involved in the system and formulated ideas for a research project. Details of the political and institutional context will follow in Chapter One.

In the early 1990s the Conservative government had fully endorsed the school-based training ideal (Department for Education Circulars 9/92 and 14/93), which changed completely the course of ITT in the UK (Furlong and Maynard, 1995; Furlong, Barton, Miles, Whiting and Whitty, 2000). With teacher training now being conducted as a partnership between schools and teacher training institutions, trainees on four-year secondary undergraduate courses spent thirty-two weeks of their course in schools. Consequently, with high quality partnership between providers such as higher education institutions [HEI] and schools essential to trainees’ learning experiences, teachers who worked as mentors in partnership schools took on great responsibility for the training and assessment of trainees.

Through discussions with colleagues at HEI Network conferences, I knew that Ofsted and the profession recognised that much needed to be done to raise the quality of mentoring. To do this, I felt that mentoring that occurred within the context of PE ITT needed to be more clearly defined through increased understanding of the processes and relationships involved.
There was no doubt that mentoring was multifaceted, demanding and time consuming. The early 1990s legislation had brought no significant gains for mentors, only an increase in pressure in an already packed schedule of responsibilities. Teachers were reluctant to take on the role of mentor because of the responsibility involved and mentors prioritised other responsibilities over the needs of trainees (Taylor and Stephenson, 1996; Stidder and Hayes, 1998). These issues impacted on mentors and trainees and added to the complexity of the task of developing and maintaining a complex relationship over a period of time.

Within the PE partnership at Southern University, structures and guidelines for practice were in place that complied with Government regulations for ITT and mentors were kept up-to-date with these. On the other hand, mentors were not introduced to the mentoring literature and mentor training focused neither on the development of knowledge of mentoring nor on the skills required to establish and maintain an effective mentor / trainee relationships. Similarly, although trainees were given guidelines for placements, including what was expected and the nature of paperwork to be completed, they were not trained to use the skills required for reflective dialogue with mentors.

Given the challenges faced by mentors and trainees in ITT I believed there was a need for research that clarified the nature of mentoring and the mentor / trainee relationship in ITT. As Hawkey (1997) had noted:

Several studies provide overviews of mentoring and its management … but few examine or analyse the intricacies of mentoring interactions, how mentoring relationships operate between individuals involved, or how and what student teachers learn from their mentoring experiences. (Hawkey, 1997, p.325)

My study therefore set out to address the imbalance identified by Hawkey (1997) through an examination of mentor / trainee relationships in PE ITT at Southern University. It drew from literature across the fields of mentoring, counselling, social psychology and pedagogy. Literature on mentoring relationships in business, the health professions and education was used to inform understanding of the nature of PE ITT mentor / trainee relationships.
For this study, library-based research started at the end of 1999 and fieldwork was carried out from February 2005 to February 2006. During this period Southern University Partnership procedures for practice had to fulfil government regulations identified in *Qualifying to Teach. Professional Standards for Qualified Teacher Status [QTS] and Requirements for Initial Teacher Training* (Department for Education and Skills, 2002). Thus, by the end of their course, trainees had to achieve the Department for Education and Skills (2002) QTS standards to become newly qualified teachers [NQT]. Subsequently, schools and mentors within the University partnership followed guidelines produced by Southern University set out in the Partnership in Education [PiE] Agreement and Handbooks (2005a and 2006a) and the Mentors’ Handbooks (2005b and 2006b).

**Outline of the Thesis**

In Chapter One I set the scene and identify the context within which PE mentoring at Southern University existed. My historical review traces, first, the way in which teacher education became centralised, school-based initial teacher training evolved and, second, the significant change in the role of teachers in schools from supervisors to mentors.

In Chapter Two my review of mentoring literature familiarises the reader with how mentoring evolved and the confusion in defining the term. It shows that the nature of mentoring in every field and in each institution varies; and I argue that the context must be known in order to understand the nature of the mentoring that takes place.

In Chapter Three I examine the processes involved in mentoring and the nature of the relationship within which they operate.

Chapter Four gives further insight into the interactions and processes that take place within a mentor / trainee relationship. I address the conditions that are perceived to facilitate the development of successful relationships and a range of skills used to achieve intended outcomes. In addition, I draw from previous chapters to argue a case for the research undertaken in this study.
Chapter Five identifies the aim of the research and the research questions. I justify the use of an interpretive approach as well as an exploratory case study method. I examine also the advantages and disadvantages of the multi-research techniques chosen.

In Chapter Six I report on the findings within and across the mentor / trainee relationships studied. I examine patterns that re-occur across all relationships as well as unique occurrences in each of the relationships.

Chapter Seven reflects on the findings in relation to the literature addressed in Chapters One to Four. In addition, I consider the limitations of my chosen research approach, method and techniques. Drawing on the findings and conclusions, I make recommendations for further research, for additions or alterations to Government policy, for accreditation for mentors and for higher status and increased time for mentors in schools.
CHAPTER ONE
From university-based teacher education
to school-based teacher training

1.0 Introduction
This research set out to explore and describe the nature of mentoring and the mentor / trainee relationship in PE ITT\(^2\) in a sample of mentor / trainee relationships from the Southern University partnership. The mentoring practice I observed during school visits was nothing like my concept of holistic mentoring, which demanded a challenging learning process within an open and caring relationship that enabled personal and professional growth. I was both confused and concerned about the mentoring practice I observed during school visits. This prompted me to explore how the terms “mentoring” and “mentor” had come to be used in ITT to describe the process and functions of the role given to those senior teachers in schools who were responsible for working with trainees.

For me to form a concept of mentoring in ITT, to recognise it in practice and to reflect critically on what took place required an understanding of what mentoring and, more specifically, mentoring in ITT meant (Roberts, 2000). Likewise, the role of the mentor needed to be defined, so that the nature of the relationship could be established and the required competencies and skills identified (Clutterbuck, 2001). Within the context of formal mentoring in ITT, the ‘culture and / or climate of the organisation, the structure and purpose of the scheme and the background of the mentor and mentee impacted on the role of the mentor’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.16) and on the mentor / trainee relationship. Thus, consideration of the ‘macro’ context [political forces] and the ‘meso’ context [HEIs and schools] in which ITT mentoring occurred was essential, prior to

---

\(^2\) In view of the ambiguities surrounding the meaning of mentoring and the role of the mentor across different contexts and explanations of the PE ITT context are addressed in Sections 1.5, 1.6 and Chapter 2.
examining the ‘micro’ context [the mentor / trainee interactions] (Colley, 2003, p.5).

Many authors have documented the political debates through the decades and engaged in critical commentary on how government ideologies and policies have shaped teacher preparation. I do not set out to engage in critical political debate in this chapter. Instead, I draw upon the work of Wilkin (1996), Furlong et al. (2000) and others to document political decisions which changed the structure and content of teacher preparation.

This chapter traces the shifts in teacher preparation from an academic focus to a professional focus, from university-based teacher education to school-based teacher training and from teachers as supervisors to teachers as mentors. Also, it examines aspects of the Southern University’s partnership structure and procedures for teacher training in schools and, in particular, the expectations of mentors and trainees during school placements. This sets the scene and informs discussion: firstly, in Chapter Two, of the definition(s) and concept(s) of mentoring; and secondly, in Chapter Three, of the component processes and the mentor / trainee relationship.

The ideologies of those involved in the development, production and implementation of policy (the governments of the day, their advisors and the teaching profession) initiated changes in the content, structure and administration of ITT. Sections that follow will give an overview of the changes between the 1960s and the 1990s that led to a highly centralised school-based teacher training system and a new concept of teacher professionalism.

1.1 The strong academic focus of the 1960s is challenged by the profession in the 1970s

The 1960s has been described as a time of expansion for higher education during which teacher training colleges and their courses gained graduate status (Aldrich, 1990). Such moves ensured that ‘universities dominated the world of teacher training’, as they controlled both the content and validation of courses (Wilkin, 1996, p.61) and a ‘strong personal education’ took priority over practical training
This focus on a strong personal education represented the Conservative government’s social democratic ideology (Wilkin, 1996; Furlong et al., 2000) that valued ‘equality of opportunity for its citizens to become not merely good producers but also good men and women’ (Robbins Report, 1963, para. 31).

The Sussex University’s school-based Post Graduate Certificate of Education [PGCE] course, set up in the mid 1960s, was an exception to the academic focus of the time (Wilkin, 1996). Wilkin (1996, p.61) identified three characteristics of the Sussex University model that set it apart from other ‘university dominated’ courses. Firstly, responsibility for students’ teaching and assessment was given to teachers who were partners in training and not just supervisors. Secondly, the teacher and university tutor maintained joint responsibility of the student. Thirdly, the model had to include time for theorising through ‘reflection and debate’ (p.81). Indeed, as Wilkin (1996) argues, the Sussex University model was ahead of its time in relation to school-based PGCE courses and remained in many ways an isolated case.

Towards the end of the 1960s, tension brewed between training colleges that were striving for the academic status of their courses and the call from practitioners for a more professionally-based preparation. The strong academic focus was ranked low by students and teachers who wanted to prioritise the development of classroom competence (Williams, 1963; Griffiths and Moore, 1967; Shipman, 1967). Support gained momentum for a degree with a greater professional focus. By the start of the 1970s many colleges and polytechnics changed validating bodies from universities to the Council for National Academic Awards [CNAA], in order to facilitate their shift of focus from academic programmes towards more practically-based courses which enabled students to develop greater professional competence (Wilkin, 1996).

Teacher preparation was in a state of flux and there was still no clearly-defined role for teachers (Alexander and Wormald, 1979; McCulloch, 1979). Considerable variation existed between providers (universities, colleges and polytechnics), ‘course content and structure’, the nature of the partnership
between schools and institutions and the time spent in schools (Furlong et al., 2000, p.21). Schools and teachers remained critical of the system as teacher preparation retained an ‘over-academic approach to professional education’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.21), the role of teachers remained minimal and ‘the practice of partnerships was largely illusory’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.21).

In the 1960s and 1970s a social democratic ideology followed by a ‘lack of a clear ideological presence’ (Wilkin, 1996, p.71) enabled colleges and universities to retain autonomy over teacher education and decide on the content and structure of courses. The focus of teacher preparation was on education through ‘child development or psychology … philosophy … sociology … and history’, known as the four disciplines (Wilkin, 1996, p.53), with varying periods of teaching practice in schools. The teacher’s role as supervisor was associated with trainee socialisation into the school and profession, involving caring, guiding and assisting (Field, 1994c). While the supervisor wrote a report on a trainee at the end of teaching practice she\(^3\) was not considered to be a formal assessor (Field, 1994c). Their status as professionals meant that teachers were regarded as possessing specific subject knowledge grounded in the four disciplines; as having the authority to use subject knowledge to adjust practice, whenever necessary, in the very unpredictable circumstances of the classroom; and as holding the values necessary to act responsibly in all circumstances (Ball, 2005). This form of ‘authentic’ professionalism, which valued reflection, dialogue, debate and a critical perspective (Ball, 2005, p.4), reflected my own educational values (Introduction) and, for me, was familiar and comfortable.

During the decade of the 1970s, voices within the teaching profession (tutors, teachers, students) called for a better balance between the practical and academic elements of teacher preparation (Wilkin, 1996). They argued that a greater focus on practical aspects would improve teachers’ performance. On reflection, I

---

\(^3\) The feminine gender is used throughout this thesis when reference is made to persons whose gender is unknown as in this case ‘the supervisor’. This supervisor could equally have been male.
acknowledged the need for greater knowledge of and expertise in teaching skills and competencies and believed it complemented well the underpinning knowledge and understanding of the four disciplines. This push from the profession suited the ‘New Right’ movement, which had emerged in the western world in the 1970s (Wilkin, 1996, p.140) and ‘… challenged the social democratic perspectives of earlier years’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.9).

The incoming Conservative government of 1979 under Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister was faced with a very diverse training system that was difficult to control. The shift from theory to practice, to partnerships and to school-based training suited the new Conservative ideology (Wilkin, 1996). Wilkin (1996, p.140) suggests that several writers (Gamble, 1983; Jacques, 1983; Levitas, 1986; King, 1987) agreed that Thatcherism represented the New Right ideologies in the UK, in that Thatcherism:

… consisted of two strands: those of neo-liberalism and of neo-conservatism’. Neo-liberals believed that ‘… economic prosperity stems from the unconstrained operation of market forces. (Wilkin, 1996, p.140)

They claimed that market realities should dictate policies and practice and that teacher education was ‘unnecessary’, that it created inefficiency, and that practical work in schools should ‘take precedence’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.10). Neo-conservatists proposed the elevation of ‘… the nation over the individual’ (Wilkin, 1996, p.140). Furlong et al. (2000) indicate that the Hillgate Group (1989, p.1), proponents of the neo-conservative agenda, believed education depended upon ‘… the preservation of knowledge, skills, culture and moral values and their transmission to the young’. The neo-conservative strand maintained that teachers should be expert in their specialist subject knowledge and this should take precedence over training in pedagogy. In other words, what to teach should take precedence over how to teach (Furlong et al., 2000). The New Right movement pushed further the direction of school-based training together with the idea of apprenticeship for trainees in schools (Furlong, Hirst, Pocklington and Miles, 1988; Wilkin, 1996). While I personally valued a balance between the academic and practical elements of teacher education, the New Right agenda,
which prioritised practical elements, clashed with my belief that knowledge and understanding of pedagogy was essential.

1.2 Greater momentum for change leading towards a centralised system of teacher training in the 1980s

Although at the start of the 1980s, according to Wilkin (1996), the Secretary of State for Education had only limited powers to intervene in ITT, government changes throughout the decade led to an emerging climate of centralised control. The Secretary of State acknowledged the findings of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate [HMI] survey, published as The New Teacher in School (Department of Education and Science [DES], 1982), which showed, amongst other things, that weaknesses in training existed and should be eradicated (Taylor, 1984). In 1983, Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary of State, commissioned a study known as ‘The Cambridge research into school-based teacher education’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.22). Furlong et al. (2000, p.22) indicate that the Secretary of State had limited powers to intervene in ITT and therefore used this ‘… high profile research project’ to convince the profession and … to influence national policy …’. McIntyre (1990) reported that the study emphasised the need for much closer integration of school and university based aspects of teacher training and recommended the importance of the specialised roles of schoolteachers and university tutors. Moreover, it highlighted the need for student school experience in more than one school and the need for in-service training for teachers. Additionally, Wilkin (1996, p.82) claims it produced a ‘theoretical framework’ for the development of training courses that could incorporate the characteristics of the Sussex model of training referred to earlier.

From 1983 onwards many government papers and circulars led both to greater control over ITT by the state and to significant changes (Table 1). HMI pronounced there were no clear criteria related to what trainee teachers should be able to do by the end of their training (Wilkin, 1996). Hence, the White Paper, Teaching Quality (DES, 1983a) reflected the direction of government policy and the prescriptive criteria HMI proposed for teacher education. From 1984, government intervened more directly in ITT than ever before and the Secretary of
State for Education ‘dramatically increased the powers of his Office’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government papers and circulars</th>
<th>Recommendations – significant changes for ITT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **White paper: Teaching Quality** (DES, 1983a) | i. Criteria for assessment and approval of ITT.  
ii. Teachers in schools should be more involved in ITT. |
| **HMI Discussion paper: Teaching in Schools** (DES, 1983b) | i. Guidelines for the content of training.  
ii. Training determined by the demands of classroom teaching.  
iii. The acquisition of skills needed for good practice.  
iv. Recommendations for length of courses and the time spent in schools.  
v. Partnership desirable. |
| **Circular 3/84 ITT: Approval of Courses** (DES, 1984) | i. Campaign for the Advancement of Teacher Education [CATE] established and responsible for monitoring teacher education and advising the Secretary of State.  
ii. HMI would inspect courses and report to the Secretary of State who in turn would inform CATE.  
iii. Committees set up to promote links between institutions, schools and the community with representatives from courses, LEAs, school teachers and others from outside education.  
v. Experienced teachers had to be involved in the process of selection, supervision and assessment of students.  
vi. Time spent in schools defined for the first time.  
vii. QTS could not be awarded to a student with poor or unsatisfactory practical classroom teaching. |
| **Circular 24/89 ITT: Approval of courses** (DES, 1989b) | i. Strengthened Government control.  
ii. CATE’s responsibilities extended.  
iii. Committees played a greater role in monitoring ITT courses.  
v. Exit criteria established for students (statements of what students should be able to know, do and understand by the end of the training). |

**Table 1**  
Significant changes during the 1980s leading to greater centralisation of ITT
Dissatisfied with the training, and particularly with the proportion of theory within courses, The Secretary of State for Education took action. This action culminated in Circular 3/84 *Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses* (DES, 1984), and set out the criteria for assessment and approval of ITT courses (Furlong et al., 2000). Consequently, the influence HEIs had on teacher education diminished as the state took more control in defining the content of ITT. With the establishment of a national system of accountability in ITT, HMI worked closely with the Campaign for the Advancement of Teacher Education [CATE]. For example, HMI visited and inspected institutions before they recommended them to CATE for accreditation. Although the HMI survey of thirty training institutions between 1983 and 1985 praised many aspects of training (HMI, 1987), they also emphasised the need for more partnership, integrated theory and practice and a stronger focus on reflection and classroom skills (Wilkin, 1996) as defined by the state.

Attention was drawn to the Oxford-based PGCE programme for secondary school teachers based on the findings of the Cambridge research in 1983 (McIntyre, 1990). In this scheme a partnership was established between the University Department of Education [UDE], secondary schools and the Oxford Local Education Authority [LEA], with student teachers known as “interns” and experienced schoolteachers called “mentors”. On this model, whilst professional tutors [PT] based in schools had overall charge of school-based training, mentors were responsible for training the interns. The LEA provided funding for in-service work for mentors and professional tutors, and all personnel involved remained in regular contact through concurrent university-based and school-based studies. This collaborative practice facilitated the integration recommended by the Cambridge findings. Oxford “interns” were awarded QTS on demonstration of a list of competencies although they had experienced only one school during their training.

By 1988 most teacher training institutions had implemented the changes demanded by Circular 3/84 (DES, 1984). HMI considered the progress courses had made towards the achievement of the 3/84 directives in an investigation into
“probationers” in their first posts. To remedy the deficiencies revealed by the investigation, they recommended that levels of classroom skill competencies be introduced that trainees were expected to achieve by the end of training. Wilkin (1996) maintained that, in the view of HMI, such competencies had to be observable and measurable and (thus) facilitate assessment.

Alternative ways of training teachers emerged between 1984 and 1989 that increased choice and sped up implementation of government’s directives for school-based teacher training. The first, the Licensed Teacher Scheme, was a school-based programme that allowed individuals to train in schools under the support of the LEA (DES, 1988b; Wilkin, 1996). The second, the Articled Teacher Scheme of 1989 (DES, 1989c), enabled student teachers to spend two years in training, four-fifths of which was spent in schools (Wilkin, 1996).

The Conservative government continued its intervention in ITT through the DES Circular 24/89 (DES, 1989b). This replaced Circular 3/84 (DES, 1984) and strengthened the government’s control. For example, CATE’s responsibilities were extended, local committees played a greater role in the monitoring of ITT courses and the exit criteria for trainees came into force in January 1990. Furthermore, the two Government Circulars 3/84 (DES, 1984) and 24/89 (DES, 1989b) established a system of accountability and introduced a more practically focused professionalism. Subject studies, subject application, curriculum educational and professional studies were linked strongly to classroom practice and facilitated the development of key professional and classroom skills (Furlong et al., 2000). Overall, the content of the Circulars endorsed the recommendations of HMI and sought to remedy the perceived weaknesses in the training.

1.3 The 1990s — a decade of radical change for ITT

The trends of increased centralisation and stronger control, established in the 1980s, continued throughout the 1990s (Wilkin, 1996). Government pushed for a fully school-based system of teacher training. Most courses responded to proposals that led to extended school experience and greater training responsibilities for schools. Yet, despite improved collaborative practice between
schools and HEIs, time spent in schools varied and training was effective only where teachers dedicated the necessary time to their extended role (HMI, 1991). Overall, a complex national system of teacher training existed with a stronger focus from universities on practical elements (Furlong et al., 2000).

During the tenure of Kenneth Clarke, then Secretary of State for Education, further emphasis was placed on the role of schools in teacher training. Clarke recommended that student teachers spend more time in schools and advised that senior teachers be appointed as mentors. Consequently, further significant changes in ITT came through a number of Government circulars and acts. A summary of these changes can be seen in Table 2 and Table 3. Tighter central control over ITT was initiated through the publication of the Government Circular 9/92, *Initial Teacher Training [Secondary Phase]* (Department for Education [DfE], 1992). The aim of ITT was now to prepare students to maintain and improve standards in schools and to ensure they developed the necessary level of subject knowledge and competence. Moreover, HEIs and schools in partnership were expected to share jointly the responsibility for planning and management of training, and schools were advised to appoint mentors. To be awarded QTS, students now had to show they could teach effectively and manage the behaviour of pupils. In addition, they had to be given ‘opportunities to observe good teachers at work [and] to participate with experienced practitioners in teaching their specialist subject’ (DfE, 1992, Annex A 3.4.2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Circulars</th>
<th>Key changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Circular 9/92: Initial Teacher Training [Secondary Phase] (DfE, 1992) | • Time in schools increased.  
  • Schools would have a leading responsibility for teacher training.  
  • School to assess students on their ability to meet the required competencies in subject knowledge, subject application, class management, assessment and recording of pupils’ progress, and further professional development.  
  • HEIs responsible for ensuring courses met the requirements, awarded the qualifications and placed students in more than one school on placement.  
  • The two elements of teacher training would be subject knowledge (HEIs) and practical teaching skills (schools).  
  • CATE would advise the Secretary of State and guide institutions in matters related to accreditation, procedures, approval of courses and partnerships.  
  • HEIs could decide how to use the local committees.  
  • A grade C or above required in English and maths to enter HEIs.  
  • Ofsted to inspect courses.                                                                                                                                 |
| DfE (1993a) Government proposal for the reform of ITT          | • CATE to be abolished and Teacher Training Agency [TTA] established.  
  • TTA & Ofsted would be directly responsible to the Secretary of State.                                                                                                                                 |

Table 2  Government Consultation Papers and Circulars 1992 – 1993

There was little doubt that the post-1992 reforms significantly reduced the power of HEIs and increased the power of schools (Wilkin, 1996; Furlong et al., 2000). Even so, the contribution of HEIs could not be reduced if schools did not take up the opportunity to become involved in teacher training (Furlong et al., 2000).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Circulars</th>
<th>Key changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Circular 14/93  
*The Initial Training of Primary School Teachers, new criteria for courses*  
(DfE, 1993c)                                                                 | • The transfer of funding from the Higher Education Funding Council [HEFC].  
• The end of the Articled Teacher Scheme.  
• The establishment of the School Centred Initial Teacher Training Scheme [SCITT].  
• The establishment of the Open University distance learning scheme.  
• The research assessment exercise.  
• Moves towards semesterisation and modularisation. |
| Circular 10/97  
*Teaching: High Status High Standards. Requirements for courses in ITT*  
(Department for Education and Employment [DfEE], 1997)                             | • 9/92 competencies replaced by more detailed standards under the following headings:  
  i. Knowledge and Understanding  
  ii. Planning, Teaching and Class Management  
  iii. Monitoring, Assessment, Recording, Reporting and Accountability  
  iv. Other Professional Requirements. |
| Circular 4/98  
*National Curriculum for ITT. Requirements for courses of ITT*  
(DfEE,1998)                                                                            | • New standards.  
• National curricula for ITT.  
• Emphasis on Professional Development Profile [PDP] and Career Entry Profile [CEP]. |

### Table 3   Government Consultation Papers and Circulars 1993 – 1998

The severe reduction of the role of HEIs in the training process was of concern to some HMIs who maintained HEIs had ‘an academic and professional expertise which is crucial in the support both of individual students and schools’ (HMI, 1991, 5.vi). Similarly, institutions provided students with knowledge they could not gain in schools (Barber, 1993). However, any threat to government policies was reduced with the HMI power base weakened and replaced by local...
inspectorate teams (Wilkin, 1996). From 1992 Ofsted took over most of the work of HMI. Led by a Chief Inspector responsible directly to the Secretary of State, Ofsted developed a framework that used quantitative methods of inspection rather than the qualitative methods used previously (Furlong et al., 2000).

Radical changes continued with the publication of the Department for Education consultation document (DfE, 1993a), The Education Bill (DfE, 1993b) and The Education Act (DfE, 1994) together with the abolition of CATE and the establishment of the Teacher Training Agency [TTA]. Like Ofsted, the TTA was responsible directly to the Secretary of State with key roles such as ‘teacher recruitment and supply, the funding of teacher education in England [and] the accreditation of courses’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.73). The TTA financed the School Centred Initial Teacher Training Scheme [SCITT], perceived by government as the future of teacher training (Furlong et al., 2000). Circulars DfE 9/92 and 14/93 changed significantly the course of ITT in the UK as they endorsed more fully the school-based training ideal (Furlong et al., 2000).

Indeed, Circular 14/93 The Initial Training of Primary School Teachers (DfE, 1993c) reduced further the power of HEIs as it covered corresponding changes within primary teacher training. Further challenges to the involvement of HEIs in teacher training came also through SCITTs and Open University courses. In line with government policy, Ofsted and TTA developed an effective working relationship that led TTA to link quality ratings to course funding. HEIs had to adjust quickly to new courses, new accreditation, new funding arrangements and more frequent inspection (Furlong et al., 2000). Ofsted inspected all ITT courses between 1993 and 1995 and applied quality ratings to the outcomes of inspections, and encouraged providers to conform to Circulars DfE 9/92 and 14/93. Government support and funding for the SCITT scheme continued even though Ofsted inspection results (Ofsted, 1995) showed such schemes were few and far between and performed poorly. The increase of Ofsted inspections pressured institutions to improve the management of partnerships and to heighten the focus on the quality of the school-based training and the performance of the
mentors. On reflection, quality here seemed to mean meeting government criteria for required performance outcomes.

By 1997 government, through the TTA, had gained greater control of the content of training (Furlong et al., 2000). The trend set by the outgoing Conservative government and endorsed by the incoming Labour government maintained a tight control of ITT, which they claimed would raise standards in education in general and ensure the quality of teacher training was high (Department for Education and Employment [DfEE], 1997). The more general competencies of Circular 9/92 were replaced by the further detailed 10/97 standards (Millett, 1997). The DfEE believed the new standards defined more clearly the content of training courses on which trainees were assessed and insisted all were achieved before students could be awarded QTS. However, despite their claim of a shift towards greater clarity ‘the list of standards itself was not new, it was simply a development of earlier lists’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.152). Government wanted to be seen to be raising standards generally, thus making it difficult for the public to argue with their new policy proposals. Such rhetoric as raising standards suited their agenda and was expected to improve the public’s perception of teaching as a profession (Furlong et al., 2000).

Circular 4/98, National Curriculum for ITT (DfEE, 1998), replaced Circular 10/97. Whilst this built on the standards for the award of QTS it included also training curricula for information and communication technology for all specialist subjects. With the strong focus on standards in Circular 4/98 (DfEE, 1998) came an increased emphasis on trainees’ Professional Development Profiles [PDP]. These had proved unworkable in the mid 1990s because of the inconsistency of mentor practice across all courses (Furlong et al., 2000). However, with greater standardisation and central control, government now expected all providers to ‘… ensure that all those trainees who successfully complete a course of ITT leading to QTS receive a TTA Career Entry Profile [CEP]’ (DfEE 4/98, Annex 1, 2.1.5, p.136).

Subsequently, provision provided by both statutory providers and schools was monitored carefully to ensure trainees acquired the standards for QTS. Circular
4/98 (DfEE, 1998) increased the expectation for a high quality partnership essential to trainees’ learning experience and teachers in schools had to take on greater responsibility for the training and the assessment of trainees. By this time, the inspection process had become very controversial, as the profession had not accepted easily the intense pressure on schools, mentors and teacher training providers. Those who were critical saw it as a ‘name and shame approach’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.145) that had a negative and demoralising effect (Mortimore and Whitty, 1997; Furlong et al., 2000). Indeed, many within the teaching profession were hostile to increased central control (Furlong et al., 2000).

By the end of the 1990s, even though a role rapidly evolved for teachers as mentors there remained inconsistencies in practice between partnerships and schools. The intricacies of that role and the nature of the mentor / trainee relationship were unclear and open to the interpretation of those involved.

1.4 The relentless period of change continued into the 21st Century

The move into the 21st century saw the profession challenged again by additional changes to ITT through government intervention. The proposed revisions in the consultation document, Standards for the Award of QTS and Requirements for ITT (TTA, 2001), made changes both to the standards that trainee teachers had to demonstrate to be awarded QTS and to the requirements for ITT. To assist with interpretation and implementation, non-statutory guidance accompanied the revised QTS standards and ITT course requirements published in February 2002 for implementation by September 2002. The key proposals can be seen in Table 4.
• Standards were ‘more streamlined’ and ‘accompanied by guidance’ material. The non-statutory guidance contained examples of what trainees would have to demonstrate to be awarded QTS, ‘a code of practice on assessment and guidance on ITT partnerships’.
• Greater emphasis was placed on ‘professional values’.
• The standards reflected the most recent developments in education, e.g. ‘Foundation Stage, Curriculum 2000, National Strategies at Key Stages 1, 2 and 3, and post 16 developments’.
• Trainees would ‘spend at least 32 weeks in schools’ and providers had to recognise trainees’ prior experience which now counted towards time in schools.
• All provision prepared trainees ‘… to teach across a minimum of two key stages’.
• QTS standards covered provision on ‘… all routes to QTS’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>The new QTS standards and ITT requirements key proposals (TTA, 2001, p.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The new standards were subsumed under three headings: Professional Values and Practice, Knowledge and Understanding and Teaching. Overall, the TTA considered these standards were ‘more concise’, had ‘a clearer structure’ and would ensure that:

at entry to the profession, each new teacher has a good foundation of knowledge and understanding, is able to perform as a skilled teacher and can operate within a clear framework of professional values and practice. (TTA, 2001, p.3)

In September 2002, 4/98 was replaced by The Department for Education and Skills’ [DfES] / TTA document *Qualifying to Teach. Professional Standards for QTS and Requirements for ITT* (2002). In addition, in association with the TTA, Ofsted produced an Inspection Handbook that gave details of ITT inspection and the inspection framework (Ofsted, 2002).

Two developments in the first half of the decade had particular resonance for this study. Firstly, in 2004 the Government started to make a contribution to a greater

---

4 The way in which teacher preparation institutions divided up the 32 weeks trainees spent in schools varied from course to course.
understanding of mentoring at a conceptual level, when the DfES commissioned the Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education [CUREE] to undertake a Mentoring and Coaching Capacity Building Project. The overall aim of this work was to:

… develop clarity about the nature of effective mentoring and coaching in order to secure coherence, excellence and a positive impact on teaching and learning in the next phase of the development of a national Continuing Professional Development [CPD] strategy. (CUREE, 2004, p.2)

This move came late, as throughout the 1980s and 1990s practitioners involved in ITT (viewed as the first stage of CPD) had struggled to come to terms with and adjust to the changes that resulted in partnerships in school-based training and mentoring in schools. Hence, although mentoring and coaching were not new concepts in education, government only now supported teachers’ engagement with these processes through strong backing ‘and links to a new national CPD framework’ (General Teaching Council [GTC], 2005, p.1). CUREE found there was a massive demand for the commissioned work and realised that practice was ‘… not always well understood or appropriately resourced’ and that there was ‘… little evidence of ongoing support for the further development of mentoring and coaching’ (2004, p.2). Also, it recognised that the language [used in mentoring and coaching] was ‘confused, overlapping’ and sometimes involved ‘100% reversal of key terms’ (CUREE, 2005a, p.6).

Secondly, in September 2005 the TTA became the Teacher Training and Development Agency [TDA] (TTA, 2005). The TDA took on an extended remit with three overarching goals: ‘to attract able and committed people to teaching’, ‘to provide schools and staff with good information on training, development and workforce remodelling’ and to ‘create a training and development environment that enables the whole workforce to develop its effectiveness’ (TTA, 2005, pp.3-4). Subsequently, the GTC (2005, p.1) claimed that the TDA gave a ‘… fresh emphasis to mentoring and coaching’ through its aim to train the ‘whole school team’.
Thus throughout the 1990s and into the 21st century ITT had become centralised and had to be made more accountable with clearer expected outcomes of training. In response to change, partnerships between teacher training institutions and schools had developed, the responsibilities of teachers in schools had increased and mentors were expected to play a significant role in training. In particular, mentoring was viewed as essential both to partnership and to the success of the training.

1.5 Management of The Southern University Partnership

This section briefly reviews the nature of the Southern University partnership in the 1990s prior to the period under study and further clarifies the context, at the institutional level, within which ITT mentoring was positioned. It identifies the partnership regulations and procedures for the management of the partnership and the expectations of mentors and trainees during the fieldwork undertaken between 2005 and 2007.

During the 1990s, school partnerships within the Southern Polytechnic and then within the Southern University continued to develop. Experienced teachers in schools became known as “mentors” and 1991 witnessed the start of mentor training. The move to university status in 1992 heralded also a change from the four-year Bachelor of Education [BEd] Honours concurrent degree to a four-year Bachelor of Arts Honours [BA (Hons)] with QTS degree [BA QTS]. As expected, the University met the 9/92 Circular conditions, developed the partnership school-based model of teacher training and paid schools for the first time for their part in the training of teachers (Homer, 2001). Homer (2001) highlights that Southern University had to negotiate changes with schools and had no power to make them alter their practice. Additionally, whilst there was some funding provided by government to cover payments to schools, this was very limited and did not help to lure schools into the partnership.

From 1993, the Southern University ITT Partnership has been managed by the PiE Committee, which advises on the quality of partnership arrangements as well as on developments of other providers that impact on ITT partnership provision.
Subsequently, the Southern University PiE Agreement and Handbook, published after consultations with professional tutors and mentors in schools, provides all those involved with clear guidance on procedures. A video training package on mentoring produced by the University (Allen, Murray and Herbert, 1993) gave guidance on aspects of the mentoring competencies such as observing, debriefing, negotiating and mentoring styles. Since 1993, additions to the PiE Agreement and Handbook have included greater detail both on the expectations of lesson planning (Southern University, 1995, pp. 2.23 and 2.24) and assessment procedures (Southern University, 1995, pp. 3.6-3.8). In 1996, course outlines were given to schools together with samples of all required placement forms (Southern University, 1996) that schools were expected to complete at various stages during the placement. Mentorship development workshops were replaced with two annual mentorship subject conferences, with the focus now placed on new developments and the relationship between school-based and university-based work. In addition, conferences gave mentors the opportunity to evaluate and contribute to the development of the partnership (Southern University, 1996).

During my employment at Southern University, the conferences I attended focused primarily on giving information about changes, followed by the reinforcement and introduction of regulations and procedures. Whilst I saw the importance of this, I questioned what appeared to be an absence of mentor education that related to the nature of mentoring, the mentor / trainee relationship and associated skills and competencies.

The revised 1997 PiE Agreement and Handbook took into account the new DfEE (1997) requirements that both transformed the competencies in Circulars 9/92 and 14/93 into standards and established a national curriculum for ITT. With the new regulations enforced from September 1997 the Southern University’s annual conferences for mentors and professional tutors focused, firstly, on the standards for the award of QTS as requirements for all courses of ITT; and secondly, on the Ofsted / TTA Framework for the assessment of Quality and Standards in ITT.

After consultation within the partnership, the Southern University responded to the needs of schools and produced a mentors’ handbook in addition to the PiE
Agreement and Handbook. The mentors’ handbook was ‘…intended to provide a clear focus for mentors to develop their role as the trainer and assessor of student teachers’ (Southern University, 2001b–2006b, p.i). It included sections on the partnership and the DfEE standards and assessment procedures. In 2003 / 2004, mentors and professional tutors were asked to pilot the use of the University’s grading criteria that aimed to determine the level at which students performed. The University hoped use of the four Ofsted levels of attainment – very good, good, satisfactory and unsatisfactory – would increase consistency of assessment across schools and assist with smoother student progression (Southern University, 2004a, p.51).

1.6 Southern University Partnership 2005–2007 – role expectations of the school, professional tutor, mentor and trainee

The all-encompassing role of the school within the partnership was to provide experiences and training that enabled trainees to meet all of the standards identified by the DfES (2002) and to achieve QTS. To this end, through placements that ranged from 7 to 15 weeks in length (Southern University, 2005b, p.9), schools were expected to provide a broad and balanced programme for trainees that facilitated their involvement in whole school activities and the PENC (DfEE, 1999). Professional tutors, in schools, were responsible for trainees’ whole school experience and trainees were ‘trained by the mentors towards professional competence’ (Southern University, 2005a and 2006a, p.15). However, despite this division of roles, professional tutors and mentors were expected to liaise on matters of student assessment and mentor support.

Mentorship was considered to be ‘… at the heart of the partnership arrangements although the partnership concept extended to a much wider shared responsibility’ (Southern University, 2005a and 2006a, p.15). The mentor facilitated the exposure of trainees to a range of teaching opportunities with a variety of classes, activities and teaching styles; and provided also opportunities for training by other members of school staff (Southern University, 2005a and 2006a). In addition, the role and responsibilities of mentors included the assessment of trainees. Thus, to fulfil the
In cases where a trainee did not make progress, did not take advice, or behaved in a professionally unacceptable way, mentors were expected to implement ‘a cause for concern’ procedure (Southern University, 2005a, p.23) after consultation with the trainee and professional tutor. This was intended to guide trainees towards good teaching and to be supportive of their progress. In the case of a dispute between mentors and trainees, professional tutors arbitrated and, when necessary, asked for advice from university link and subject tutors. In addition, mentors were expected to attend subject mentor conferences so that they remained up-to-date and well informed of procedures and expected practice. Reflection on the procedures in place raised questions — firstly, whether the limited time allocated to mentors was adequate to meet the regulations and to provide deep learning experiences for trainees; and secondly, concerning the extent to which mentors relied upon the subject tutor to make difficult decisions such as placing trainees on ‘a cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations of the mentor’s one hour of allocated time weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Southern University, 2005a and 2006a, p.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Induction of the student into departmental procedures, resources and syllabuses;
- Approval of the student’s teaching plans;
- Training the student to meet the standards;
- Devising (in consultation with the student) an individual training and development programme [ITDP] based on the professional needs of the student taken from their PDP;
- Oversee the assessment and recording of pupils’ progress undertaken by the student;
- Give oral and written feedback to the student including regular appraisal and goal-setting (the student may write up the feedback and submit it to the mentor for signing);
- Assessment of the student (together with the professional tutor and university subject tutor) and drafting of reports;
- Exercise the key role of quality assurance in the school;
- Complete all required forms throughout the placement.
By 2005 the Southern University set out also the role of trainees in the PiE Agreement Handbook (2005a). The expectations of trainees are summarised in Table 6.

Students are expected to:
- Work as required with the mentor, the professional tutor and other staff in the school;
- Welcome and act upon guidance and advice from members of staff;
- Arrive in the school with an up-to-date professional development profile and devise an ITDP with their mentor;
- Write their ITDP after consultation with the mentor at the beginning of the placement;
- Show initiative in offering to assist with all manner of professional activities;
- In conjunction with the mentor, plan and evaluate all lessons, and prepare for weekly meetings;
- keep the teaching file and record of mentorship up-to-date;
- Be proactive in addressing needs and concerns with the mentor.

Table 6 Expectations of trainees while on school placement
(Southern University, 2005a and 2006a)

With generic university expectations now in place across partner schools, all mentors were expected to follow the procedures set out in the PiE Agreement and Handbook. However, in reality, from my experience, how mentors went about their duties and accomplished expected outcomes varied from school to school.

1.7 What radical policy changes meant for teacher preparation and professionalism: My perspective

Changes in the nature of teacher preparation in the late 1970s gathered momentum throughout the 1980s and 1990s and the series of policy changes exaggerated the swing from one end of the theory / practice continuum to the other (Wilkin, 1996). Subsequently, teacher education shifted from a strong personal education (in the four disciplines) towards the achievement of classroom competencies and a more practical-based training. Significant changes in outlook and attitude were required to make these extreme shifts. HEIs, schools and teachers had to adapt quickly to
fulfil Government requirements and demonstrate compliance. For me, the exaggerated shift from theory to practice clashed with my educational values and, as I began to observe how it impacted upon the practice in schools, I became uncomfortable with the changes.

The government’s national framework of accountability, rooted in its demand for control of the structure and content of teacher preparation, facilitated achievement of its purpose to change the nature of teacher preparation. Under the threat of relentless Ofsted inspections linked to funding outcomes, providers focused on management of the partnership, implemented procedures and quality assured practice to ensure government requirements were met. These three ‘overlapping programmes’ (Power, 1997, p.66) allowed providers to audit students’ progress towards achievement of the standards, which ‘contributed to compliance’ (Power, 1997, p.68). The Ofsted inspection, or what might be referred to as ‘the external audit or second order control’ (Power, 1997, p. 82) inspected the internal audits of the university, schools and trainees, which can be referred to as the ‘internal audit or the first order of control’ (Power, 1997, p.82). For example, trainees, HEIs and schools audited trainees’ progress through the PDP, Individual Training and Development Profile [ITDP] and Career Entry and Development Profile [CEDP], checked the audits against the evidence provided and completed the required paperwork. Ofsted inspections sampled the audits, evidence and performance of personnel during inspections. In my experience, this process demanded considerable time. On reflection, although I liked the idea of planning and monitoring the learning journey and could see how it would be useful, it produced masses of paperwork and demanded, in my view, a great deal of time for deep reflection. From personal experience, despite efforts in the university to explain the functions and potential benefits of the audit trail, trainees and mentors did not see the value and were reluctant to dedicate enough time to engage fully

5 PDP: Section 1.3, Table 3; Section 1.6, Table 5.
6 ITDP: Section 1.6, Table 5 and Table 6.
7 The CEP (Section 1.3, Table 3) was replaced by the CEDP. On completion of teacher training, trainees had to complete this audit to take to their first job.
with the process. Depth of reflection on progress and personalised learning to make the process meaningful was therefore missing.

The system was also questionable because of what I considered to be the potential ‘dysfunctional side-effects’ (Power, 1997, p.13) that might occur as a result of accountability through audit trails and inspection. My experience over time affirmed that the university, schools, mentors and trainees developed strategies to cope with auditing and inspection to allow them to show compliance with required procedures and performance outcomes ‘while retaining as much autonomy as possible’ (Power, 1997, p.13). The monitoring and inspection of audits demanded the selection of samples of work. However, these did not necessarily show the most accurate picture, judgements lacked consistency (Furlong, et al., 2000) and there was the possibility of incorrect diagnosis (Power, 1997). It was difficult, firstly, to get accurate and appropriate information about performance ‘without drowning in paper’ and, secondly, to develop an effective feedback system that provided the information required without interfering with the actual work in schools and the university (Kettl, 1993, p.29). The system was expensive (time and money), intrusive and relentless; and such formal controls potentially undermined trust (Sitkin and Stickel, 1996; Power, 1997). Again it is questionable how such an unwieldy time-consuming system enforced on university tutors, mentors and trainees, without the necessary resources of time and money, could cultivate a truly progressive and reflective learning experience for trainees.

Government policies since the 1980s heralded a ‘new generation of teachers with different forms of knowledge, different skills and different professional values (Furlong et al., 2000, p.6). Professionalism, it seems, was reduced to ‘exogenously generated rule following’ and ‘a form of performance’ (Ball, 2005, p.5). This threatened the extinction of the ‘authentic professional’ who ‘valued reflection and the ever present possibility of indecision … and dialogue’ (Ball,
through the technologies of ‘performativity’\textsuperscript{8} and ‘managerialism’\textsuperscript{9} (Ball, 2005, p.5). Teacher training institutions, schools and teachers’ practice now focused upon the response to government demands, as they did whatever it took to satisfy performance requirements, excel, or survive. Good practice for mentors, trainees and teachers meant meeting performance audit criteria (Ball, 2005). The most dominant discourse was of a professional defined by ‘depthlessness, flexibility transparency and represented within spectacle – within performances’ (Ball, 2005, p.12). As for most trainee teachers, reflection became ‘… a pragmatic strategy for thinking through and sharing the practical experience’ in school, and ‘critical education’ was unfulfilled (Furlong et al., 2000, p. 140). For me, ‘authenticity and performativity’ clashed and grated (Ball, 2005 p.10) and the reforms effectively de-professionalised teaching (Furlong et al., 2000). The more subordinate, ‘under-stated and under-valued’ discourse was of the authentic professional, like myself, who ‘… learns from but is not fundamentally re-made by re-form’ (Ball, 2005, p.12). This professional demonstrates ‘… moral purpose, emotional investment and political awareness, adeptness and acuity’ (Hargreaves, 1994, p.6). Authenticity is about ‘teaching having an emotional heart’ (Woods, 1996, p.26) and a ‘sense of desire’ (Hargreaves, 1994, p.12), which gives teaching meaning that is founded on ‘… personal commitment’ and ‘motivation’ (Hargreaves, 1994, p.12). Authentic teachers consider what they are told to do, engage in reflection, dialogue and debate; they act within ‘… a set of situated dilemmas and messy confusions’ and learn from the consequences (Ball, 2005, p.12). In my view, for teachers, mentors and trainees to maintain such a position in the reformed climate was both difficult and uncomfortable.

\textsuperscript{8} Performativity: ‘… is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgments, comparisons and displays as a means of control, attrition and change’ (Ball, 2005, p.6). Performance of individuals ‘serves as measures of productivity …’ (Ball, 2005, p.6).

\textsuperscript{9} Managerialism: ‘… seeks to introduce new orientations, remodels existing power relations and affects how and where policy choices are made’ (Clarke, Cochrane and McLaughlin, 1994, p.4). Management works to instil performativity in the worker’s soul (Ball, 2005, p.6).
Reforms impacted significantly on individuals and relationships within the teaching profession and within teacher training. I related well to the concept of ‘values schizophrenia’ (Ball, 2005, p.9) described as the struggle with the sacrifice of experience and commitment for the creation of an impression and performance. In other words, the ‘… “splitting” between the teacher’s [or mentor’s] own judgements about “good practice” and student’s [or trainee’s] needs on the one hand and the rigours of performance on the other’ (Ball, 2005, p.9). The ‘emotional and social’ connections between the teacher and pupil and the mentor and trainee, ‘necessary for a more learner-centred approach’ (McNess, Broadfoot and Osborn, 2003, p.246), appeared to have a limited place in this performance-centred culture (McNess, Broadfoot and Osborn, 2003; Ball, 2005) in which productivity was more highly valued than people (Ball, 2005).

As a consequence of the changes, the teaching profession had come to reflect an environment of ‘low trust, tight control and a centrally and even ideologically defined environment for teaching’ (Richards, Harding and Webb, 1997, p.30). Indeed, government’s vision suggested the teacher was ‘… almost wholly silenced and passive’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.157) and similarly those in the universities ‘felt under siege’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.16). It must be noted also that many in the teaching profession were ‘deeply hostile to the massively increased central control’ (Furlong et al., 2000, p.157). In the past the profession had taken a position against the uneven weighting of education and practical elements in teacher preparation. Once again, they felt this extreme shift to the other end of the continuum exceeded ‘cultural boundaries beyond which the uneven weighting of the two elements relative to each other is not acceptable’ (Wilkin, 1996, p.184). Subsequently, practitioners with their own ‘histories’, ‘experiences’, ‘values’ and ‘purposes’, within specific institutional contexts, interpreted and responded to policy text in different ways (Bowe, Ball with Gold, 1992, p.22). This potentially created a gap between what was intended by the policies, what was implemented and what was practiced in institutions (Furlong et al., 2000).
HEIs such as Southern University were held accountable by government for the effective working of the partnership, but had no power to demand change of practice in schools (Homer, 2001). Hence, any changes required delicate negotiation between the University and schools, which did not guarantee success (Homer, 2001). There was still no obligation on schools to be partners in training: they could opt out at any point in time and schools were not held accountable to government for their role in training. While Southern University received funds for trainee teachers and was required to pay schools for their part in the partnership, available funding was limited and time given to mentors for their mentoring role was very restricted.

This review of the literature so far reaffirms for me that there were many unanswered questions about mentoring in ITT. Over the decades due consideration and priority of action had not been given to the complexity of the mentor / trainee relationship and the implications of this on practice. For the purpose of teacher training, I was convinced there was a need to explore how mentors and trainees interpreted and implemented procedures and how they formed and maintained mentor / trainee relationships.

With a more informed understanding of the complexities of the context within which the mentor / trainee relationship sat, it was important that I next explored the concept and definitions of mentoring, so that I might better appreciate how it was applied in ITT. Chapter 2 now explores the nature of mentoring.
CHAPTER TWO
The nature of mentoring

2.0 Introduction

As the Government started to centralise ITT and introduced school-based training, the term “mentor” was used to refer to the role played by senior and experienced teachers. Although DES Circular 3/84 suggested that mentoring included functions such as training, supervision, support and the assessment of students, the role and relationship were not defined clearly. This chapter reflects on the nature of mentoring, its origins and the plethora of definitions applied to the term across various contexts and more specifically in ITT. It highlights also the ambiguous concept that ITT adopted without careful consideration of its meaning, and identifies some of the challenges this has raised.

2.1 The origins of mentoring

The roots of the term “mentor” have been traced back to Homer’s poem, the Odyssey, in which Mentor was charged with the responsibility of raising Telemachus and facilitating his development into a wise ruler (Little, 1990; Kerry and Mayes, 1995; Anderson and Shannon, 1995). In many modern accounts Mentor is portrayed as a father figure, role model, approachable counsellor, and trusted advisor who challenges and encourages Telemachus (Caldwell and Carter, 1993) within a personal, mutually respectful and asymmetrical relationship (Little, 1990). These accounts emphasise that this relationship demands the ‘integrity’, ‘personal investment’ and ‘deep mutual affection’ characteristics associated with ‘the classical model of the mentor’ (Colley, 2003, p.39).

Alternatively, Riley’s (1994) translation of Fenlon’s (1699) account of Les Aventures de Telemach, highlighted the moral and political education of Telemachus by Athene. Athene was associated with Minerva, the female goddess of wisdom, a mother figure (Caldwell and Carter, 1993), who appeared in the disguise of Mentor to give Telemachus ‘advice, encouragement and spiritual
insight’ (Smith and Alred, 1994, p.103) within a caring relationship. Ford (1999) associates Athene’s mentoring role with ‘high standards of professional practice’ (p.9) and ‘in-depth care’ (p.10).

Over time the concept of classical mentoring evolved and became associated with an informal ‘… quasi-parental relationship between exceptional individuals, such as Socrates and Plato’, (Colley, 2000, p.8) and characterised by a powerful emotional bond between an older and younger person (Merriam, 1983). The classical mentor helped ‘… to shape the growth and development of the protégé’ (Merriam, 1983, p.162).

Whilst Clutterbuck (1991, p.1) acknowledges that the term mentor came originally from Greek methodology, most experts ‘… agree that modern mentoring had its origins in the concept of apprenticeships’. For example, Clutterbuck (1991) traced the earliest form back to medieval times when promotion started with apprenticeship. In this role the novice learned skills from a wise master who acted as a mentor and passed on knowledge of how tasks were done and how the commercial world functioned. Once the apprentice acquired the skills, he in turn acted as a substitute for the master craftsman. Often, ‘intimate personal relationships’ developed between ‘… the master (or mentor) and the apprentice (or learner) …’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.1).

2.2 Mentoring concepts and definitions: 1960s – 1990s

A variety of concepts and definitions of mentoring emerged between the 1970s and 1980s. In the 1970s, mentoring in the business world in the USA focused initially on induction and continuing professional development (Nejedlo, 1987) and made use of networks and resources within firms (Clutterbuck, 1991). This preceded the development of mentoring first in Europe and then in the UK (Clutterbuck, 1991) as business focused on the development of human resources (Eng, 1986; Anderson and Shannon, 1995). Table 7 shows how authors during the late 1970s and 1980s defined mentoring and the mentor’s role. Most definitions bore some resemblance to the modern portrayal of Homer’s Mentor / Telemachus relationship. They all focused on the process of facilitating the development of
potential (Nejedlo, 1987) within a relationship and fell into one of two categories, those that emphasised professional development and others that emphasised both professional and personal development (Carruthers, 1993). The holistic mentor attended to personal growth and professional (career) development. Therefore, she was expected to encourage and nurture, to improve performance, to develop technical skills, to facilitate learning through a problem-solving process in a stimulating environment and to create an open and trusting relationship that enabled the mentee to confide in her (Clutterbuck, 1991; Segerman-Peck, 1991). Varied degrees of emphasis were placed on the mentor as a role model for the mentee. Whilst some authors identified role modelling as the most important part of the process (Carruthers, 1993), others cautioned against giving too much importance to this role. They argued that a mentee’s perception of a problem and its solution was more important than being a clone of the mentor, the most likely case with mentoring in the form of apprenticeships (Stammers, 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Mentoring definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levinson (1978)</td>
<td>Older and experienced person who facilitated realisation of a dream like a parental or love relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapiro, Haseltine and Rowe (1978)</td>
<td>Mentor as a teacher and advocate within an intense paternalistic relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runions and Smyth (1985)</td>
<td>A ‘learning partnership between 2 or more individuals who wish to share or develop a mutual interest’ (p.14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleman (1986)</td>
<td>Provision of information, challenging tasks, assists with career development, builds trust, develops and protects the personal relationship and friendship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7  Definitions of mentoring and mentor roles**

By the mid-1980s and early 1990s the workforce had to be flexible and imaginative with a range of skills and qualities to remain abreast of the competition. Subsequently, there was a need for mentors / coaches to identify talents, aims and expectations and to facilitate development (Clutterbuck, 1991;
Caldwell and Carter, 1993). A significant growth of mentoring programmes maintained a competitive edge in the workplace, which was evidenced by the shift from the supervisor, who directed, controlled and oversaw employees, to the coach who educated individuals and provided a link with managers (Caldwell and Carter, 1993). A distinction was drawn here between the classical image of a wise mentor and a coach. Whilst the first was associated with ‘antiquity, wisdom and learning…’ (Caldwell and Carter, 1993, p.3), the latter was linked with competition, ‘mastery of practical skills’ (Caldwell and Carter, 1993, p.3) and the development of an individual from the ‘competence and confidence acquisition stage to their application on the job’ (Carter, 1993, p.152).

Organisations in the USA and Europe (including the UK) recognised the benefits of mentoring and set up formalised structures to ensure it took place. This was in contrast to the informal classical concept of mentoring, where individuals chose each other and generated their own goals as they developed mentoring relationships (Morton-Cooper and Palmer, 2000; Roberts, 2000; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Whilst the formal mentoring system was supported, as it ensured organisational goals were met when resources were invested appropriately, it had limitations (Clutterbuck, 1991; Cole, 1991; Kram and Bragar, 1991). For example, the imposition of a relationship on participants could cause ‘discontent, anger, resentment and suspicion’ (Clutterbuck, 1991, p.11). Also, difficulties could arise if the match between novice (mentee) and expert (mentor) was incompatible (Dagenais, 1991).

In the 1990s the concept of mentoring still remained elusive because of its complexity and the number of tasks included in the role (Ardery, 1990; Dagenais, 1990; Little, 1990; Carruthers, 1993; Stammers, 1992; Kerry and Mayes, 1995). Mentoring was not understood clearly (Morton-Cooper and Palmer, 1993) as each organisation that used the term defined it differently (Beels and Powell, 1994) and most definitions in the literature were vague and unhelpful (Anderson and Shannon 1995). Despite difficulties created by the lack of clarity of the concept of mentoring and the nature of its application, Dagenais (1990, p.63) claims it is the best way of educating and ‘… inducting novices into a trade or profession’. He
identifies four categories of learning relationships, which exist along a human developmental continuum (see Figure 1). These extend from a narrow behaviourist approach (training) to a more holistic approach (mentoring). As the approach moves towards mentoring the required level of trust increases. A decade later Clutterbuck (2001) also makes distinctions between teaching, tutoring, coaching and mentoring and emphasises that as the relationship approaches mentoring it becomes increasingly closer, facilitative and encouraging.
MENTORING
Trust and respect are essential

The mentoring experience includes a career function (coach, sponsor, protector), psychological function (role model, counsellor, friend) and a project function (give appropriate challenge and accountability).

COACHING
Interest in the person and their well being as well as their assimilation and understanding of information.
Depth of trust is essential.

TUTORING
Trust and respect, the learning process and its outcomes become important.
Passing on knowledge.

TRAINING
Acquisition of technical skills.
Trust and respect not essential.

Figure 1 My representation of the human developmental continuum (Dagenais, 1991)
2.3 Further clarification sought 2000 – 2006

Whilst mentoring appeared to be about helping individuals to learn and develop in different contexts (Roberts, 2000; Parsloe and Wray, 2000; Clutterbuck, 2001; Brockbank and McGill, 2006), this resembled concepts of teaching, tutoring, coaching and many other functions. There was still no consensus on terminology, and terms were often used synonymously (Parsloe and Wray, 2000). Hence, at the start of the 21st century there remained a need for greater clarity (Roberts, 2000).

Although Parsloe and Wray (2000, p.82) offer distinctions between mentoring in different contexts, like many others these are based primarily on mentoring functions. For example, classifications include the ‘corporate mentor’ as one who guides, advises and counsels an individual during her career; the ‘qualification mentor’ who guides an individual towards achieving a professional qualification; and the ‘community mentor’ who is a friend, advisor, or counsellor to a disadvantaged or distressed individual (Parsloe and Wray, 2000, p.80). Whilst I felt sure the ITT mentor would be classed as a ‘qualifications mentor’, such general categorisations did not help me to address the complexity of the mentoring process or the nature of the relationship in ITT.

Based on a comprehensive review of the literature over the decades Roberts (2000, p.162) defines mentoring as:

A formalised process whereby a more knowledgeable and experienced person actuates a supportive role of overseeing and encouraging reflection and learning within a less experienced and knowledgeable person, so as to facilitate that person’s career and personal development.

This definition, for me, embraces the holistic ideal, and with it I felt able to consider in greater depth component processes that might be involved in the mentoring process. Roberts (2000, p.150) identifies eight ‘essential attributes’ of mentoring that include:
a process form, an active relationship, a helping process, a teaching-learning process, a reflective process, a career and personal development process, a formalised process and a role constructed by or for a mentor. (Roberts, 2000, p.151)

He claims other ‘contingent attributes’ such as ‘role-modelling’, ‘sponsoring’ and ‘coaching’ (Roberts, 2000, p.158) are not essential.

In comparison, Clutterbuck (2001) distinguishes between the European style of developmental mentoring and the USA style of sponsorship mentoring. The first involves combinations of coaching, networking, guiding and counselling; the second is orientated more towards guiding and sponsoring. Clutterbuck (2001, p.19), on examination of five ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19) (coaching, guiding, counselling, networking and mentoring), concludes that mentoring has the flexibility to shift from one to another depending upon the needs of the mentee at any one time. He claims ‘the effective mentor may use the challenging behaviours of stretch coaching at one point and the empathetic listening of counselling a short while later’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.21). Overall, this classification of ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19) is based on the extent to which the mentor’s behaviour was directive (the mentor in charge) or non-directive (the mentee sets the agenda and develops self-reliance), or challenging or nurturing. I found Clutterbuck’s (2001) model to be a useful tool for identifying the fluidity of the process and the nature of mentors’ and mentees’ behaviours in varying contexts. Although, like many before him, he focuses on the mentoring functions, Clutterbuck’s behavioural matrix\(^8\) gave me a framework for examining the styles that mentors use to accommodate the needs of trainees.

As I sought further clarification of the minefield of concepts and definitions, I agreed strongly that practitioners must ‘examine their philosophy and make it known’ (Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.9). To avoid further ‘… the swamp of … semantic discussion’ (Colley, 2003, p.31) it was attractive to consider that the name of the ‘helping to learn’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19) activity (e.g. mentoring)

\(^8\) See Clutterbuck’s (2003) behavioural matrix in Section 3.6, Figure 6
was irrelevant and ‘a matter of choice’ (Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.275). It seemed more important that the purpose, the process and the learning outcomes were identified together with clarity about the basis of the learning activity (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Subsequently, consideration was given to Brockbank and McGill’s (2006) four categories of mentoring that include functionalist, engagement\textsuperscript{11}, evolutionary and revolutionary approaches. I considered the possibility of using these categories as a framework for examining the nature of all ‘helping to learn’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19) activities (teaching, coaching, mentoring etc). This seemed a useful way of examining the nature of mentoring within a context. Table 8 shows the characteristics of the four categories.

Each of Brockbank and McGill’s (2006) categories is determined by:

a. its purpose, which is either prescribed by an external agency or agreed between the mentor and the mentee;

b. the process, defined either by directive transmission of knowledge and advice given within a hierarchical structure, or by a person-centred, nurturing and humanistic process;

c. the learning outcome, which ranges from the improvement of performance through ascending levels of transformation of the mentee; and

d. the psychosocial aspect, which ranges from developing rapport to increasing levels of trust and emotional bonding.

Models of mentoring with prescribed, directed behaviour focus upon improvement of performance within a relationship, extend to building rapport and are primarily functionalist with the status quo preserved. The more the process becomes person-centred with agreed goals that lead to transformation of the individual’s life and a strong emotional bond between mentor and mentee, the more the model becomes either engagement or evolutionary mentoring (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Although revolutionary mentoring was not a

\textsuperscript{11} Engagement mentoring is a term used by Colley (2003)
category I examined for the purpose of this research, it was included, as it extends the range of mentoring approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Learning outcome</th>
<th>Psychosocial aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Agreed activity but prescribed.</td>
<td>Nurturing and humanistic process.</td>
<td>Improvement to enable individual to overcome resistance to change transformation.</td>
<td>Presence of the psychosocial aspect. Quality of the inter-personal bond important. Degree of trust needs to be high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evolutionary</strong></td>
<td>Agreed activity between mentor and “client” (^{12}) with goals generated for the client.</td>
<td>Person-centred.</td>
<td>Transformation into a satisfactory life structure that contains the dream.</td>
<td>Emotional bond important for personal and professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revolutionary</strong></td>
<td>To transform the structure of society and peoples’ beliefs. Liberation from false consciousness.</td>
<td>Through rational argument and persuasion.</td>
<td>Radical transformation.</td>
<td>Subjective world of the individual not important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8**  The characteristics of functionalist, engagement, evolutionary and revolutionary mentoring categories (Brockbank and McGill, 2006)

\(^{12}\) “Client” represents the individual (learner, mentee, trainee) who is working with the practitioner (teacher, tutor, mentor).
So far the discussion has given an overview of the prolific number of ways that mentoring has been viewed over the years and the confusion that still remains. At an early stage in my journey through the literature, I recognised how modern portrayals of Greek myths painted the picture of mentors as ‘inspirational characters’ with ‘extraordinary qualities’ (Colley, 2003, p.39) in close developmental relationships with mentees. Conversely, Colley (2003, p.41) argues that in actuality ‘Mentor’, in Homer’s Odyssey, was an old man, who had been incapable of maintaining order and advising Telemachus. In fact, he was ‘a public laughing stock – a far cry from the wise and nurturing advisor …’. She highlights, also, that whilst the Goddess Athene, in the form of Mentor, assumed the mentoring of Telemachus and carried out functions associated with mentoring (advising, role modelling), there is ‘no sense of any emotional bond or nurture between them’ (Colley, 2003, p.41). Based on Colley’s (2003) argument, I recognised that when mentoring was portrayed by many as ‘The Real Thing … a close personal relationship’ (Colley, 2003, p.42) which produces successful outcomes and benefits institutions and individuals, it was attractive, seduced the public and served the government’s agenda (Colley, 2003). I realised that, whilst the appealing rhetoric that portrayed mentoring as a close and transformational relationship was closely aligned with my values, this was in stark contrast to the reality of mentor / trainee relationships in ITT that I observed during subject tutor visits.

I explored the literature further, struggling through what Haggerty (1986) referred to as a ‘definitional quagmire’ (Roberts, 2000, p.149). The numerous ‘illusive’ definitions (Roberts, 2000, p.148) led me to believe that mentoring was ‘… a ubiquitous and chameleon-like approach which is everywhere in name but nowhere in substance’ (Piper and Piper, 1999, p.129). Whilst many define mentoring in terms of functions (training, tutoring, coaching etc.), this was not helpful because as mentoring shifted context so its functions varied and proliferated (Colley, 2003). Consequently, I speculated that what set mentoring apart from other functions such as training, tutoring and coaching was the ‘…combination of developmental functions …’ (Colley, 2003, p.32) within ‘… an ongoing caring relationship’ (Anderson and Shannon, 1995, p.29). Dagenais
(1991) and Clutterbuck (2001) allude to this when they claim the greater trust and closer relationship necessary for mentoring sets it apart from training and tutoring. Ultimately, I suggest that the result is a ‘blur’ (Colley, 2003, p.31) and that ‘tantalising’ and ‘vexing’ questions remain, such as ‘What does mentoring mean’?, and ‘How can we define it’? (Colley, 2003, p.30).

2.4 Contrasting perspectives of mentoring in ITT

The lack of success in the USA of ‘adopting a model [of mentoring] without examining its applicability’ (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995, p.18) did not act as a warning to those in the UK who were responsible for the illusive concept of mentoring adopted in ITT in the 1990s. Consequently, without careful consideration of its true nature there was the danger that organisations could abuse both the term mentor and the nature of the phenomenon or process (Maunder and Dixon, 1992). Indeed, ITT needed to ‘… find its own route into and its own preferred model of mentoring’ (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995, p.119).

In teacher training the concept of mentoring was ‘substantially more narrow’ as it focused on the school setting, curriculum information, organisation, resources and technical support (Little, 1990, p.298) within a limited time period. With rapid changes in ITT in 1992 and 1993 through DES 9/92 and 14/93, together with the speedy implementation of school-based teacher training, HEIs and schools had to come to terms quickly with mentoring (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995). Just as the senior teacher’s role shifted from supervisor to mentor, so too mentors were expected to take on a much broader role in which supervision and tutoring played a part (Kirkham, 1992; Maunder and Dixon, 1992). One senior teacher describes the difference in his claim that mentoring implies ‘… involvement with the learning process of the student …’ while supervision means ‘… merely keeping an eye on the student’ (Hurst and Wilkin, 1992, p.53). Unless teachers assumed this larger role as teacher educators (Field, 1994d) there was a possibility of reverting to apprenticeships as advocated by the New Right (Hillgate Group, 1989). Despite the changes in role, terms such as training, mentoring, and supervision were still used interchangeably.
The ‘style’ versus ‘substance’ (Wilkin, 1992c, p.1) debate was prominent during the early 1990s. Whilst style referred to how the mentor and mentee conducted the relationship and the mentor’s behaviour towards the trainee (Wilkin, 1992c), substance referred to what the mentor communicated to the trainee to ensure that she learned (Wilkin, 1992c). Wilkin (1992c) argues that teacher trainers should only be concerned with ‘substance’ (p.1), i.e. with what the trainee has to learn, and she maintains that the ‘style’ (p.1) of mentoring is not important as long as the learning relationship is productive. Although Wilkin (1992c) sees no need to focus on the personal behaviour of the mentor, she concedes that style might become worthy of consideration as trainees became more experienced. Similarly, Kirkham focuses primarily on the professional aspects of mentoring in ITT and, in particular, the mentor ‘linking theory and practice in the classroom’ (Kirkham, 1992, p.66). These points of view suggested to me that in ITT the interpersonal or psychosocial aspect was less important than the developmental aspect of mentoring.

In contrast, a more holistic perspective of mentoring in ITT was also present. This claimed that mentoring could ‘… create the essential conditions in which the imagination of individuals is stimulated, their flexibility enhanced and their unlimited potential unleashed’ (Maunder and Dixon, 1992, p.3). Ultimately, for those who shared the holistic ideal, mentoring in ITT had:

> little to do with filling in forms, attending meetings, filling in profiles. It has everything to do with an active engagement between mentor, articulated teacher, college and school community… developing together, to think, to feel, to learn, to grow. It is ultimately to do with the human spirit and how we cherish that within ourselves and within others. (Corbett and Wright, 1994, p.233)

This holistic model of mentoring addresses both the professional and personal development of the trainee and mentor in a mutually respectful and trusting environment. It advocates that there is ‘… a kind of wisdom … needed for being a mentor’, which includes not only knowledge of her craft skills but also knowledge of self (Smith and Alred, 1994, p.104). From the holistic perspective, mentors who educate trainees need to understand the learner, listen to her needs and
understand how the perceptions, attitudes and beliefs brought to the course are formed (Smith and Alred, 1994). Hence, this mentoring process is:

concerned with easing transitions and enabling change and growth … a process of active, creative engagement in education and not just finding evidence to support externally imposed standards of professional conduct. (Fletcher, 2000, p.xii).

Overall, the vision of a mentor is someone who is self-aware and a learner who welcomes others as fellow learners as she shows the trainee how to be and how to do aspects of the professional role (Smith and Alred, 1994). Based upon the argument for a holistic model of mentoring in ITT, it is advocated that mentees will benefit if they have a separate mentor, supervisor and assessor (Smith and Alred, 1994).

In addition to the existence of either an apprenticeship or holistic model of mentoring, Maynard and Furlong (1995) suggest that mentoring in ITT is a dynamic relationship that requires a combination of teaching and learning approaches and behaviours, with different models of mentoring applied at various stages in trainees’ development. For example, the apprenticeship model, akin to what the Hillgate Group (1989) proposed, is used as trainees learn to ‘read’ what goes on in a classroom. Then, as trainees progress, the mentoring approach shifts to a competency-based model in which mentors act as coaches who observe and give feedback on specific teaching competencies, facilitate trainees’ ability to take greater control and encourage them to experiment. However, Maynard and Furlong (1995) warn that once trainees develop the necessary teaching competencies there is a tendency to hit a plateau beyond which they do not progress unless mentors engage in a reflective model of mentoring. At this stage, mentors become co-enquirers who challenge trainees to think critically about pupils’ learning and their own practice. Indeed, Maynard and Furlong (1995, p.21) claim:

Thinking critically about teaching and learning demands open-mindedness and involves confronting beliefs and values. This is difficult and challenging work but we believe it is an essential element in what a true mentor must be.
Maynard and Furlong (1995) argue that the reflective model of mentoring can only be successful if the mentor/mentee relationship is more equal and open. It appeared to me that Maynard and Furlong (1995) advocate that the dynamic nature of mentoring in ITT would progress along Dagenais’s (1991) human developmental continuum with more of a training focus that required low level trust at the beginning, to mentoring that required deeper levels of trust and a more open relationship later. However, for Maynard and Furlong (1995) every stage is referred to as mentoring.

In spite of the growth of mentoring in ITT over the last fifteen years it was only in 2004 that Government gave strong support to mentoring and coaching programmes. In 2004 the DfES commissioned the CUREE ‘to devise a framework for mentoring and coaching that would offer simple guidelines [and] share best practice’ (GTC, 2005, p.1). Just like others before them, as indicated in Chapter One, CUREE (2005a, p.6) found current language ‘confused and overlapping’. Whilst CUREE, 2005b) had no intention of producing a fixed model of mentoring and coaching, it devised a framework that included ‘principles’ (p.1), ‘core concepts’ (p.2) and ‘skills’ (p.3) that overlapped ‘mentoring’, ‘specialist coaching’ and ‘co-coaching’ (p.4). In this framework, ‘principles’ (p.1) identify what mentoring and coaching involve; ‘core concepts’ (p.2) indicate the purpose of the activity (why?), those involved (e.g. mentor or coach), the behaviours required by coach/mentor, where the activity takes place and when in an individual’s career it occurs.

While the CUREE (2005b, p.4) framework identifies an overlap between ‘mentoring’, ‘specialist coaching’ and ‘co-coaching’, it also recognises key differences. Firstly, mentoring focuses on ‘… supporting professional learners through career transitions’ (CUREE, 2005b, p.4) as it provided opportunities for development and assessment, and appraisal or accreditation of practice. Secondly, specialist coaching focuses on ‘enabling the development of a specific aspect of a professional learner’s practice’ (CUREE, 2005b, p.4). Thirdly, co-coaching emphasises the reciprocal learning of colleagues ‘as they embed new knowledge and skills from specialist sources in day-to-day practice’ (CUREE, 2005b, p.4).
Although CUREE (2005b) claims that the framework addresses ITT, in my view this did not improve clarity. Much work is still required to identify more specifically how the framework can be applied appropriately to mentoring in ITT, which may require elements of ‘mentoring’, ‘specialist coaching’ and ‘co-coaching’ (CUREE, 2005b, p.4).

2.5 Taking stock of the situation in ITT

The confusion I felt at this point created anxiety and provoked anger at the adoption and implementation of a term without consideration of what it meant for those involved in ITT. It was difficult to see the wood from the trees as the blurred concept of mentoring that existed elsewhere was also present in PE ITT. Often mentoring was referred to as “training” and “coaching”, with terms used interchangeably and with only limited attention given to the nature of the relationship between mentor and trainee. Government policy, and consequently Southern University’s regulations, promoted teacher preparation as training with assessment as an essential part of the mentor’s role. This suggested to me a narrowly conceived concept of mentoring (Little, 1990) which was associated closely with the acquisition of skills and an apprenticeship model (Hillgate Group, 1989).

It was questionable whether the informal personal relationship so integral to the classical mentoring model could be transferred to this ‘externally imposed and assessment driven’ system (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995, p.13) and short-lived mentor / trainee relationships. Indeed, assessment did not fit comfortably in a role that was generally associated with a supportive, close and open relationship (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995). It was clear to me that the imposed system of mentoring in ITT enabled neither the mentee to select his or her own mentor, nor facilitated the development of a helping relationship and/or a close bond between mentor and trainee (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995). Within the centralised audit-driven society (Power, 1997), where good practice meant meeting performance outcomes

13 Mentor / trainee relationships ranged from 7 – 15 weeks in the case of Southern University courses.
(Ball, 2005), contrasting mentoring models existed (the more narrowly conceived technicist model and the holistic model). Holistic mentoring, which appealed to my educational values, advocated the education of trainees (Field, 1994d; Fletcher, 2000), enhanced their personal as well as professional development within closer and more open relationship (Maunder and Dixon, 1992; Smith and Alred, 1994; Corbett and Wright, 1994) and facilitated greater depth of reflection (Maynard and Furlong, 1995). Yet, in a system that valued performance outcomes more highly than the people involved, I sensed difficulties for those mentors who perceived an expectation to nurture and to care for trainees while also being expected to assess and maintain high standards of professional practice. Colley (2001, 2003) draws from Hochschild’s (1983) work to highlight that expectations of caring combined with maintaining ‘… professional distance and control’ (Colley, 2001, p.11) can demand emotional costs such as the suppression of feelings, ‘stress and burn-out’ and ‘low self-esteem’; also mentors can succumb to ‘self-blame’ and ‘guilt’ (Colley, 2003, p.154). Yet, emotional costs had gone “…entirely unaddressed in accounts of mentoring” (Colley, 2003, p.155) and had not been examined in ITT.

To add to the challenges presented by the major changes in ITT over the decades were the difficulties of the adaptation of mentoring to the existing school structure and environment. Section 2.6 addresses these issues.

2.6 The school environment conducive for mentoring

Little (1990) points out that the legacy of mentoring does not lend itself to teacher training. She argues that teachers, as mentors, experience difficulty when they give up their control in the classroom. Hill, Jennings and Madgwick (1992), Shaw (1992) and Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) were among the first to emphasise that it is essential to have a whole-school approach to mentoring. For example, Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) argue that schools depend on a collaborative culture that consists of:
… pervasive qualities, attitudes and behaviours, which run through staff relationships on a moment-by-moment and day-by-day basis. Help, support, trust and openness are at the heart of these relationships (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1992, p.65).

Likewise, Tickle (1994, p.191) reflects on the value of the relationship between the mentor and the novice teacher in learning to teach, and draws on Cole's (1991) concept of ‘multiple buddies’ in a caring community of learners where knowledge and ignorance are shared. Tickle (1994) speculates that teachers gain from the relationship between mentor and trainee and suggests that dialogue between them can be ‘an exercise of social learning by placing experience, ideas and issues in the public domain’ (p.203). Yet he warns that reflection and learning are limited when teachers seek to understand, cope with, control and manipulate events. Indeed, Tickle (1994) and Corbett and Wright (1994) agree that educational dialogue is limited when teachers (as mentors) want to remain in control. Moreover, Tickle (1994) suggests that the type of dialogue that facilitates a more community-based perspective on learning can be perceived as threatening by the teaching community.

Just as the school environment impacts on the nature of mentoring, so too the school ethos plays an important role in successful mentoring. In schools that embrace the concept of a learning community, all staff identify failure and weaknesses and work towards improvement within a safe environment (Smith, 1993; Frost, 1994). Smith and Alred (1994, p.115) argue that the school that does this ‘… personifies wisdom, the other merely impersonates it’. They claim that:

… unless we can be open about our failures … such courage and confidence will not be found in the world of schools. (Smith and Alred, 1994, p.115)

Senge (1990) believes the concept of a whole school approach to learning and development is essential. This is reflected in his ‘learning organisation’

… where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together. (Senge, 1990, p.3)
Similarly, Frost (1994) also argues that this type of collaborative and supportive school culture is required for mentors to be critically reflective.

The concept of the learning community embraced Senge’s (1990) principles of the learning organisation. This represented collaborative practice within a community of learners (town, home school) where those involved were interested and committed to a cause and keen to develop (Retallick, Cocklin and Coombe, 1999; Bolam, McMahon, Stoll, Thomas and Wallace, with Greenwood, Hawkey, Ingram, Atkinson, and Smith, 2005). Such an environment placed an importance on process over product, enquiry and reflection (Cordingley, 2003).

It appears to me that a school which embraces the learning community ideal is most conducive for mentors and trainees in ITT, regardless of the model of mentoring adopted. Such an environment is essential if the holistic model of mentoring is adopted so as to enable mentors and trainees to work collaboratively, engage in reflection, learn from mistakes and develop open relationships. However, the expectation that the mentor and others will also assess trainees upsets the balance of power in relationships. Regardless of the collaborative and supportive nature of a learning community, the threat of assessment creates for trainees a ‘constant threat of failure’, impacts on the quality of relationships and the learning process and potentially limits development (Jones, 2006, p.73).

2.7 Summary

As Colley (2003, p.1) and others before her indicate, there is ‘… no clarity and consensus’ about the meaning of mentoring. The purpose, process, learning outcomes and psychosocial aspects as identified by Brockbank and McGill (2006) vary from one context to another and are neither carefully considered nor clearly identified prior to the implementation of mentoring schemes. Consequently, as Colley (2003, p.1) argues, there is ‘… no sound theoretical base to underpin policy or practice’.

Definitions of mentoring by authors in ITT differ in the extent to which mentoring focuses on the personal development of the trainee and the nature of the mentor / trainee relationship. For Wilkin (1992c), the Hillgate Group (1989) and others
who believe the outcome is solely related to professional development, an emotional bond between mentor and trainee does not appear to be important. Yet others such as Hill, Jennings and Madgwick (1992), Maunder and Dixon (1992), Smith and Alred (1994), Corbett and Wright (1994) and Fletcher (2000) advocate a more holistic model of mentoring which focuses on the importance of personal as well as professional development within a caring relationship, despite the hierarchical and assessment-driven context.

The Government’s CPD development plans encourage the growth of schools as learning communities and embrace the whole-school approach to learning through mentoring and coaching. The concept of collaborative, committed, communities of learners personifies what authors claim to be an ideal environment for mentoring (Senge, 1990; Retallick et al., 1999; Cordingley, 2003; Bolam et al., 2005; Jones, 2006). However, even if these communities are realised, the ‘double-edge sword’ created by the assessment role of mentors in ITT seems to counteract many of the advantages of the learning community ideal (Jones, 2006, p 73).

2.8 The next step in my journey

By now I understood how contrasting conceptualisations between the technical-behaviourist and the holistic models of mentoring added to the complexities and discrepancies I encountered throughout my experience as a university tutor, subject tutor and link tutor. My drive to develop a more informed understanding of the model of mentoring applied within the Southern University partnership and the nature of the relationship between mentors and trainees was further strengthened. Maynard and Furlong’s (1995) work suggested that I needed to explore further the nature of mentoring and the relationships between mentors and trainees that facilitated trainees’ development. Clutterbuck’s (2001) behavioural matrix provided me with a framework for evaluating the behaviour of mentors and trainees, and Brockbank and McGill’s (2006) classifications allowed me to look beyond the term ‘mentoring’ and examine more clearly the nature of ITT mentoring. Colley (2003) reminded me to be constantly mindful of the impact of the wider context within which the mentor / trainee relationships sat and the less attractive sides of mentoring.
To explore further the concept of mentoring in ITT, Chapter Three examines what the literature tells us about trainees’ development as they learn how to teach, the processes involved and the nature of relationships between mentors and mentees / trainees / clients.
CHAPTER THREE
Mentoring: Learning, reflective and helping processes within a dynamic relationship

3.0 Introduction
In this chapter I explore the literature on the nature of trainees’ development as they learn to teach, the processes that mentors and trainees might be expected to engage in within a short-lived, dynamic one-to-one adult learning relationship and the nature of mentoring relationships. I consider these in the light of the externally imposed, assessment-driven context (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995) and the lack of a clearly articulated concept of ITT mentoring as identified in Chapter Two. Whilst I address the processes that facilitate developmental and interpersonal components of the relationship separately, it is important to acknowledge that they are interwoven and occur simultaneously to cater for the constantly changing needs of trainees and the dynamics of the situation.

3.1 Learning to teach
This section gives a flavour of ‘learning to teach’ and highlights some of the learning challenges that face trainees and ways in which mentors can facilitate trainees’ development and growth. Tomlinson (1995) claims that teaching is a demanding and complex open skill, as a lot happens at once and much is often unpredictable. He argues that expert teachers deal with situations in their stride as they draw from their vast repertoire of strategies. Hence, much of what they do appears fluent, smooth, intuitive and unproblematic to the novice trainee, who views teaching from a pupil’s passive perspective. Indeed, without assistance, trainees are unable to recognise either what teachers do in the classroom or the reasons that underpin their actions.

14 Open Skill: many variables impacting upon performance simultaneously e.g. playing a game of hockey.
A marked contrast is evident between the superficial level of thought of novice trainees, who access only temporary solutions for immediate problems, and the thinking and reasoning of expert teachers at the deeper level of core concepts (Bransford, Brown and Cocking, 2000). It is only as trainees learn to look more deeply that they are able to recognise and understand the concepts that drive the decisions teachers make (Leask, 2001a). Hence, trainees need to be encouraged to question old perceptions as they experiment with new materials, teaching methods and organisational strategies; discuss their requirements; reflect on and evaluate their practice; and form new opinions (Elliott and Calderhead, 1994). It is important also that mentors, as expert teachers, articulate their own practice so that trainees can understand what happens, why it happens and how it impacts on pupils’ learning. Consequently, in order to respond to trainees’ needs the mentors’ pedagogic content knowledge needs to be well organised and easily retrievable (Tomlinson, 1995).

Tomlinson (1995) highlights how trainees’ ability to teach can only be developed over time, through a gradual process of building pedagogical knowledge and experience together with the skill of metacognition. Engagement with this process enables trainees to step back as they question the reasoning behind the changes that occur in their approach, knowledge, beliefs and skills (Elliott and Calderhead, 1994; Tomlinson, 1995). Only then are they able to construct their own professional knowledge, subject knowledge and professional judgement for effective teaching (Leask, 2001a).

Additionally, it is crucial that mentors address the psychological aspects of learning to teach that could be both bewildering and painful (Maynard and Furlong, 1995). Therefore, it is important that mentors believe in the ability of trainees as they nurture their growth, consider their personalities, offer appropriate opportunities and provide good role models (Anderson and Shannon, 1995). Moreover, if the holistic model of mentoring is adopted, it is only as mentors engage with trainees’ values and attitudes that they facilitate personal development alongside professional development (Elliott and Calderhead, 1994).
To be able to understand better the needs of trainees, I examined further the developmental process from novice trainee to a NQT.

### 3.2 Trainee development from novice to qualified teacher

I acknowledged the multi-dimensional, complex, ‘idiosyncratic and personal’ (Elliott and Calderhead, 1994, p.173) nature of trainees’ development from novice to NQT and accepted that absolute stages\(^{15}\) could not accurately represent trainees’ development, as they arrive in a school with different profiles and progress at different rates (Elliott and Calderhead, 1994; Fletcher, 2000). Stages of progression ‘are not discrete and development is not linear’ (Field, 1997, p.27), as trainees can be at one stage in one aspect of work whilst simultaneously in another at a more or less advanced stage. Additionally, it is not unusual for trainees to regress between placements (Fletcher, 2000). I found the notion of Fletcher’s (2000) broad stages\(^{16}\) of development very useful. Firstly, I maintained that identification of these stages acted as a guide for mentors as they worked with trainees (Fletcher, 2000). Secondly, I believed they provided me with a guide for the examination of the process of trainees’ development as they learned to teach.

The literature indicated a continuum of development along which a trainee progressed and/or regressed that depended upon their task focus at the time. Table 9 shows the broad developmental stages proposed by Fuller and Brown (1975), Maynard and Furlong (1995), Tomlinson (1995) and Leask (2001b). I argue that, while these models use different terminology, they identify the same continuum of development from the novice teacher with limited experience and idealistic perceptions, to the more experienced teacher who is able to read classroom situations, reflect on practice, solve problems and cater for pupils’ individual learning needs.

\[\text{Table 9}\]

---

15 Absolute stages: discrete, set stages which trainees progress through in a linear way.

16 Broad stages: discernable and variable patterns which trainees display during development from novice to NQT. Trainees can be at more than one broad stage at once depending on the range of work they are doing.
Authors of the stage models agree that students enter training with idealistic perceptions (Fuller and Brown, 1975; Maynard and Furlong, 1995; Tomlinson, 1995; Leask, 2001b). At this early stage, trainees have a vision of the type of teacher they want to be and have less sympathetic feelings towards the teachers they observe, based on their perceptions of teaching from a pupil perspective (Fuller and Brown, 1975). Trainees feel their way and do not see with understanding what actually happens within a classroom. Tomlinson (1995, p.19) highlights how at this ‘cognitive phase’ trainees have a simplistic view of teaching, are anxious about survival, and expect to be given simple procedures that ‘get it right’. Leask (2001b, p.22) adds that as trainees move from ‘the passive role of pupil to the active, managing and authoritative role of a teacher’ they focus on their self-image, lesson content and class management rather than on pupils’ learning.

My understanding of Maynard and Furlong’s (1995) three stages of survival, dealing with difficulty and hitting a plateau, affirmed these are synonymous with Tomlinson’s (1995) associative phase and Leask’s (2001b) whole-class learning stage. During this period, through their teaching experiences, trainees develop pedagogic and subject knowledge and discover strategies and skills that work. It is only as trainees develop that they are able to address and change their perspective and self-image (Fuller and Brown, 1975; Maynard and Furlong, 1995; Leask, 2001b). Trainees grow simultaneously in self-belief and confidence and become more effective as they handle the classroom and establish good working relationships with pupils (Leask, 2001b). However, Leask (2001b) warns, this takes time, effort and reflection. Once trainees’ confidence increases, they focus on planning relevant lessons with appropriate learning objectives and outcomes for the whole class; write detailed lesson evaluations for assessment of learning; and monitor learning against the outcomes and objectives to inform future planning (Leask, 2001b).
During this slow developmental process (Leask, 2001b) trainees at times achieve a level of satisfaction, want to remain within their comfort zone and hit a plateau, which they need to be challenged to go beyond (Maynard and Furlong, 1995).

As trainees move on and demonstrate increased levels of reflection, greater efficiency and success and a more consistent concern for individual pupils’ learning through differentiation, they reach the mastery stage (Fuller and Brown, 1975), the moving on stage (Maynard and Furlong, 1995), the autonomous stage (Tomlinson, 1995), and Leask’s (2001b) third stage, characterised by a focus on pupils’ individual learning.

Through personal experience and my observation of practice in schools, I had insights into the complexities of learning to teach. I recognised trainees’ often bewildering and painfully slow process as they acknowledge what does and does not work, understand why, decide what to do next and develop the confidence to change things. It was clear to me that mentors have to engage with trainees’
values and perceptions, guide reflection, and nurture and challenge in appropriate measures. This builds trainees’ confidence, facilitates depth of understanding, helps them cope with difficult experiences, shifts attitudes and changes practice. I witnessed trainees demonstrating characteristics of more than one of the broad stages at a time, and observed how they regress from time to time when they focus on something new, have a bad lesson experience, or return after a break between placements. I recognised that in this early survival stage, trainees can benefit from mentors who encourage them both to confront their perceptions and to reflect on their values. Such mentors can support and nurture trainees when their idealistic views are challenged and their confidence is threatened. It is through the guidance and support of mentors that trainees progress and focus on how they manage class control and establish themselves as teachers (Maynard and Furlong, 1995). I suggest it is only when trainees are challenged continuously to reflect critically on their own practice and the practice of others and are given the opportunities to draw on the professional knowledge and judgement of mentors and other experienced teachers that their competence and confidence increases. This enables them to push through a plateau (Maynard and Furlong, 1995) and facilitates progress towards providing for pupils’ individual learning needs (Leask, 2001b).

From my perspective, it was the holistic approach to mentoring within an active, respectful and trusting interpersonal relationship that addressed trainees’ professional and personal development and best suited the complex range of trainees’ learning needs (Maunder and Dixon, 1992; Smith and Alred, 1994; Field, 1994d; Corbett and Wright, 1994; Fletcher, 2000). The behaviourist training approach based upon the acquisitions of skills and competencies, and driven by assessment, seemed inadequate: yet, it was possibly most appropriate for fulfilling government policy requirements in an audit (Power, 1997) and performance outcome (Ball, 2005) driven society.

From my interpretation of the literature and experience in ITT, it seemed clear that the learning, reflective and helping processes were an integral part of mentoring. Nevertheless my experience also indicated that the degree to which
mentors and trainees engaged with these processes varied considerably from relationship to relationship. In Sections 3.3 to 3.5, I examine in turn the nature of the learning, reflective and helping processes in order to provide greater understanding. This later facilitated the evaluation of the extent to which mentors and trainees in the relationships under study engaged with these processes.

3.3 The learning process

I related the process of learning to teach to the learning cycles of Kolb (1984), Honey and Mumford (1992) and Argyris and Schon (1996) and the teaching cycle proposed by Tomlinson (1995). Tomlinson (1995, p.17) claims that trainees’ learning takes place through a teaching cycle that he identified as ‘plan – teach – reflect’ (Figure 2). This was similar to the experiential learning cycles (plan – experience – reflect – make sense of the experience – plan) put forward by Kolb (1984) and Honey and Mumford (1992). For Tomlinson (1995), anyone who intends to teach has first to know what she must do and this necessitates prior planning. He maintains that it is at this point that trainees enter the cycle of learning. This is followed by a teaching experience and self-feedback in which trainees identify if what happened had been intended or not. Trainees then monitor the outcome of the teaching, consider feedback about the intended goals, reflect on the experience and use this to help them plan more effectively for the next lesson. It is important for trainees to ‘… achieve the above functions within the teaching cycle if they are going to increase their teaching capabilities’ (Tomlinson 1995, p.19). Through engagement in this process, trainees take risks in the teaching scenario, try new things and solve problems as they occur. However, this places demands on their feelings, motivations and values and requires them to have ‘the courage to try again’ (Tomlinson, 1995, p.19). It is vital, therefore, that mentors motivate trainees in order ‘to harness their personal strengths through appropriate interpersonal strategies and awareness’ (Tomlinson, 1995, p.20).
I likened the experiential learning cycle of Kolb’s (1984) and Tomlinson’s (1995) teaching cycle to the single loop learning process (Argyris and Schon, 1996) ‘for improvement, meeting goals and altering practice on the basis of experience’ (Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.33). This process, which led to an increase in competence and confidence, was a function of what Brockbank and McGill (2006) referred to as functionalist mentoring or coaching (Section 2.3). This identified for me the level at which, during subject visits, I observed mentors and trainees in ITT engaged with the learning process.

In Figure 3, I show the processes of planning, action and reflection embedded within the learning cycles (Kolb, 1984; Honey and Mumford, 1992) and the teaching cycle (Tomlinson, 1995) as a developing spiral (Field, 1997). As the cycles of learning are continuous, reflection and learning are again and again followed by experimentation and further experience. Each learning cycle builds on the one before and enables trainees to refine their teaching and progress their learning as they move within and between the stages of development, from early idealism and survival (Fuller and Brown, 1975; Maynard and Furlong, 1995) with a focus on self-image (Leask, 2001b), to mastery (Fuller and Brown, 1975) with a focus on pupils’ individual learning (Leask, 2001b).
### Figure 3


**Key:**
- P: planning; TE: teaching episode; R: reflection; MS: making sense of the teaching episode;
- P: planning and moving on
On reflection I acknowledged also that in my absence (as a subject tutor) deeper reflection on learning, facilitated by reflective dialogue between mentor and trainee, may have occurred. If so, this could have challenged trainees to think ‘outside the box’ and question the ‘taken-for-granted’ (Brockbank and McGill, 2006 p. 34). It was only through this process that they could create new ways of seeing and doing things and swing into the double loop learning process (Argyris and Schon, 1996) rather than simply refining existing patterns (Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.34). For Brockbank and McGill (2006) it is only when the learner swings out of the single loop process into the double loop process that new understandings emerge and transformation occurs. However, trainees need courage to face completely new experiences, which require an investment of energy fuelled by emotion (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). I postulate that confident and knowledgeable trainees might achieve this swing to double loop learning if they work with empathetic and reflective mentors who have the time and skill to engage in effective reflective dialogue. Figure 4 shows a representation of the single and double loop learning processes.

Figure 4   Double Loop Learning (adapted by Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.35, from Hawkins, 1997)
3.4 Reflection defined

Many authors have confirmed that reflection is an integral part of the learning process (Habermas, 1971; Dewey, 1933; Schon, 1983; Kolb, 1984; Moon, 1999). As a specialised form of thinking (Dewey, 1933), it plays a role in the way in which individuals process ideas and experiences and structure these into knowledge (Habermas, 1971). Habermas (1971) refers to three types of knowledge: instrumental knowledge, i.e. knowing how or that; knowledge associated with interpreting actions and behaviour; and knowledge gained from the first two forms in order to transform situations and make judgements. He argues that while instrumental knowledge is not directly related to the reflective process, the second and third categories are closely linked. For Dewey (1933), reflection allows individuals to ponder on some aspect or issue as they give serious thought to supporting knowledge. He claims that reflective practice involves doubt at first, followed by a search for a resolution of the doubt. Schön (1983) goes further and identifies two types of reflection. While reflection-on-action takes place after an event, reflection-in-action occurs as the professional performs. He argues that whilst professionals build expertise from their practice as they reflect and use tacit knowledge, they have to make their practice explicit so that further reflection takes place.

Boud, Keogh and Walker (1985) and Moon (1999) argue that emotion is a significant yet often neglected part of reflection. For example, in the act of reflecting, an individual’s associated feelings, thoughts and ideas come into play. Consequently, thoughts, theories, knowledge, experience and feelings are all inputs into the reflective process (Moon, 1999). I suggest this emotional engagement could fuel the energy that Brockbank and McGill (2006) maintain is required to swing into the double loop process and trigger transformation (Section 3.3).

3.4.1 Reflection in practice

Schön (1983) links teachers as reflective practitioners with successful teaching. He perceives such teachers as reflecting critically on how they present and deliver their material, the teaching and learning environment and relevant theories. In my
experience, it is necessary that mentors are reflective practitioners who reflect in and on action and make their practice explicit to trainees. Such mentors work to facilitate trainees’ reflection on action, encourage trainees to articulate their practice and extend their learning (Field, 1994b, d). Subsequently, as trainees develop knowledge and experience through practice and reflection, they become more able to reflect in action. This improves their ability to read classroom situations, apply strategies for effective classroom management and focus on pupils’ individual learning needs. Simultaneously, mentors need also to understand how trainees feel and actively listen to them (Field, 1994b, d).

I applied Moon’s (1999) work to trainees’ experiences in schools. She equates reflection with deep learning as learners (in this case trainees) make meaning of ideas, situations and processes; transfer meaning to other situations; create and integrate ideas; use new learning to transform the old and upgrade learning at a future date. Moon (1999) notes that reflection slows down the process as learners mull over and re-process ideas, feel ownership of the learning because they are active in the process, consider their own learning behaviour and think about their own thinking (metacognition) as well as complex and unstructured information. I realise from my lecturing and subject tutor experience that engagement in this process challenges trainees and enhances their ability to deal with difficult material. While I acknowledge that trainees have difficulty reflecting in depth, it is important that mentors challenge them to do so as they review their abilities and approaches (Hatton and Smith, 1995).

Clutterbuck (1998) associates two types of reflection with mentoring, and it was clear to me how these could be applied directly to trainees and mentors in ITT. As trainees reflect on their practice in their own time, they engage in ‘personal reflective space’ [PRS], or ‘intra-personal dialogue’ (Clutterbuck, 1998, p.15). This is focused quality time used to sort thoughts and ideas, which leads to greater understanding (Clutterbuck, 1998). In addition, trainees also engage in ‘dyadic reflective space [DRS]’ or ‘interpersonal dialogue’ with their mentor (Clutterbuck, 1998, p.16). This adds an outsider’s perspective and allows mentors,
where necessary, to challenge trainees’ perspectives and question their practice and views.

I suggest that Clutterbuck’s (1998) intra-personal reflection (PRS) assists trainees’ learning through Kolb’s (1984) cyclical learning process and Argyris and Schon’s (1996) single loop learning process. However, PRS is not enough to cause a swing into double loop learning, which results in transformation, as it only represents the trainees’ own perspective (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). On the other hand, interpersonal dialogue (DRS), with a mentor, offers possibilities for challenge, depth of reflection and double loop learning (Argyris and Schon, 1996). DRS increases opportunities for trainees to go beyond learning for improvement of performance, to achieve new understanding and transformation (Brockbank and McGill, 2006).

3.5 The helping process

If, as the literature suggests, trainees need to be challenged repeatedly to question their values, perceptions and practice during a ‘bewildering’ and ‘painful’ process of learning to teach (Maynard and Furlong, 1995, p.10), then it seems important that mentors engage in a helping process. Professionals such as counsellors, psychologists and social workers formally ‘…help people manage distressing problems in life’ (Egan, 1998, p.4). While ITT mentors are not charged with helping in this formal sense, ‘help functions’ (Roberts, 2000, p.149) such as guiding, caring, nurturing and advising are considered to underpin mentoring (Caruso, 1990; Roberts, 2000). Through such functions, mentors address with trainees psychological and emotional aspects of learning to teach (Maynard and Furlong, 1995). Subsequently, trainees cope better with difficulties, make enhanced use of learning opportunities, become empowered, reduce anxiety and build confidence and self-esteem (Caruso, 1990; Roberts, 2000). Tomlinson (1995) maintains that helping is an interpersonal aspect of mentoring, which facilitates the realisation of trainees’ goals and assists them to take action rather than mentors taking action for them.
I found Egan’s work (1990, 1998) relevant to ITT as it provides an example of ‘a practical and reflective approach’ (Tomlinson (1995, p.61). Egan (1998) identifies teachers as informal helpers who facilitate the management of problem situations such as those experienced in crisis, distress, performance and interpersonal relationships. This I felt was true also of mentors in ITT. From my understanding, the helping process is a two-way procedure that speeds up the natural decision-making process (Egan, 1998) for trainees, and once trainees understand this process they can apply it for themselves (Egan, 1998). Figure 5 shows Egan’s (1998) four stages of helping. Whilst Egan (1998) argues that helping is a social-influence process that empowers individuals, he warns that individuals who require help have to take action for themselves otherwise nothing will happen. For example, trainees have to take action for themselves to resolve problem situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making it happen</th>
<th>Individual must commit to action at every stage in the process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action strategies</td>
<td>Identify how best to achieve the goals which suit the individual’s talents, temperament and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred scenario</td>
<td>Select appropriate goals to achieve the required situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commit to the goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current scenario</td>
<td>Reflection on what has happened and / or what is happening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select the correct problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5    My representation of Egan’s (1998, p.25) helping model
There are essential boundaries between the helping functions of mentoring and those of counselling and therapy, which have to be maintained (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Mentoring is not counselling and is not intended to be therapy, even though mentors use counselling skills. Mentors, whose intended purpose is facilitation of improvement of performance only, are unlikely to struggle with these boundaries as the relationship does not involve much emotional commitment (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). However, if the intended learning outcome of mentoring is transformation of the mentee / trainee and emotional input is required to fuel the swing into double loop learning (Brockbank and McGill, 2006), then the emotional bond between mentor and mentee / trainee becomes more important. Consequently, mentors are more likely to encounter tricky emotional situations and possibly risk crossing boundaries. The literature makes it clear that whilst mentors need to be aware of how mentees / trainees feel, and have to deal with what they express in an empathetic way, they should not go beyond this (Clutterbuck, 1998; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Hence, it is important mentors know their limitations, recognise professional boundaries and, as and when appropriate, refer mentees / trainees on to suitable professionals.

Frankland and Sanders (1995) provide a framework for counselling and helping activities that sheds light on what Tomlinson (1995) identifies as a distinction between the helping functions of ITT mentoring and counselling. They acknowledge differences between types of counselling and helping activities and note three levels based on the nature of support provided. Table 10 gives a visual image of this.
| PERSONAL SUPPORT | LEVEL 3: therapeutic counselling | British Association for Counselling [BAC] counsellor, not involved in another occupational role |
|------------------|--------------------------------||--------------------------------------------------|
| LEVEL 2:         | problem solving counselling    ||
| PRACTICAL SUPPORT| LEVEL 1: developmental support  | Helper is within another profession using counselling skills |

Table 10  The Overlap of Helping Activities
Adapted from Frankland and Sander’s (1995) model of the overlapping wave of helping activity

Whilst practical support mainly involves level 1 and the problem-solving focus of level 2, personal support predominately involves level 3 and the problem-solving focus of level 2 at a deep personal level. Although professional counsellors operate predominately at levels 2 and 3 as they provide deeper levels of personal support, helpers in occupational roles such as teachers and mentors mainly use counselling skills to provide practical support. Yet even though they operate primarily at levels 1 and 2 an overlap occurs between practical and personal support. For example, essentially practical problems still have personal dimensions and vice versa (Frankland and Sanders, 1995). Thus, mentors in ITT deal with the anxiety and distress of mentees (personal) and also facilitate the improvement of lesson plans after a poor lesson (practical). Clutterbuck (2001, p.19) makes a distinction between counselling as a ‘helping to learn’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19) style for mentors and uses the term ‘in the context of support and learning as opposed to therapy’. As such it is a non-directive and nurturing activity that helps an individual to cope. Thus, in the role of counsellor, mentors act as ‘a sounding board, helping to structure and analyse decisions and sometimes simply by being there to listen’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19).
On reflection, regardless of the mentoring model adopted in ITT, it seems important for mentors to understand the complex developmental process of learning to teach and the nature of the processes involved, to be able to facilitate effectively trainees’ development. In light of the discrepancies between the narrowly conceived behaviourist and the more holistic models of mentoring which could have existed, I was unclear of the extent to which trainees’ learning remained within the single loop process for improvement or swung into the double loop process and achieved some transformation. Additionally, whilst the helping process appeared to me to be an essential component of mentoring, the extent to which mentors engaged in this process depended upon, firstly, whether mentors saw it as part of their role and, secondly, whether they had knowledge and experience of the helping process.

As Roberts (2000, p.151) indicates, these processes take place within ‘an active relationship’. Indeed, Parsloe and Wray (2000, p.165) warn that the outcome of the mentoring process depends ‘… on the quality of the relationship between the people involved’. In Section 3.6, I draw from literature across contexts to supplement the very limited literature in education which focused on the nature of the mentoring relationship. This provides some useful insights which inform understanding of the mentor / trainee relationship in ITT.

3.6 The ITT mentor / trainee relationship

The mentor / trainee relationship in ITT was difficult to define with any certainty or conviction. It was this uncertainty, the lack of clarity, combined with the dearth of research in this context that focused on the intricacies of these relationships, which fuelled my motivation for this research. This drove me to examine mentor / mentee relationships in other contexts so that they might inform my understanding.

Mentor / trainee relationships are short-lived, happen in the workplace and there are strict professional guidelines for behaviour. It seemed possible, therefore, to categorise ITT mentor / trainee relationships as ‘professional relationships’ (Argyle and Henderson, 1985, p.267) which:
… can, and do, vary greatly in the degree of intimacy and in the length and intensity of the relationship, in the sort of feelings each participant has about the other, and in the balance of power. (Argyle and Henderson, 1985, p.267)

Maximum learning appears to occur when the quality of the relationships between mentors and trainees is ‘good’ (Maunder and Dixon, 1992; Hill, Jennings and Madgwick, 1992; Elliott and Calderhead, 1994; Tomlinson, 1995; Hawkey, 1997). Whilst Wilkin (1992c) maintains the principal focus has to be on the professional element of training, the literature made it clear to me that personal aspects also impact on the effectiveness and success of one-to-one professional relationships. Barnett draws on Ashburn, Mann and Purdue’s (1987) work and succinctly classifies ITT mentoring as the ‘establishment of a personal relationship for the purpose of professional instruction and guidance’ (Barnett, 1995, p.45). Sections 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 indicate that, throughout the learning, reflective and helping processes, mentors and mentees need to engage in the personal aspects of their relationships as they interact with each other’s personality, values and attitudes (Hill, Jennings and Madgwick, 1992; Barnett, 1995; Hall and Kinchington, 1995; Tomlinson, 1995; Brooks, 1996).

Clutterbuck’s model of European developmental mentoring (Section 2.3) and his behavioural matrix shed greater light on the behaviour of mentors as they facilitate mentees’ learning and development. Figure 6 shows the behavioural matrix and the range of mentoring behaviours related to the ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19).
Figure 6 Clutterbuck’s (2003) Behavioural Matrix

Key: Roles: Extending along an active/directive —

passive/non-directive continuum
As identified in Section 2.3, two key dimensions drive developmental mentoring relationships (Clutterbuck, 2001). First, the directive and the non-directive are related to who is in charge and who drives the relationship. For example, if the mentor drives the relationship it is directive in nature, whereas if the mentee is in charge, the relationship becomes non-directive. Second, the stretching / challenging and nurturing dimension refers to the needs of the mentee. For example, if the mentee’s needs are primarily about learning then the relationship is more challenging in nature. Conversely, when the relationship is more about support and encouragement it becomes more nurturing. Clutterbuck (2001) maintains that an effective mentoring relationship requires a mixture of task-focused functions in which the mentor moves anywhere along the continua depending on the needs of the mentee at a particular time. Based on experience, I could visualise how mentors in ITT might move along the continua from moment to moment throughout the placement as they dealt with the spectrum of learning needs and the progression and regression within and between broad stages identified in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

Garvey’s (1994b) study of mentor / mentee relationship dimensions in the National Health Service [NHS] Master of Business Administration [MBA] mentoring programme assisted with my understanding of the nature of PE ITT mentoring relationships. Table 11 identifies the continua of Garvey’s (1994b) relationship dimensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMAL</th>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>existence and management are formalised; individuals have no choice in the matching of pairs; rules of conduct are agreed.</td>
<td>managed on a casual basis; mentees select mentors and vice versa; there are few if any ground rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>others know it exists; issues are discussed with third parties.</td>
<td>no-one or very few people know it exists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>both participants take action as a result of discussions.</td>
<td>little or no action expected as a result of discussions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STABLE</th>
<th>UNSTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>understanding and feeling of commitment and regularity; consistency and trust are essential.</td>
<td>unpredictable, insecure; lacks commitment and trust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN</th>
<th>CLOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all topics can be discussed freely.</td>
<td>topics discussed are specified clearly, centre on work, with others off limits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11  Garvey’s (1994b) continua of relationship dimensions

Garvey (1994b) suggests that, just as individuals change over time, relationship dimensions also change and if a relationship does not work it ‘… can transform itself, provided there is the will on both sides’ (Garvey, 1994b, p.23). He highlights how trust and commitment are essential elements that affect the operation, conduct and survival of a relationship and suggests combinations of dimensions ‘… seem to offer more potential than others for a successful outcome’ (p.26).

Although Garvey (1994b) argues that a variety of combinations can be successful because of the uniqueness of individuals and pairings, his study shows that the ‘…open, public, formal, active, stable dimensions appear to offer the best combination for success’ (1994b, p.26). He suggests that, whilst a relationship can survive if one dimension is different from the norm, complications arise when
more than one differs. If applied to the ITT context, this model of the mentor / mentee relationship dimensions could extend knowledge and understanding of the uniqueness and complexity of the relationships. It is clear that ITT mentoring relationships are formal and public. For example, the relationship has to take place, mentors and trainees have no say in the matching of pairs (formal); and others know they exist (public). On the other hand, the extent to which ITT mentor / trainee relationships are active / passive, stable / unstable and open / closed is not fixed, could vary from one relationship to another and may change as relationships develop.

3.6.1 Stages and phases of the relationship

The notion of broad stages rather than absolute stages of development identified in Section 3.2 was useful here as a guide for the exploration of the dynamics of mentor / trainee relationships in ITT. My thoughts were informed additionally by the studies of Kram (1983) into the nature of the mentoring process in a Public Utility company; Amherst School of Education (1989) into mentor / student teacher relationships; Walker and Stott (1993) into the mentoring process for perspective school principles; and Clutterbuck’s (2001) observation of European developmental mentoring. Differences were apparent in individual contexts with considerable variation in the length of relationships; the purpose of the mentoring schemes; the participants (staff in firms, head teachers, student teachers); and the countries in which the studies were located. The following discussion examines the broad stages of relationship models identified by Kram (1983), Amherst School of Education (1989), Walker and Stott (1993) and Clutterbuck (2001) in relation to other literature on mentoring relationships.

Table 12 shows the progression made from stage to stage in each of the mentoring relationships models.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kram (1983)</td>
<td>12 months: Initiation:</td>
<td>36 months: Cultivation:</td>
<td>Indeterminate: Separation:</td>
<td>Beyond: Redefinition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business model</td>
<td>Suspicion evolves to trust and mutual respect.</td>
<td>Mentor: works to help mentee to advance and set personal and career goals.</td>
<td>Dissolves the relationship.</td>
<td>Redefines the relationship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutterbuck (2001)</td>
<td>6 months: Rapport building and direction setting. Getting to know each other. Direction setting.</td>
<td>24 months: Maturation:</td>
<td>30 months: Ending:</td>
<td>Beyond: Continuing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business model</td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress making.</td>
<td>Winding down, celebrating success, moving on.</td>
<td>Informally, infrequently as a sounding board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst School of Education (Vickers, 1989)</td>
<td>Formal stage: Pair thrown together, must make it work, quickly begin to build rapport and respect and plan for the placement.</td>
<td>Cordial stage: Respect and trust develop on personal and professional levels.</td>
<td>Friendship stage: Trainee has gained greater confidence and has less need for the mentor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Developmental stages in mentor / mentee relationships across contexts (Kram, 1983; Amherst School of Education, 1989; Walker and Stott, 1993; Clutterbuck, 2001)
Stage 1: getting the relationship started

All models identify how mentors and mentees begin the relationship in a formal way as they get to know each other, build rapport, set targets for development and plan how these will be achieved (Clutterbuck, 2001). Hence, mutual respect, goodwill and relevance of experience are important as participants begin their journey, learn to work together and accumulate positive experiences. Cranwell-Ward, Bossons and Gover (2004) note how rapport is built only through a level of informality in early meetings. This evolves as mentors and mentees self-disclose, establish a common and shared purpose with clear developmental goals and use a diagnostic tool such as the Myers–Briggs type indicator that enables them to share information about themselves. Garvey (1994b) suggests that the learning styles inventory is used by mentors and mentees as an icebreaker through which they get to know each other better.

While Walker and Stott (1993) note that mentees perform routine tasks and that discussion between mentors and mentees focuses on general matters related to the school, others claim that an important part of Stage 1 is planning direction for the period of mentoring (Kram, 1983; Amherst School of Education, 1989; Clutterbuck 2001). For Tomlinson (1981) the establishment of each other’s expectations and experience is one of the first functions for mentors and mentees. Barnett (1995) and Cranwell-Ward et al. (2004) are more explicit about the functions during this early stage of the relationship. They specify that the interaction between pairs includes an initial meeting in which both parties introduce themselves, make plans for the experience, set boundaries for the relationship and identify targets for the placement. Furthermore, they warn that such meetings need to be planned carefully, as they set both the tone for the relationship and establish the realistic expectations mentors and mentees have of each other. For example, mentors expect that mentees will show commitment, be responsible for their own learning, respect confidentiality, discuss issues openly and show respect for mentors’ time constraints. Likewise, mentees expect mentors to act as sounding boards as they provide learning opportunities, facilitate the development of greater insight, increase self-awareness and career advancement,
give new perspectives on the organisation and challenge and support them in their work. In this early stage, it is important that a mentee’s needs analysis takes place as this establishes her past experiences, informs target setting and indicates where mentors will start (Shaw, 1992; Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004). Similarly, it is crucial that mentees prepare thoroughly as, for example, with a SWOT analysis that identifies strengths and weaknesses, including those aspects they find threatening, and notes the opportunities required (Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004). Initial planning meetings are expected to be followed by regular meetings (Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004).

There is limited time available within a short teaching placement\textsuperscript{17} for building a mentor / trainee relationship. With little in the way of guidance from Southern University for building the interpersonal aspect of relationships, I imagined that the Amherst School of Education’s (1989) and Walker and Stott’s (1993) models described most appropriately the situation in ITT. For example, mentors and trainees are placed together, have to make it work, attempt to build rapport and maintain distanced respect. Whilst mentors and trainees might have started to build rapport and mutual respect at this stage, the level of trust that Kram (1983) and Clutterbuck (2001) intimate is developed by the end of Stage 1 might have developed only towards the end of the ITT relationship, if at all.

Southern University guidelines for mentors and trainees (Section 1.6, Tables 5 and 6) give similar guidance to what Shaw (1992) and Cranwell-Ward et al. (2004) suggest for planning the developmental aspect of the relationship at this early stage. For example, there is a need that:

i. Trainees arrive at the school with a PDP and devise with their mentor an ITDP at the beginning of the placement (based upon the trainees’ self assessment); show initiative and get involved in all professional activities and prepare for weekly meetings.

\textsuperscript{17} Teaching placements in ITT last anywhere from 7 – 15 weeks depending on the course.
ii. Mentors induct trainees into the school and department; discuss the trainee’s PDP and assist them with planning their ITDP at the start of the placement; and plan an appropriate time each week for a one-hour meeting with the trainee.

**Stage 2: Making progress**

The four relationship models identify that in Stage 2 respect and trust build simultaneously at professional and personal levels. Kram (1983) and Clutterbuck (2001) recognise that much deeper levels of trust develop in relationships established over six months, and reciprocal benefits for mentors and mentees increase as the latter rely more on their own judgement. During this stage of the relationship it is only when mentees feel safe and trust is developed that they experiment more and challenge mentors’ interactions (Clutterbuck, 2001; Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004). Yet, at times, even when mentors and mentees build rapport and persist in their relationships, pairs do not gel. When such setbacks occur it is still expected that mentors firstly guide mentees into finding the most appropriate solutions and strategies that fit their individual needs and secondly, agree actions that facilitate the development of mentees’ knowledge (Clutterbuck, 2001; Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004).

Unlike the longer, more established corporate relationships, the Amherst School of Education’s (1989) and Walker and Stott’s (1993) studies indicate that when mentors and mentees have been together for only a few weeks, rapport and trust is still being established.

**Stage 3: Mutual understanding, winding down and ending**

All models indicate that at Stage 3 friendship develops once mentees develop greater confidence and have less need for mentors. From my perspective, there was little doubt that Kram’s (1983) and Clutterbuck’s (2001) Stage 3 models differed from educational models. Significantly, relationships between mentors and mentees had lasted for two years or more and now wound down as mentees prepared to move on. For example, in Kram’s (1983) model mentees are anxious
to separate out from mentors as they experience a new sense of autonomy and independence. In Clutterbuck’s (2001) model, mentors and mentees prepare over a period of time for the end of the relationship. Even so, Clutterbuck claims, ‘in the relationships with the least time to run … the intensity of the relationship and the learning was higher than in those where the time frame was more relaxed’ (2001, p.109). In educational relationships, it is only when mentors develop enough confidence in and respect for mentees, as mentees gain in confidence and ability, that they grant additional freedom, greater sharing takes place, mutual understanding and trust develop further and discussions become frank and honest (Walker and Stott, 1993).

Walker and Stott argue that ‘if trust was not established or failed to move past a fairly superficial plane, task involvement remained routine and directed’ (Walker and Stott, 1993, p.83). They conclude that not all pairs progress at the same rate and the depth of challenge for learning only progresses once interpersonal relationships develop. Thus, whilst the more effective relationships move quickly through the stages, some take a whole placement to reach mutual trust and openness and others never reach this level.

My interpretation of the inter-relationship which Walker and Stott (1993) describe between the interpersonal dimension and the professional task dimension is shown in Figure 7. Once rapport and trust develop, relationships move from closed to open. At the same time, as mentees grow in confidence, become more skilled and are exposed to greater challenge, they are left alone and treated as equals. Relationships which develop in this way render greater reciprocal benefits to mentors and mentees.
Figure 7  The relationship between the interpersonal and developmental components of the mentor trainee relationship created from Walker and Stott’s (1993) model of the stages
Turner (1993) suggests that complications in relationships can be caused by differences in mentor and mentee personalities, issues that arise because of the different levels of interpersonal and psychological development, career and/or educational development and their levels of experience and expertise. I postulate that if difficulties such as these are unresolved, relationship development may be interrupted or stalled and relationships fail to become open with greater freedom for the mentee.

Stage 4: Ending or re-defining the relationship

Formal review and evaluation is considered to be an important part of the ending process (Clutterbuck, 2001) and, as such, the final part of a continuous process that has occurred throughout. Participants need to identify what has or has not been achieved (i.e. how knowledge and behaviour has changed), the future needs of mentees and what, if anything, is expected from any future relationships (Clutterbuck, 2001; Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004). Due consideration also needs to be given to the impact of the relationship on the achievement of learning outcomes as for example, the learning climate, the degree of trust and rapport and the frequency and effectiveness of mentor meetings (Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004).

I was able to draw similarities here with the ITT relationship. For example, mentors and trainees continuously review attainment and evaluate progress continuously throughout the placement; and, at the end, identify what has been achieved in relation to the standards (DfES, 2002) and set targets to be achieved either on the next placement, or in the trainees’ first posts as NQTs.

By Stage 4, as the longer corporate relationships of between two to five years (Kram, 1983; Clutterbuck, 2001) are coming to an end, participants decide either to terminate or redefine their relationships. For Walker and Stott (1993) the official end of relationships comes at Stage 4 when mentees and mentors have developed real friendships with a high degree of trust. With a relationship between equals there are greater reciprocal benefits and mentees are given freedom to complete tasks alone. Beyond this in Stage 5, mentors and mentees
maintain contact and friendship and seek advice about professional issues (Walker and Stott, 1993).

Having examined the processes involved in mentoring and components and developmental broad stages of the dynamic relationship, it was essential to consider next the tensions placed on the mentor / trainee relationship within the ITT context, which impact on mentors and trainees as they interact.

3.7 **Tensions impacting on the mentor / trainee relationship**

The following sections highlight tensions caused by the dynamics of the multiple interdependencies such as government agencies, university tutor(s), mentors and trainees and the assessment role of mentors. These tensions can be seen to impact on how mentors and trainees relate. Particular reference is made to the work of Gay and Stephenson (1998), Colley (2003) and Velija, Capel, Katene and Hayes (2008), to emphasise the complexities of the context within which mentors and trainees in PE ITT are expected to forge effective relationships.

Based upon my understanding of the literature, the distribution of power impacts on the style of mentoring (Gay and Stephenson, 1998) and potentially influences the dynamics of the interpersonal and developmental relationship. I infer that, with outcomes imposed externally by powerful institutions such as government, the university and schools, it seems likely that these institutions determine the goals of mentor / trainee relationships, rather than negotiation between mentors and trainees (Gay and Stephenson, 1998). Hence, relationships imposed by external agencies may potentially be ‘triadic’ (e.g. government, mentor and trainee) with the mentor ‘… a vehicle for external interests rather than a facilitator for the mentee’ (Colley, 2003, p.37). Consequently, it seems that these relationships are characterised by ‘hierarchy’ rather than ‘reciprocity’, ‘control’ rather than ‘empowerment’, ‘direction’ rather than ‘guidance’, ‘inequality’ rather than ‘equality’ and ‘dependency’ rather than ‘autonomy’ (Gay and Stephenson, 1998, p.53; Colley, 2003, p.36).

If the QTS standards (2002) are seen as ‘hard’ outcomes, which dominate mentoring in ITT and act as a ‘measure of success’ (Colley, 2003, p.163), this
potentially undermines the benefits of soft outcomes such as ‘increased confidence, better health, and higher aspirations’ (Colley, 2003, p.163). I balk at the likelihood of mentors focusing primarily on a very ‘directive mode of operation’ to achieve ‘hard’ outcomes rather than on trainee-centred development (Gay and Stephenson, 1998, p.50).

Colley (2003, p.164) draws on the work of Watts (2000) to indicate that ‘dyadic helping interventions, based on personal interactions and relationships should be seen as soft instruments of policy’, which work ‘… through individuals, rather than on them’ (Watts, 2000, p. 303). During this process, the learner is active and encouraged to determine her path and contribution on a ‘voluntaristic basis’ (Watts, 2000, p.303). This ‘person-centred, voluntaristic principle’ (Colley, 2003, p.164) in my view could facilitate trainees’ personal and professional development if the holistic model of mentoring is adopted in ITT. However, based on my interpretation of the literature and my experience, I sensed that the policy and procedures at the macro and meso levels in the ITT context reinforced a more prescriptive and autocratic approach which potentially made the person-centred holistic approach untenable; and relationships less empowering at best, and at worst disempowering for trainees (Gay and Stephenson, 1998; Colley, 2003). This being the case, it was therefore debateable that open learning relationships could be achieved. I argue that this directive style is unlikely to work in the best interest of individuals, as it can provoke resistance (Egan, 1994) and potentially hinder development and learning.

3.7.1 **Contrasting ideologies and power relations within the ITT meso and micro context**

Complex power relations exist within groups of people who interact together within an intricate network (Velija et al., 2008). Elias (1978) refers to such groups as figurations, within which one party tends to be more dependent than the other(s). When related to the ITT context, the university tutors, mentors and trainees who interact together represent a figuration within which university tutors and mentors have the knowledge and the power to pass or fail trainees. As this makes trainees dependent, they aim to please (Velija et al., 2008).
Velija et al. (2008) found that the differences that exist in PE ITT between the ideas of university tutors, mentors and trainees cause tensions for trainees while in school. Mentors and trainees value doing PE (practice) over thinking about PE (theory), a value they associate with university tutors. Based upon their perspective, mentors pay scant attention to the information sent by the university and see it as having little importance to the practice of teaching (Velija, et al., 2008). Subsequently, tensions arise for trainees when the advice from mentors and other school staff differs from that of the university. For example, trainees have to decide whether to persist with the demands of the university or follow the advice of their mentor and other staff. Invariably, trainees do what mentors and school staff require. As one PGCE trainee claims, they ‘jump through hoops’ to please staff (Velija et al., 2008, p.389) and consequently copy ‘… the status quo in teaching’ (Velija et al., 2008, p.404). Trainees do not feel empowered to challenge mentors’ practice (Maynard, 2000; Velija et al., 2008), as their main concern is to be accepted in the PE department and to pass the course.

On reflection, the differences in values could suggest one reason why, on so many occasions, mentors have paid scant attention to my subject tutor feedback, and why the mentoring practice did not change much (if at all) from one subject visit to the next. I infer that differences in values, along with the imbalance of power, potentially interrupt the progression of learning as trainees move from university-based work to school-based work. Consequently, trainees’ study and application of pedagogic theory (thinking) to practice (doing) is inhibited. Velija et al.’s (2008) findings additionally suggest that the development of a trusting and open relationship between mentors and trainees is unlikely.

3.7.2 Tensions created by assessment within the mentor’s role

Chapters One and Two established that assessment was an enforced function of the ITT mentor (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995; Jones, 2001) and this gave the mentor power over the trainee. For some, assessing and mentoring are closely related processes (Watson, 1995; Stephens, 1996). In contrast, many argue that the processes of mentoring and assessment are significantly different because the judgemental nature of assessment is in conflict with the supporting and caring
function of mentoring (Anforth, 1992; Walker and Stott, 1993; Smith and Alred, 1994; Wolf, 1995; Barnes and Stiasny, 1995; Diamandis, Herne and Throp, 1995; Claughton and Lloyd, 1995; Hall and Kinchington, 1995; Jones, 2001). Others indicate that formative assessment is an integral part of mentoring (Roberts, 2000). To examine this further I found it was helpful to distinguish between summative assessment as a formal ‘objective’ assessment, which determined whether or not an individual has achieved a qualification (Colley and Jarvis, 2007, p.300) and formative assessment, a ‘less formal’ process, which occurred as the learning took place and did not directly determine whether or not a qualification has been achieved (Colley and Jarvis, 2007, p.300). Table 13 shows my understanding of the criteria Colley and Jarvis (2007, p.300) attribute to aspects of formal and informal learning and assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal learning</th>
<th>Less formal learning</th>
<th>Informal learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summative assessment: Objective, valid and reliable information which determine the qualification</td>
<td>Formative assessment: subjective perceptions and experiences of the mentor.</td>
<td>Learning with no assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidly specified qualification learning outcomes</td>
<td>Qualification outcomes are not directly at stake in the interaction.</td>
<td>No specified learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13  **Representation of criteria for attributing formality and informality to aspects of assessment (based on Colley and Jarvis, 2007, p.300)**

These levels of formality and informality are used to consider the nature of assessment in ITT. Although assessment always involves making a judgement about something or someone, it is effective only when embedded in the learning process as opposed to tacked on at the end (Carroll, 1994; and Haydn, 2001). Assessment is often the start of the learning process as mentors need to know where learners are and how best to start (Tomlinson, 1995; Haydn, 2001).
Information that is based on assessment and fed back continuously affects further action and maximises learning (Carroll, 1994, pp.8-9). Formative assessment takes place at intervals throughout the teaching cycle (Tomlinson (1995). For example, mentors assess and give feedback to trainees prior to and during the reflective / reviewing phase as trainees attempt to make sense of the teaching and learning experience. Formative assessment therefore provides continual ‘feedback and feed-forward’ throughout the teaching / learning cycle (Haydn, 2001, p.288). Subsequently, information gleaned from continuous formative assessments contributes to summative assessments made against individual training and development programmes and the DfES QTS Standards (2002). Therefore, from my perspective, within the context of ITT, both formative (less formal) and summative (formal) assessments are integral to the work of mentors in ITT. Whilst less formal formative assessment occurs during informal discussions, lesson de-briefs and weekly mentor meetings, it is impossible to argue that this does not ultimately contribute to the formal summative assessment of trainees.

At present in the UK, mentors value their role as assessors and welcome their increased status and influence as ‘gatekeepers’ to the profession (Jones, 2001). At the same time, trainees expect continuous formative and summative assessment to enhance their attainment and progress. Yet, many argue that the formative and summative assessment of trainees’ achievements as they move towards achieving the QTS standards causes complications: if, for example, mentors become secretive and hide information from trainees; or if trainees are reluctant to establish close relationships with mentors; or if trainees only do and say what they think mentors want to hear (Walker and Stott, 1993). Studies conducted by Dormer (1994) and Jones (2001) identify how the threat of assessment restricts ‘… trainees in developing their own style appropriately when they deal with the variety of teaching environments and students they encounter and inspire a “play it safe” attitude’ (Jones (2001, p.87). This causes trainees, especially those who are less confident and able, to be less creative and willing to try new things in different contexts (Jones, 2001, p.91). Such tensions also impair the level of honesty and trust that develops between mentor and trainee, the very ‘prerequisites for establishing and maintaining positive mentor relationships’
(Jones, 2006, p.74). This in turn impacts on the extent to which mentors and trainees engage in honest, critical dialogue in which trainees admit weaknesses, and mentors confront trainees about their weaknesses and provide feedback. Such scenarios work against promoting ‘inquisitiveness’ and producing ‘critical thinkers’ who can bring about change and improvements and contribute to ‘… the welfare of the local, national and global community’ (Jones, 2001, p.92). Indeed, the imposition of assessment on mentors and the resultant power imbalance within the mentor/trainee relationships may prevent the most desirable relationship outcomes (Barnes and Stiasny, 1995; Hall and Kinchington, 1995; Jones, 2001).

I suggest that just as desirable relationship outcomes are potentially inhibited by the formal assessment role of mentors, so too are formal assessment roles potentially undermined by the informal nurturing / caring role (Colley and Jarvis, 2007). For example, formative and summative assessment involves mentors making judgements about trainees’ level of competency against the standards and judgements about trainees’ ‘attitudes … dispositions … and … personal worthiness’ (Colley and Jarvis, 2007, p. 311). Based upon my interpretation of the literature, I argue that, if mentors are seeking caring relationships and ‘harmonious outcomes’ (Colley and Jarvis, 2007, p. 310) with trainees as well as striving visibly to maintain DfES (2002) requirements, they may be reluctant ‘…to pass negative judgements’ (Wolf, 1995, p. 98) and may be tempted to pass a trainee because she is a good person with wonderful personal qualities, although not demonstrating competence at an appropriate level. The formal judgements made on performance could therefore be subverted by the informal judgements (Wolf, 1995; Colley and Jarvis, 2007).

The process in my view, is only made increasingly complex by the ambiguity of the written standards, which are left open to the interpretation of all those involved in the partnership. These are all contentious issues, which threaten the rigour, transparency and validity of effective formal assessment of trainees against the standards (DfES, 2002) and have implications for mentor / trainee relationships.
3.8 Summary

Mentoring relationships are complex and dynamic. Whilst the notion of broad stages of relationship development is useful, mentoring relationships are idiosyncratic as the nature of mentors’ and trainees’ journeys and the pace of trainees’ development differ from pair to pair. As mentor / trainee relationships are situated within a complex matrix of interdependencies, influenced strongly by government ideology and policies, tensions are created by differences in the values of university tutors, trainees and mentors, the assessment role of the ITT mentor and the power relations. The imbalance of power between the mentor and trainee ‘… can seriously interfere with the development of a trusting and honest relationship’ (Jones, 2001, p.91) and restrict critical evaluation and reflection, which in turn can confine practice to a ‘technicist approach’ (Jones, 2001, p.91).

In reality, despite the perceived importance of the interpersonal relationship component, the hierarchical relationship is likely to be artificial and centred on ‘delivery rather than relationship’ (Smith, 2002, p.8) and a ‘directive mode of operation’ (Gay and Stephenson, 1998, p.50). In addition, the validity of trainees’ formal assessments can be called into question because of the range of interpretations of the standards and the conflict mentors face between maintaining national standards, protecting their reputation and wanting harmonious social outcome with trainees.

I argue that as there is no definition for mentoring in ITT and no clearly defined mentoring process linked to explicit learning outcomes for the relationship, the nature of the developmental and psychosocial components of the relationship remain unclear and left up to the individuals involved. As a result, discrepancies exist in the system, which create tensions between university tutors, trainees and mentors. If the ‘technicist approach’ (Jones, 2001, p.91) is adopted, it is characterised by a directive transmission of knowledge, single loop learning, low levels of reflection and advice giving, for the improvement of performance, within an interpersonal relationship that only requires rapport. In contrast, if a more holistic approach is adopted, the process is humanistic and facilitates personal as well as professional development, deeper levels of reflection, single-loop learning
and the possibility for double loop learning to enhance opportunities for transformation. This approach demands a greater emotional bond and a more open relationship between mentor and trainee.

I imagine that, depending upon the mentoring approach adopted, there could be differences in the nature of the ideal conditions for developing an effective mentoring relationship and the necessary skills and competencies mentors and trainees need. Further study of the skills and competencies is therefore necessary to inform my ability to identify those used by mentors and trainees during interactions. In Chapter 4, I examine those skills and competencies which the literature suggests enables mentors and trainees to build interpersonal relationships and those which facilitate the learning, reflective and helping processes discussed in Sections 3.3 - 3.5.
CHAPTER FOUR
The nature of competencies and skills associated with mentoring

4.0 Introduction
In this chapter, before I set the research problem, I consider, firstly, the competencies and skills that literature from across contexts associated with mentoring; secondly, the need for mentor education and training; and, thirdly, the gaps in mentoring research in ITT mentor/trainee relationships.

It is not my intention here to critique the literature on competencies and skills related to mentoring. Instead, I identify and discuss the nature of competencies and skills that might apply to mentors and trainees in ITT. Then, in Chapter Six, I use this knowledge as a framework for the analysis of the competencies and skills used by the mentors and trainees in this study during weekly mentor meetings. I suggest that the extent to which mentors and trainees engage with these competencies and skills is influenced by externally imposed government policy, university procedures, working conditions in the school, the values mentors and trainees bring to the process and their relationships, and the skills and competencies they bring to the job.

4.1 Competencies and skills associated with mentoring
Brockbank and McGill (2006, pp.203-232) make distinctions between the practical skills of ‘functional’ and ‘evolutionary’ mentors. For functionalist outcomes (Section 2.3) such as the improvement of performance, mentors need to be able to communicate, summarise, question, give feedback and be empathetic. Conversely, for transformational outcomes, evolutionary mentors (Section 2.3) are expected to engage more with being present for the mentee, to be genuine, to ask enabling questions to probe the mentees’ ‘taken-for-granteds’ as they challenge, confront, deal with defence mechanisms and review the learning
(Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.215). To achieve transformation, mentors have therefore to deal skilfully with the person, her perspectives, and her values and emotions in a holistic way. Most mentoring literature across contexts refers to the skills identified by Brockbank and McGill (2006), although they do not distinguish between different types of mentors (Mountford, 1993; Hall and Kinchington, 1995; Anderson and Shannon, 1995; Long, 1997a; Parsloe and Wray, 2000; Clutterbuck, 2001).

Whilst mentors from different contexts engage with some or all of the skills and competencies at different levels, this depends on their intended outcomes. With evident discrepancies about intended outcomes in ITT, it became imperative that I addressed the skills and competencies in relation to a range of possible outcomes that extended from the improvement of performance to the achievement of transformation. As over time my values have emerged through my experience as a teacher, sports coach and teacher educator, I struggled to understand how mentors could separate the learner from the learning process. For example, it was difficult to conceive how any teacher, mentor or coach could go through the motions and teach, mentor and coach without some level of engagement with the learner’s values, emotions and needs. In my view, therefore, all learning relationships are made up of developmental and interpersonal components (Walker and Stott, 1993) that need to work in unison so that those involved achieve greatest value and success. When I took this into account, I chose, firstly, to examine those competencies and skills most frequently referred to in the literature; and, secondly, those that I considered, from my experience, applied to mentors in ITT as they implemented either a functional or more holistic approach. In the following sub-sections, therefore, I examine the establishment of core conditions, emotional competencies, goal setting and components of communication skills.

4.1.1 Establishing the core conditions

It is debateable to what extent mentors ensure that the environment for mentoring remains safe and comfortable for the development of open and honest relationships. In my experience, I cannot think of many trainees who have not welcomed a mentoring experience in which they felt safe, were comfortable
enough to ask questions, seek advice and have their practice challenged. Based upon this, I decided it was important to examine the benefits experienced by establishing Roger’s (1957) core conditions in the development of effective relationships.

The following discussion defines the core conditions of empathy, unconditional positive regard (respect) and genuineness and the contributions each core condition makes to informal helping relationships such as those in ITT mentoring.

a. **Empathy**

Empathy has been defined as the way in which individuals listen to and understand others and communicate this understanding to them, so that they in turn may better understand themselves (Egan, 1998). Brockbank and McGill (2006) identify three essential steps for a person to demonstrate empathy:

- identify the other’s feelings (expressed verbally and non-verbally);
- identify the behaviour related to the feeling (expressed verbally);
- communicate awareness of the other’s situation.

In their view empathy is the skill of making the receiver feel:

… the power of an understanding response that builds trust, establishing the basis for a relationship within which it is safe to engage in reflective dialogue, and thus enables the process of connection and reflective learning. (Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.190)

They believe that the capacity for empathy is rare and only a few experience it. Nevertheless it is difficult for me to imagine a mentor / trainee relationship in ITT that would not benefit from an empathetic relationship between mentors and trainees.

b. **Unconditional positive regard (respect)**

Frankland and Sanders (1995, p. 46) acknowledge Roger’s (1957) definition of respect as recognition of the ‘fundamental worth [of another human being] with needs, drives, hopes and fears’. This does not mean agreement with an
individual’s behaviour, but how one perceives the human value apart from the behaviour. I imagine that, whilst it may not always be easy for mentors to regard the trainee apart from her behaviour, those aspiring to transform trainees must be able to view them in this way.

c. **Genuineness**

If a “helper”\(^{18}\) is genuine she is able to ‘be herself’ and experience ‘harmony between how she experiences herself and how she wants to be in the relationship’ (Frankland and Sanders, 1995, p.50). Hence, when people are authentic and comfortable in interactions they neither patronise nor act in a condescending way towards another, nor become defensive (Egan, 1998). This seemed important for ITT mentors as they set about the development and maintenance of rapport and trust.

Dagenais (1990, p.42) alludes to the need to establish the three conditions outlined above when he maintains that a mentor needs to express ‘warmth and caring’ as she sets the scene for sharing. Tomlinson (1995, p.83) is one of the first to identify the importance of the core conditions when a trainee is being mentored in ITT. He acknowledges respect and empathy as important elements in the maintenance of trainees’ motivation. For example, he suggests that both threat and the possibility of a defensive reaction can be minimised if the mentor communicates ‘a sense of how things appear and feel to the other person’ (Tomlinson, 1995, p.83). Whilst mentors need to discover where trainees are ‘coming from’ and how they see the situation, they can do this only if they perceive skilfully and listen actively. This enables trainees to share confidently their views and worries and has ‘a reassuring motivational effect’ (Tomlinson, 1995, p.83). Whilst I saw the benefits of establishing the core conditions, I acknowledged it was important not to be seduced by this language (Colley, 2003),

---

\(^{18}\) “Helper”: a term used here to identify someone in an informal helping relationship such as teaching and mentoring.
and realised that this humanistic approach could prove challenging and might not be considered appropriate, especially in hierarchical relationships.

4.1.2 Emotional competence

If mentors are to engage in the learning, reflective and helping processes within an active relationship (Section 3.3-3.5), it seems crucial that they are self aware (Clutterbuck, 2001; Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004), have insight ‘into patterns of behaviour between individuals and groups of people’, and are able to predict ‘consequences of specific behaviours or courses of action through frequent observation and reflection’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.53). For me, the recognition and management of one’s own behaviour and understanding of how it impacts on others is crucial. Indeed, it seems the success of a relationship can be placed at risk if individuals have little regard for self-awareness and ‘… avoid reflection on such issues, depicting them as soft and of low priority’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.51).

During ITT subject tutor visits I observed on occasions problems arising when mentors failed to help trainees identify the emotional and intellectual content of issues and to assist trainees so that they gained greater control of their feelings (Clutterbuck, 2001). Indeed, I also noted how important it was that mentors raised awareness in trainees of how their behaviour bred ‘behaviour in others’ and could in turn help them to develop strategies that were most likely ‘to achieve the intended results consistently’ (Clutterbuck, 2003, p.2). I suggest, therefore, that if transformation is an outcome of ITT mentoring, it seems impossible for mentors to avoid management of emotional issues. On the other hand, it is reasonable also to assume that the purely functional mentor / trainee relationship will benefit from how well mentors and trainees demonstrate emotional competencies (Cranwell-Ward et al., 2004). Even so, based upon my experience in ITT mentoring, it is questionable whether mentors and trainees focus any attention on the need for emotional competencies.

4.1.3 Goal setting

It has been established already that the long-term goal for trainees in ITT mentor / trainee relationship is to meet the QTS standards (DfES, 2002). Hence, the goal-
setting referred to here relates to what mentors and trainees aspire to achieve in the short, medium and long term so that trainees reach the QTS standards (DfES, 2002). In ITT this process has been more frequently referred to as “target setting”. With goal / target setting identified as one of the generic skills of mentoring, mentors are expected to achieve this effectively through a process of ‘discussion, observation and evaluation’ (Shaw, 1992, p. 92). Shaw (1992) emphasises that all debriefs should conclude with smart, measurable, achievable and realistic goal setting. Research seems ‘… to show that those who set goals and work, however slowly, towards them are more successful and have higher self-esteem’ (Bayliss, 2001, p.124). Yet, careful planning is required for goal setting, if this is to effectively move the learner towards her intended goal; and mentors are expected to be alert to the feelings of the learner if and when goals are not achieved (Bayliss, 2001). With target-setting a required skill for ITT mentors, they are expected throughout the placement to support trainees with the development of their ITDPs (plan for meeting the standards) and facilitate the identification of weekly targets and action. Subsequently, this contributes to trainees’ learning experiences and their achievement of the standards for QTS (DfES, 2002).

4.1.4 Communication skills for mentoring

Communication skills have been identified as essential for mentoring (Tomlinson, 1981; Shaw, 1992; Corbett and Wright, 1994; Field, 1994; Long, 1997a; Parsloe and Wray, 2000; Clutterbuck, 2001; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). With the need for constant communication, no matter what the situation, mentors and trainees need to be aware of both what is said and how it is said (Tomlinson, 1981). Clutterbuck (2001) identifies communication as a mentoring competence made up of a combination of skills. For example, he emphasises that the mentor listens and is “… open to visual and … non-verbal signals” (p.54); makes use of effective

19 Debrief is a term used to describe a discussion which takes place between a mentor and trainee after a trainee’s teaching experience (which may be after they have taught a lesson).
‘parallel processing’ (p.54)\(^{20}\); makes what is said and how it is said ‘appropriate for the situation and recipient(s)’ (p.54); adapts ‘tone, volume, pace and language accordingly’ (p.54); and exits the dialogue ‘with clarity and alignment of understanding’ (p.55). Shaw (1992) emphasises the crossover between such skills and those of counselling and problem solving. He points out that the skills used by a mentor as she gives and receives feedback have similar values to those of counselling. Yet he urges that mentors should not cross the professional boundary between mentoring and counselling.

Within the following sub-sections I address communication skills within the clusters of attending, listening and responding (Bayliss, 2001). As attention is paid to each cluster of skills, I believe it is important to consider that if use of these skills is ‘… not underpinned by the core values of empathy, respect and genuineness’ (Bayliss, 2001, p.85) there is a danger of the helper / mentor appearing false and the skills ‘becoming little more than applied techniques’ (Bayliss, 2001, p.85). Table 14 identifies the communication skill clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attending</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Preparing the setting for interaction; ii. preparing self for interaction; iii. observing body language; iv. being there for the mentee.</td>
<td>i. Reading body language; ii. focusing on the verbal message; iii. hearing verbal and non-verbal messages; iv. sustaining focus.</td>
<td>i. Restating: reflecting back feelings and words, paraphrasing; ii. using enabling interventions; iii. using appropriate questioning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14  Communication skill clusters and goal setting.
Summary of the work by Bayliss (2001)

\(^{20}\) Parallel processing: ‘analysing’ what is said, ‘reflecting on it, preparing a response’ and ‘slowing down the dialogue’ if they need more time (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.54).
a. Attending

Egan (1998, p.62) describes the skill of attending as the ability to be visibly “tuned in” and ‘with’ the client physically and psychologically. Bayliss (2001) maintains that, in order to attend effectively, helpers need to prepare themselves and make the environment as conducive as possible for honest dialogue: for example, the choice of a quiet room, telephones off the hook and appropriate seating. A number of micro skills of attending are also crucial to the helping process (Egan, 1998; Bayliss, 2001): for example, how the helper sits and faces the client; maintains a posture that communicates openness; leans towards the client, which says ‘I’m with you’; maintains eye contact without staring and portrays a relaxed presence (Egan, 1998, p.63). Similarly, it is essential that helpers are aware constantly of the non-verbal signals they give, as by ‘attending you learn to use your body instinctively as a value-driven means of communication’ (Egan, 1998, p.64). For Egan (1998, p.65), ‘Effective attending puts helpers in a position to listen carefully to what clients are saying both verbally and non-verbally’. Hence, good observation skills are important for listening, as non-verbal cues send powerful messages, especially during initial encounters, and ‘… have been shown to affect the quality of any subsequent relationship’ (Bayliss, 2001, p. 88). Subsequently, attending is considered an important competence for mentors in ITT as they engage and help trainees and facilitate reflection and learning.

b. Listening

Many authors highlight how important it is for mentors to listen (Clutterbuck, 2001; Rigby, 2001; CUREE, 2004; Wallace and Gravells, 2005). Ineffective listening caused by involvement in personal thoughts, judgements about the person and thoughts about how to respond can distort the message received and hinder effective communication (Egan, 1998; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Indeed, when the relationship ‘… is working effectively, the mentor … is really listening’ (Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.177). Listening has been thought of as in two parts, ‘discrimination’ and ‘communication’ (Frankland and Sanders, 1995, p.107). In the first, helpers listen and pick up all the relevant verbal and non-
verbal cues; ‘not just words, but … all of the subtle nuances between the words [and] the feelings that go along with the story’ (Frankland and Sanders, 1995, p.107). Non-verbal signs either confirm or deny what is said verbally (Knapp, 1978; Egan, 1998) and it is important that helpers listen to what needs to be challenged (Egan, 1998). In the second, helpers reflect back what they hear and understand (Frankland and Sanders, 1995) as they check that what they understand is accurate, complete and appropriate.

c. Responding

Attending and listening have been regarded as the foundation stones for effective responses (Egan, 1998). The skill of responding involves gaining understanding from attending and listening; feeding it back so the recipient understands better and acts on their understanding; and probing, which involves making statements and asking appropriate questions to facilitate exploration of the issues (Egan, 1998; Frankland and Sanders, 1995; Bayliss, 2001). Successful responding, therefore, depends upon making accurate perceptions of what is going on for the person being responded to, and confidence on the responder’s part in her ability to challenge appropriately (Egan, 1998). The following discussion addresses the clusters of responding skills, including reflecting-back feelings and words, paraphrasing, summarising, enabling interventions and questioning.

i. Reflecting-back and paraphrasing

Reflecting-back enables the helper to check-in with the other person through repetition of the content of the other’s words (Frankland and Sanders, 1995). This does not mean simply echoing the last four words in parrot fashion, which may give the impression that the helper is mocking the speaker (Bayliss, 2001). In addition, it is also important that the emotional content of what the other person says is played back to the speaker (Bayliss, 2001). Bayliss (2001) believes that the use of a combination of reflecting words and feelings demonstrates an attempt by the helper to understand the other’s world and empathise. Brockbank and McGill (2006) recommend that the first thing a mentor has to do is to restate the mentee’s key points so that she checks understanding and if necessary allows the mentee to
adjust what she has said. They claim it is valuable that the mentee hears her thinking and feelings re-articulated so that she can then reflect on the message and respond to improve the accuracy.

I liken paraphrasing to Brockbank and McGill’s (2006, p.183) skill of ‘restating’. Paraphrasing is associated with rephrasing the factual content in the listener’s own words (Bayliss, 2001). When reflecting-back and paraphrasing are used in tandem, helpers let the person know that both the content of what she said and her feelings are heard (Bayliss, 2001). When helpers, such as mentors, ensure that trainees are heard, this constitutes empathy and communicates caring and attention for the person being helped (Frankland and Sanders, 1995).

**ii. Summarising**

Summarising provides focus and direction (Egan, 1998). Helpers summarise what they hear and facilitate also the other’s attempts to summarise (Egan, 1998). This skill is useful at the beginning of a new session as the helper recaps on what has gone before; and during a session, when it provides focus and direction for what follows, particularly when the person being helped gets stuck at a stage in the process; and at the end of a session (Egan, 1998). Thus, through the use of summarising, helpers and those being helped gain a clearer picture of the situation (Bayliss, 2001; Egan, 1998). As Brockbank and McGill (2006, p.184) emphasise, summarising is ‘a key skill for reflective dialogue’ and a competent summary depends on the quality of the restatements.

**iii. Enabling interventions**

An intervention is ‘an identifiable piece of verbal and / or non-verbal behaviour that is a part of the practitioner’s service to the client’ (Heron, 1990, p.3). Heron (1990), inspired by the earlier work of Blake and Mouton (1972), identifies six enabling interventions used by helpers such as teachers, tutors, and counsellors, which I considered applicable to mentors. He places them into two clusters of authoritative and facilitative interventions (Table 15). This section focuses on verbal interventions as responding skills in interaction.
Authoritative interventions | Facilitative interventions
---|---
**Prescriptive**: directs the behaviour of the client. | **Cathartic**: enables the client to discharge painful emotion e.g. grief, fear, anger.

**Informative**: imparts knowledge, information and meaning. | **Catalytic**: elicits self-discovery, self-directed living, learning, and problem-solving.

**Confronting**: raises the client’s consciousness about some limiting attitude or behaviour. | **Supportive**: affirms ‘the worth and value of the client’s person, qualities, attitudes or actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritative interventions</th>
<th>Facilitative interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescriptive</strong>: directs the behaviour of the client.</td>
<td><strong>Cathartic</strong>: enables the client to discharge painful emotion e.g. grief, fear, anger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative</strong>: imparts knowledge, information and meaning.</td>
<td><strong>Catalytic</strong>: elicits self-discovery, self-directed living, learning, and problem-solving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confronting</strong>: raises the client’s consciousness about some limiting attitude or behaviour.</td>
<td><strong>Supportive</strong>: affirms ‘the worth and value of the client’s person, qualities, attitudes or actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 **Authoritative and facilitative interventions**  
(Heron, 1990, pp.5-6)

Whilst authoritative interventions are related to how the practitioner directs and guides the “client” e.g. ‘giving instructions and raising consciousness’, facilitative interventions encourage the learner ‘to become more autonomous and take more responsibility for themselves’ and their progress (Heron, 1990, p.6). However, excessive use of one category is not effective and appropriate combinations of interventions depend upon the needs of the client and the situation (Heron, 1990).

For example, whilst excessive use of authoritative interventions encourages dependence on a mentor, overuse of facilitative interventions slows down growth because of a trainee’s lack of knowledge and ideas. While Heron (1990) claims that there is no set order for the use of interventions, he suggests tutors use a three-phase sequence with students. I believe these can be applied to mentors who work with trainees in ITT. Table 16 exemplifies Heron’s (1990) three progressive phases. I have substituted the term “trainee” for the term “student” throughout the sequence.
Intervention sequencing model for tutors working with students, facilitating learning of subject matter the student had studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention sequencing model for tutors working with students, facilitating learning of subject matter the student had studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Catalytic interventions to help the trainees ‘rehearse learning’ and ‘explore understanding’, mixed with supportive interventions, agreeing with the trainee, and confirming their understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| b) Confronting interventions to help the trainee examine their perspectives, correct ‘misunderstandings and misjudgements followed by catalytic interventions’ to ‘revise their understandings’, mixed with ‘light cathartic interventions to relieve tension in laughter … (and) then informative interventions to fill the gaps in the trainee’s knowledge and critical awareness’.
| c) Catalytic interventions for further exploration, with supportive interventions and possibly prescriptive interventions to add guidance for future action. |

Table 16  Intervention sequencing model for tutors. Summarised and adapted from Heron (1990, pp.138-139)

From my perspective, this sequential model guides trainees through phases of Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning cycle, assists with their planning for future action and could potentially facilitate a swing into the double-loop learning process (Argyris and Schon, 1996). Heron (1990) notes that practitioners use cathartic and confronting interventions least well because they require high levels of emotional competence for which many are untrained. Yet, combinations of confronting and cathartic interventions are essential skills as they are used to challenge individuals and ease the tension created by the challenge (Frankland and Sanders, 1995; Bayliss, 2001; Brockbank and McGill, 2006).

Challenge is an essential skill as it moves the learner on by ‘confronting them with some aspect of their thoughts, feelings or behaviour’ (Frankland and Sanders, 1995, p.146) and enables growth, as long as it is balanced carefully with support (Frankland and Sanders, 1995; Bayliss, 2001). When applied to mentoring, confrontation is used productively when it deals with conflict and challenges the views or behaviour of mentees / trainees and promotes growth (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Brockbank and McGill (2006, p.226) perceive confrontation as an essential challenging skill that aids reflective dialogue. In the context of mentoring, confrontation does not mean an aggressive verbal assault on a person. Instead, it refers to a process, underpinned by the core conditions, that
seeks to raise the awareness of the mentee and enables her to break through her learning blocks (Heron, 1990). As Brockbank and McGill (2006, p. 226) emphasise, ‘effective confrontation is non-aggressive and non-combative, deeply supportive of your client and with the intended outcome of enabling learning’.

iv. **Questioning**

Mentors need to use appropriate questions that enable learners to reflect on their experience and identify future action (Parsloe and Wray, 2000; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Indeed, it is only through the use of appropriate questions that learners are enabled to identify strengths and weaknesses as they move from superficial evaluation to deeper and more specific analysis (Parsloe and Wray, 2000). Yet, careful consideration has to be given to the types of questions used (Frankland and Sanders, 1995; Egan, 1998; Bayliss, 2001). Closed and loaded questions are considered least helpful as they allow only for short answers, limited reflection and curtail the learner’s contribution to the dialogue (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Open questions such as Where? Why? or How? are considered more advantageous as they help learners to develop their understanding and come to their own conclusions (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Additionally, they help to establish rapport, create involvement and check for understanding (Parsloe and Wray, 2000). Rhetorical, leading and multiple questions are considered least helpful for the facilitation of learning. For example, they lead learners towards mentors’ views rather than encouraging them to generate their own views (Brockbank and McGill, 2006).

I found Parsloe and Wray’s (2000) categories of questions most useful for this study as they helped me to identify the nature of the questioning used by mentors during dialogue with trainees. Just like Heron’s (1990) intervention categories, they shed greater light on the nature of the developmental processes that occurred during mentor / meetings. Table 17 identifies the categories and purpose of questions with some of my examples of how they might be applied in ITT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of questions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raising</td>
<td>To develop self-awareness and a sense of responsibility for future action.</td>
<td>What can you do to lift the performance of the sequence further?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>Elicits clarification and confirmation of understanding by reflecting back words.</td>
<td>You said you hate teaching that class; can you explain exactly what you mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Provide an opportunity for further explanation of reasons, attitudes or feelings.</td>
<td>Can you elaborate on what makes you think the pupils achieved the learning objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td>Poses ‘a situation’ to introduce a new idea or concept, but only if the learner has the knowledge and understanding for this.</td>
<td>What if you started with the game followed by work on a key skill? How about re-grouping the pupils?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probing</td>
<td>Mixture of open and closed questions to obtain the required information.</td>
<td>Funnelling: broad questions first followed by more specific questions to narrow the focus; OR Drilling: go straight to the focus and dig deeper until you get the information you need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking</td>
<td>To check what has been heard, to confirm or correct understanding.</td>
<td>Are you sure about the names of the pupils involved?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Categories and examples of questions adapted from Parsloe and Wray (2000, pp.151-153)

As alluded to at the beginning of this chapter, I believe that the extent to which mentors and trainees in ITT apply these skills depends on firstly, their awareness and knowledge of the skills; secondly, their ability to use them and thirdly, their perception of the need to use them within the ITT context.

I argue that regardless of the mentoring approach (i.e. technicist or holistic), mentors’ and trainees’ knowledge and appropriate application of the competencies and skills addressed in this chapter can be of benefit to the developmental and
interpersonal components of their relationship. In turn, I argue that mentor education and training are essential, firstly, to enhance awareness and knowledge of the process of mentoring in ITT and the tensions that might arise and, secondly, to facilitate development of skills that enhance attainment of the intended outcomes.

4.2 Education and training for mentors

I found substantial support in the literature for mentor education and training (Maynard and Furlong, 1995; Barnett, 1995; Garvey and Alred, 2000a; Fletcher, 2000; Clutterbuck, 2001; Brockbank and McGill, 2006; Jones and Straker, 2006). As advocated by Barnett (1995), there is a need for mentors to know more about their role and demonstrate leadership skills, human relation skills and processing skills (e.g. problem solving and reflection). Recommendations in the literature also included an educative approach based on the application of theory to practice (Garvey and Alred, 2000a). The content of such a programme could include, for example, ‘the origins of mentoring; variety in mentoring; … learning processes; one’s own approach to mentoring; the influence of organisational culture in development; the potential benefits of mentoring and practise [of] mentoring skills’ (Garvey and Alred, 2000a, p.123). This programme could be enhanced further by the inclusion of ‘the dynamic nature of the relationship, its stages and phases [and] anticipating and forestalling possible problems’ (Clutterbuck (2001, p.81).

I support the view that the skills required for effective mentoring in ITT differ from those required by successful classroom teachers and a good teacher does not necessarily make a good mentor (Martin, 1994). Jones and Straker (2006) suggest that mentors in ITT have a limited mentoring knowledge base and, with limited time to do the job, apply their own teaching practice knowledge and experience and classroom strategies when they mentor trainees. Moreover, Jones and Straker (2006) highlight that when mentors reflect on their practice they focus on technical aspects such as lesson observations, de-briefs and target setting, and do not emphasise critical analysis of practice through deeper reflection on issues (Jones and Straker, 2006).
If mentors’ practice influences ‘… the quality of the relationship’ between mentors and mentees in ITT and determines ‘… the extent to which a critical, reflective or a conformist, passive attitude towards professional development is promoted’ (Jones and Straker, 2006, p.182), then it is essential that mentors have a sound theoretical and practical knowledge base. This would include knowledge related to ITT, a critical understanding of theoretical models and frameworks of mentoring and the generic principles that underpin effective practice (Jones and Straker, 2006). In addition, it is important that schools provide conditions and resources for education and training that allow mentors to extend their knowledge base. Indeed, only then can ITT mentors’ ‘practice bear the hallmarks of professionalism’ (Jones and Straker, 2006, p.183).

Yet, it is important when planning and implementing mentor education and training programmes in ITT to remain mindful of the nature of the context and the pressure and tensions created by government policy. If education and training programmes advocate only holistic, trainee-centred, deeply reflective approaches to mentoring, in a culture which focuses on performance outcomes and encourages ‘depthlessness’ (Ball, 2005, p.12), then mentors could be placed under unbearable stress to extend their efforts beyond their allocated time and resources, to go the ‘additional mile’ (Ford, 1999, p.13). If outcomes for trainees were then unsuccessful, the danger is that mentors would either blame themselves or fear they will be blamed. This, I imagine, would be more of a problem for those ‘authentic professionals’ (Ball, 2005, p.4) referred to in Section 1.7. It seems to me, that mentor education and training programmes have to present the bigger picture and help mentors to negotiate their way successfully. In my experience, I have not come across any mentor education or training programmes within the partnership which claimed these intended outcomes.

4.3 **Studies of mentoring relationships used to inform knowledge and understanding**

Chapters One to Four have extended understanding through exploring the ITT context, the nature of mentoring, the processes involved, the dynamic relationship and generic mentoring competencies and skills. It is important now to give an
overview of the studies which I used to inform understanding about the mentor /
trainee relationship, and to present the case for my research.

On searching for studies which related to ITT mentor / trainee relationships within
four-year BA QTS courses in the UK, I found no study that traced or tracked
relationships either through a full placement and/or over consecutive placements.
A few studies from other contexts examined and analysed the intricacies of
mentoring interactions. These informed my knowledge and understanding as I
formulated my approach to the research and identified frameworks for analysis of
aspects of mentor / trainee relationships.

The following discussion briefly overviews studies referred to in the literature
review that informed to a greater or lesser extent my understanding of the mentor /
trainee relationship. As these took place in a range of different contexts, their
findings cannot always be directly applied to the ITT context. Moreover,
methodologies were limited as, for example, few tracked relationships over time,
many only used questionnaires and / or interviews and gathered data based upon
participants’ perspectives, and in most the sample sizes were small. In addition,
the stage models which some studies produced tended not to represent the
complexities and idiosyncrasies of a dynamic mentor / trainee relationship.

4.3.1 Studies from within the field of education

The work presented by the Amherst School of Education (1989), based on a
collaborative project between the East Longmeadow School District
(Massachusetts) and the University of Massachusetts, identifies teachers’
reflections about their experiences as mentors. Based upon his experience Vickers
(1989, p.21), a social studies teacher at the High School who mentored many
student teachers, ‘theorises’ three basic stages (Section 3.6.1, Table 12) in mentor
/student teacher relationships. However, as this model only represents broad
stages it does not reflect the complexities of mentor / mentee relationships.
Indeed, Hawkey (1997, p.328) characterises it as ‘an idealised overview of the
changing patterns of the relationship between mentors and mentees’. Yet despite
this, it is a useful guide as it represents relationships within the area of teacher preparation and considers broad stages in relationship development.

Walker and Stott’s (1993) exploratory and descriptive study aims to ‘… advance guidelines … useful to organisations considering the establishment of similar programmes’ (Walker and Stott, 1993, p.78). This study focuses on a small sample of experienced school principals who mentored new principles in their first year in post. As such it was formal, with mentees attached full time to mentors for two months, and data were based upon mentees’ perceptions at particular relationship stages. Although this study, like that of Vickers’ (1989), provided broad relationship stages (Section 3.6.1, Table 12) for consideration in the ITT, some differences were apparent. These included the context, the age of mentees (practitioners older and more experienced than trainees) and the length of the relationship. This restricted generalisability.

Furlong and Maynard’s (1995) extensive research aimed to develop a more effective model of professional learning that identified the role of the mentor. In this study the eleven students, who worked with 16 different teachers in a primary post-graduate teacher preparation programme, were visited either on a weekly or fortnightly basis. In general, the research was exploratory, mapped territory, raised questions and suggested new directions for future research. Research tools include exploratory observation, semi-structured and sometimes unstructured interviews and documentary evidence. Such methodology allowed for an examination of the differences between what students and experienced teachers knew about the development of students’ learning needs as they change over time, what students need to learn and the complexity of the learning process (Section 3.2, Table 9). Overall, Furlong and Maynard (1995) argued that they required a clear grasp of the issues before they could ‘characterise the process and content of effective mentoring’ (p.100). Their use of multi-techniques allowed for greater understanding of the reactions of student teachers and identified mentoring styles at different stages in development (Section 2.4). Whilst the model did not take into account the ‘highly personal and idiosyncratic development’ of individual
teachers (Hawkey, 1997, p. 327), it did at least provide a framework within which I could then examine developmental changes.

The work of Fuller and Brown (1975), based on a review of 300 earlier empirical studies, describes the ‘experience of learning to teach’ (p.37). As I considered their proposed broad stages of trainees’ development (Section 3.2, Table 9), this further informed my understanding of learning to teach. Similarly, Tomlinson’s (1995) work provides a useful perspective on mentoring in ITT. Based on psychological (educational) research in the 1960s, it included ‘analytical / philosophical research’ (Tomlinson, 2008, p.1) and made use of the theories, findings and frameworks of cognitive psychologists. With none of their work applied to teaching, a lot of Tomlinson’s (2008) thinking about mentoring came from Schön (1983, 1987). Tomlinson’s (1995) work further informed my understanding of the mentor / trainee relationships as it provoked my thinking about learning to teach (Section 3.1), broad stages of trainees’ development (Section 3.2), the teaching cycle (Section 3.3, Figure 2) and the interpersonal aspects of mentoring (Section 3.5). Although Leask’s (2001b) models of stages / phases of trainee development were not based upon systematic research, she claims they were ‘… based upon the professional observations of trainees’ teaching over many years’ by Capel, Leask and Turner (Leask, 2008, p.1). This work further informed my knowledge of learning to teach and trainees’ development through broad stages.

4.3.2 Study from within the National Health Service

Garvey’s (1994b) model of relationship dimensions provides another useful perspective on mentor / mentee relationships. His research focused on mentoring in the Health Service MBA scheme in which participants freely chose mentors. The case study research method made use of a descriptive dimensions model (Section 3.6, Table 11) with the sample limited to two pairs. A series of structured

---

21 Tomlinson claims this research ‘… has to do with examining and developing concepts and frameworks, as well as critically appraising the strengths and limits of empirical work’ (2008, p.1).
interviews carried out over a six-month period provided data based on participants’ perspectives. Garvey’s (1994b) findings further informed my knowledge and understanding and I used his dimensions model as a framework for the examination over time of the dimensions in the mentor / trainee relationships.

4.3.3 Corporate studies

Kram’s (1983, p.608) seminal exploratory research on phases in the mentor relationship produced a ‘conceptual model derived from an intensive biographical interview study of 18 relationships as they [were] occurring in one corporate setting’ (Section 3.6.1, Table 12). Pairs of managers (of varied ages and experience) were interviewed in relationships at different phases of development. Yet whilst this study informed knowledge of a particular type of informal mentoring relationship (USA sponsorship style) and extended understanding of the complexities of mentoring relationships, it could not be applied directly to the ITT developmental context.

Clutterbuck’s (2001) early work in mentoring reflects characteristics of the US sponsoring form of mentoring upon which Kram’s (1983) research was based. However, Clutterbuck (2007) finds it difficult to apply this form of mentoring within the European context. For example, it does not suit European mentoring objectives as it does not encourage employees to take greater responsibility for their own careers and personal development. In Europe, relationships are shorter, personal growth is prioritised over career development and mentors are expected to ensure that mentees achieve independence quickly (Clutterbuck, 2007).

Clutterbuck’s work and research with large corporate organisations across Europe, North America, and Africa underpinned his extensive writing on mentoring. For example, his work includes a collection and thematic analysis of case studies (Megginson and Clutterbuck, 1995), a qualitative study of practice and effectiveness in executive mentoring (Clutterbuck and Megginson, 1999) and relationship endings (Clutterbuck and Megginson, 2001). In particular, one study focused upon the observation and charting of mentoring conversations through
random observation of selected pairs in mentoring sessions and workshop practices. This, together with interviews with effective and ineffective mentors, led to his flexible theoretical model of the behavioural matrix (Section 3.6. Figure 6), that could be applied across mentoring contexts (Clutterbuck, 2007). Clutterbuck claims this model ‘helped thousands of programme participants position what is expected of them, both in general and in one to one discussions with their dyadic partners’ (2007, p.639). However, despite Clutterbuck’s extensive work in the field, he identifies further need for a formal academic study that ‘compared expectation of behaviour by both mentors and mentees, with actual behaviours and linked these with outcomes for both parties’ (2007, p.639). Although Clutterbuck’s (1991-2007) work is based in the commercial world and as such could not be applied directly to the ITT context, it informed my developmental work in the field. For example, the behavioural matrix was used in this study as a framework for examining the behaviour of mentors and mentees over time.

4.4 The need for further research

The introduction to this study identified how my concerns about the state of PE ITT mentor / trainee relationships drove me to examine further mentoring literature as I undertook this research. As I examined the literature, I understood better how the current situation evolved and became more aware of the complexities. I was not entirely surprised that discrepancies existed in the system or that these impacted on mentor / trainee relationships. In my view, the lack of clarity caused confusion and this resulted in variations in expectations and practice. As a practitioner, I remained anxious about the ease with which schools could opt out of the system at any time, the variations in practice I observed, the reluctance of some PE mentors to improve their practice, the reliance of some PE mentors on subject tutors to make decisions about trainees’ lack of attainment and progress, the limited depth of mentor engagement with trainees, tales of poor mentor / trainee relationships that impacted negatively on trainees’ practice and the lack of mentor education. Additionally, I was very surprised at the lack of substantial research that informed practice.
My confusion and anxiety along with the lack of empirical research studies from across courses in PE ITT, highlighted the urgent need for greater understanding of mentor / trainee relationships in PE ITT. I needed to know what happened in the field from the perspectives of mentors and trainees and through systematic observation of aspects of practice in mentor / trainee sessions, which were not observed on subject and link tutor visits. I anticipated this would raise awareness, enhance understanding and lead to challenging questions for the partnership and the profession. In addition, new research questions, informed by my findings, could be generated to develop the work further.

I felt strongly that my study needed to be an exploratory journey of discovery that:

a. identified mentors’ and trainees’ concept of ITT mentoring and how this informed what they did and how they did it over time;

b. tracked and traced mentor / trainee relationships across placements and examined, not only what mentors and trainees said they did, but also what they actually did and how this impacted on required outcomes.
5.0 Introduction

In this chapter, firstly, the purpose of the research is clarified and the research questions are identified prior to the justification of the epistemological position, chosen method and research techniques. Secondly, the process of data analysis is examined and the ethical issues considered prior to the start of the fieldwork are addressed. Thirdly, a description of the pilot study is given along with consideration of the benefits of such an undertaking. Throughout the chapter, I refer back to my background, experience and values (Introduction: Researcher’s biography), which impacted on every stage of the research process (Denscombe, 1998).

5.1 The research purpose and questions

Although previous studies have focused on the implementation and management of mentoring, few examined the interactions between mentor and trainee and how the mentor / trainee relationship developed over time (Hawkey, 1997). None examined the intricacies of relationships within the context of the BA QTS PE four-year degree. This study attempted to address this imbalance as identified by Hawkey (1997). The literature neither alleviated my concerns about the ambiguity of the mentoring process, nor clarified my understanding of the nature of the mentor / trainee relationship (Researcher’s biography). In fact, it strengthened my view that further research was essential to provide a greater breadth and depth of understanding. I valued the rhetoric that focused on education and welcomed mentoring in ITT. Yet, the practice I witnessed did not reflect holistic and humanistic principles underpinned by theory and depth of reflection (Maunder and Dixon, 1992; Elliott and Calderhead, 1994; Anderson and Shannon, 1995; Fletcher, 2000). The claims of mentors and trainees which indicated that they spent time reflecting deeply on practice were neither reflected in the trainees’
lesson plans, evaluations and weekly report forms, nor in the mentors’ final placement reports, which were vague, brief and unhelpful (Researcher’s biography). Thus, I realised I had to investigate not only what mentors and trainees said they did, but also observe and examine what in fact they did.

This study is positioned primarily within the disciplines of pedagogy and mentoring. However, consideration was given also to literature from the fields of counselling and social psychology. My examination of the range of literature informed understanding of the extent to which ITT mentoring encompassed ‘holistic’ ideals and if it achieved a ‘transformational’ outcome, via a ‘humanistic’ process (Kazanjian, 2001; Ikeda, 2001) that utilised counselling skills. Additionally, literature provided examples of prospective methodological tools.

The aim of the research was to explore the mentor / trainee relationship and to enhance depth of understanding of the mentoring process in which mentors and trainees in ITT engaged. I aspired to ‘… enrich the thinking and discourse of educators … through the systematic and reflective documentation of evidence’ (Stenhouse, 1985, p.50). Such findings would contribute to the educational debate among teacher training providers, teachers, mentors and policy makers, and give them something to ‘… read about, argue over, reflect on and then either reject and forget or file away in their memory or adapt and adopt later’ (Bassey, 1999, p. 51).

As such, the study sought to address the following questions:

a) What is the nature of mentoring within the PE ITT context?

b) What is the nature of the PE ITT mentor / trainee relationship?

c) How do PE ITT mentors and trainees establish, maintain and end their relationships?

5.2 The philosophical approach to this research

Research activity ‘… does not take place in a vacuum … but in a community of scholars who share similar conceptions of proper questions, methods, techniques, and forms of explanation’ (Sparkes (1992, p.41). The term “paradigm” is
generally used to represent the fundamental beliefs of such communities (Kuhn, 1962; Schulman, 1986; Patton, 1978; Sparkes, 1992). Hence, as a set of basic beliefs … it … represents a worldview that … defines for its holder, the nature of the world, the individuals place in it, and the range of possible relationships to that world and its parts. (Guba and Lincoln, 1998, p.200)

It follows, therefore, that whatever paradigm was adopted would both shape the research and impact on each stage of the research process (Lincoln, 1990; Sparkes, 1992; Smith, 1996). For example, researchers’ beliefs would impact on their paradigm of choice, which in turn would indicate their ontological, epistemological and methodological positions and guide their choice of research method and techniques. Hence, when operating within a paradigm a researcher needs to be socialised into the way of seeing the world through the eyes of her adopted community of scholars (Sparkes, 1992). Indeed, there is no way of escaping the appropriate ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions of the adopted paradigm (Hammersley, 1995). To be able to place myself within either the positivist, critical or interpretivist paradigms (Sparkes, 1992), I had to identify my ontological, epistemological and methodological positions.

Firstly, I addressed the ontological question, which asked ‘What is the form and nature of reality?’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1998, p.201). From my personal perspective many ‘realities’ exist: these are made up of mental constructions, are context-specific and formed by individuals or groups (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). In my view, individuals see, interpret and engage with the world in different ways and there is no one ultimate truth that exists for all (Researcher’s biography). In other words, realities exist in the minds of individuals who interpret their environment and act on the basis of their interpretation (Sparkes, 1992). An individual’s interpretation, therefore, might coexist with a variety of different interpretations within the same environment.

Mentoring is a phenomenon that exists and my examination of the literature determined that the concept remained elusive (Roberts, 2000; Jones, 2006).
Moreover, the different mentoring schemes that existed provided ‘… different parameters within which the mentoring role [was] enacted’ (Jones, 2006, p.162). With ‘… a multitude of definitions and interpretations’ (Jones, 2006, p.161), it was inconsistently applied (Yau, 1996; Smith, 1999; Maynard, 2000; Jones, 2001) and practice remained ‘inconsistent and idiosyncratic’ (Jones, 2006, p.162). Therefore, despite prescriptive government regulations and university procedures, mentors and trainees appeared to interpret the mentoring process in their own ways (Jones, 2006). From my informed perspective, it was therefore impossible to adopt a realist ontology as I set out to explore, interpret and construct a more informed and sophisticated understanding (Sparkes, 1992; Guba and Lincoln, 1998) of the nature of mentoring in ITT, through examining the mentor / trainee relationships.

Secondly, my relativist ontological position impacted upon the answer to the epistemological question ‘What is the nature of the researcher and the known and what can be known?’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). It seemed appropriate and logical that, once I accepted the existence of multiple realities, I needed to adopt a subjective epistemology. Hence, I accepted also that my values, knowledge and experiences would impact on interpretations of what I read, heard and saw happening in the field (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). Consequently, knowledge would be co-created between the mentors, trainees and the researcher.

Thirdly, it followed that to be true to the relativist ontological and subjectivist epistemological positions, it was essential to adopt a hermeneutic methodological approach. This would allow me to get close to the mentors and trainees and gain first-hand knowledge of their authentic experiences within the natural context (Sparkes, 1992; Silverman, 1993). Such an approach would need to involve the interpretation of mentors’ and trainees’ records of their experience, participant observations of mentor / trainee weekly interactions and dialogue with mentors and trainees over a period of time.

Once the essential questions above were answered, I was able to make a more focused and informed decision about the paradigm of choice. The positivist, critical and interpretivist paradigms were examined in greater depth, to establish a
fit that best suited my ontological, epistemological and methodological positions and the requirements of the study.

The main tenet of the positivist paradigm purports that reality is ‘… independent from individuals … driven by natural laws’ and the research is designed around a hypothesis and a detached researcher (Guba and Lincoln, 1998, p.204). Those who subscribe to these views believe that there is no possibility of including ‘feelings and subjective experience into the realms of social scientific knowledge unless they … can be rendered observable’ (Bryman, 1988, p.14). Natural scientists who claim that research is only scientific if the researcher is detached from the researched and uses valid and reliable tools for measurements subscribe to positivism. This approach did not match my perspective and was therefore considered inappropriate for the kind of study of human beings attempted here (Polanyi, 1958). Just as it was unacceptable to assume one reality, in this study it was impossible to separate individuals from the knowledge process (Martens, 1987, Sparkes, 1992). For example, I could not separate mentors and trainees’ perspectives from the construction of knowledge about mentoring.

Those who subscribe to the tenets of the critical paradigm, on the other hand, claim to raise awareness, develop knowledge and empower individuals (Gibson, 1986; Sparkes, 1992). Critical theorists reject the positivist ontological and epistemological position and emphasise that to dismiss individuals’ perspectives and their interpretation of meaning inaccurately represents the phenomena under study (Carr and Kemmis, 1986). Hence, for critical researchers, there is no such thing as a value free research process (Sparkes, 1992). Furthermore, critical researchers claim it is essential to identify ‘historically specific, oppressive, social structures’ (Harvey, 1990, p.1) and promote the idea that knowledge is ‘… structured by existing sets of social relations’ (Harvey, 1990, p.2). For example, they declare that interrelations between individuals must be studied in relation to the wider context and social structure. Additionally, they want to identify what is happening and also do something about it (Harvey, 1990). While I accepted much of this perspective, I did not feel prepared to take a critical approach. I believed it was more important to take a wide-angle approach to the work to enhance a more
sophisticated understanding of what actually happened in context. Only then would it be possible to delve deeper with more of a critical eye to establish explanations and empower participants. Yet, I was not entirely macro-blind\textsuperscript{22} (Sparkes, 1992). It was essential to describe the ‘macro’ and ‘meso-level\textsuperscript{23} (Colley, 2003, p.5) contexts within which ITT was positioned, to allow readers firstly to relate to the similarities and differences within their own contexts; secondly to raise awareness of political and institutional forces and thirdly to enhance the possibility of generalisation.

Like the criticalist paradigm, the interpretist paradigm stands ‘… in direct contrast to positivism’ (Sparkes, 1992, p.24). It urges that knowledge is constructed by humans, which is not the ultimate truth, but something that is constantly changing and developing (Sparkes, 1992). Interpretivist’s internal-idealists ontology supports my belief in multiple realities and ‘… the continuing search for ever more informed and sophisticated constructions’ (Sparkes, 1992, p.26). I believe that ‘… mind and object … are inextricably linked – the knower and the process of knowing cannot be separated from values’ (Sparkes, 1992, p.27). This position represents a subjective epistemology and requires a ‘hermeneutical’ methodology (Sparkes, 1992, p.21). Through this process, reality is interpreted both by the researcher and the researched (Smith, 1989; Sparkes, 1992). Indeed, interpretivists focus on the respondents’ perspectives of the phenomenon (Brown, 1990). Hence, as an ‘active participant’ in the process (Sparkes, 1992, p.29), I engaged with respondents in the real setting and could not guarantee truth in the same way as positivist researchers (Sparkes, 1992). Truth, therefore, was based upon agreements between participants and myself (Popkewitz 1984; Smith, 1984) and ‘… common understandings … socially constructed’ (Sparkes, 1992, p.31). I considered the goal of this work to be ‘… a form of learning’ (Flyvberg, 2006, p.22).

\textsuperscript{22} ‘Macro-blindness’ is ignoring the power relationships which exist (Sparkes, 1992, p.39) and how behaviour is shaped by ‘… political forces, economic conditions, social structures and inequalities’ (Colley, 2003, p.5).

\textsuperscript{23} ‘Meso-level’: factors impacting on behaviour at the institutional level (Colley, 2003, p.5).
p.236). It would allow for the production of context-dependent knowledge important for the development of expertise. Context-dependent knowledge was considered to be ‘... more valuable than the vain search for predictive theories and universals’ (Flyvberg, 2006, p.224).

While this study sought a more accurate understanding of mentor / trainee relationships and the approach taken sat broadly within the interpretist paradigm, it could not claim to be polarised into one of the three distinctive interpretist methodologies: phenomenology, symbolic interaction or ethnography. It went beyond the phenomenologist’s focus on the perspectives of respondents and their accounts of experience and meaning (Cohen and Omery, 1994). It did not ‘bracket’ the ‘preconceptions about the world ... to seek the roots or beginnings of knowledge in the subjective processes, in things themselves’ (Ray, 1994, p.119). Rather, it drew on and embraced my preconceptions, previous experience and knowledge and acknowledged the impact of this on the interpretation of meaning. Like symbolic interactionists, I was interested in the interaction and encounters of individuals at the micro-level. However, symbolic interactionists want to understand each individual and how they act within society so that they develop an understanding of the underlying forms of human interaction (Marshall, 1998, p.657). Whilst this study did focus on the interactions of mentors and trainees, it did so to increase understanding of the mentor / trainee relationships and mentoring. The ethnographic methodology has as its primary focus an understanding of behaviour in a cultural context to gain understanding of cultural phenomena (Holoway and Wheeler, 1996). It consequently requires intense and extended periods of involvement and observation in the respondents’ culture. While there may have been many benefits from spending extended periods of time with mentors and trainees, my time restrictions made this impossible. In many ways, however, because of my knowledge and accumulated experience from over ten years of working with mentors and trainees within the partnership, this study

_____________________________________________________________________

24 ‘Micro-level’: level of personal interaction (Colley, 2003, p.5).
was ‘infused by a flavour of ethnography’ (Hardcastle, 2002, p.82). Overall, therefore, I drew on elements from the range of interpretist methodologies.

5.3 Methods considered and discarded

Given the exploratory nature of the study and my quest for learning through a more informed understanding, case study appeared to me to be the most appropriate method. Surveys limit investigation of the context (Yin, 1994) and only offer a ‘snapshot’ of a setting (Edwards and Talbot, 1999, p.33). Consequently, they do not allow for exploration of what goes on and how things happen between mentor and trainee within the natural setting of the school. Consideration was given to action research, described by McNiff, Lomax and Whitehead (1996, p.7) as ‘a form of practitioner research that can be used to help you improve your practice in many different types of workplaces’. This too was disregarded because of my perceived need to gain greater understanding of what goes on prior to consideration of raising awareness and improving practice.

5.3.1 The case study method

Case study is a flexible and ‘comprehensive research strategy’ (Yin, 1994, p.13), well recognised in the social sciences as a way of doing research (Edwards and Talbot, 1999; Stake, 2000). It is ‘useful for the study of human affairs’ (Stake, 2000, p.19) and suited to the qualitative paradigm (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). It allows for an in-depth study of individuals, areas, settings, social phenomena and interaction within the context to be observed (Yin, 1994; Edwards and Talbot, 1999). Qualitative case study allows researchers to ‘preserve the multiple realities’ (Stake, 1995, p.12) and to be subjective, thus providing scope for interpretation (Flyvberg, 2006). A qualitative educational case study seemed to be the most suitable research method for this study. Its flexibility suited my ontological and epistemological positions within the interpretist paradigm and it allowed exploration of authentic experiences of mentors and trainees in their natural settings through the use of mixed research techniques. Additionally, whilst mixed research techniques would produce primarily word-based qualitative data, they would generate also some numerical data to enable readers to extract greater meaning from the narrative descriptions (Sandelowski, 2001). The case study
method facilitated my ‘expansionist pursuit’ (Stake, 2000, p.24) of proliferating information about mentor / trainee relationships within the Southern University partnership, and added to ‘existing experience and humanistic understanding’ to maximise what could be learned (Stake, 2000, p.24).

5.3.2 Type of case study

Six types of case study were considered: exploratory, descriptive, explanatory (Yin, 1994), as well as intrinsic, instrumental and comparative (Stake, 1995). The exploratory case can be used to build theories (DeVaus, 2001) and as a pilot study for further research (Yin, 1984 and 1994). The descriptive case describes a phenomenon within its context (Yin, 1994; Edwards and Talbot, 1999) and provides narrative accounts (Yin, 1984; Merriam, 1988; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). The explanatory case tests theory, makes judgements (Yin, 1984, Merriam, 1988, Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000), illustrates principles, and evaluates or compares studies (Edwards and Talbot, 1999). Additionally, intrinsic case studies provide a greater understanding of a particular and unique case; and finally, instrumental case studies seek insight into a particular issue and comparative case studies provide greater understanding of groups studied (Stake, 1995).

This case study is exploratory and, in addition to its contribution to existing knowledge and understanding (Bassey, 1999), it has potential to be a pilot study for further research (Yin, 1994). For example, it could be seen as the ‘… starting point for … a piece of action research’ (Edwards and Talbot, 1999, p.53). As it is used to gather information about mentor / trainee relationships and describes pictures through descriptive-analytical accounts, it comes close in purpose to a descriptive case, which is used ‘… to gain insights into the area of study …’ (Edwards and Talbot, 1999, p.53). In this instance, the case study is instrumental to accomplishing something other than understanding ‘… a particular case’ (Stake, 1995, p.3). The principal criterion in selection of the Southern University course was that it would provide a deeper understanding of the mentor / trainee relationships and the nature of mentoring within the Southern University partnership.
5.3.3 Selection of the case and its embedded units

The case selected is a ‘bounded system’ (Punch, 1998, p.153) with ‘…geographical, organisational and institutional boundaries…’ (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1995, p.319; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.182). The BA (Hons) Physical Education with QTS Degree at Southern University is a nationally recognised course subject to the DfES (2002) government regulations and the University’s partnership guidelines for ITT courses. Therefore, it is representative of other ITT courses nationally bounded by the same DfES (2002) regulations. However, while this particular university’s guidelines are similar in some ways to those produced by other courses in England and Wales, they are not currently exactly the same. Although multiple cases would have allowed for comparison and diversity, distance between institutions and the limited time of one researcher made this an impractical option.

A number of relationships had to be selected for study to understand more about the nature of mentoring and the PE ITT mentor / trainee relationship within the Southern University partnership. DeVaus (2001, p.220) refers to the terms ‘holistic’ and ‘embedded’ units used by Yin (1989) to identify the levels of components or the number of sources within a case, and demonstrates a case with a number of sources through using the analogy of a marriage. While characteristics such as, for example, the length, stage, type of marriage are considered at the holistic level (the case as a whole), the husband and wife are regarded as embedded units (components) within the marriage. This enables the researcher to build a clearer picture of the marriage ‘by incorporating the experiences and perspectives of the husband and wife’ (DeVaus, 2001, p.220). Similarly, data gained from the mentors and trainees within relationships (embedded units) enhanced understanding of mentoring and the mentor / trainee relationships that existed within the BA (Hons) Physical Education with QTS (4 year) degree within the Southern University partnership.

As there were many mentors, situated throughout the ‘home counties’ and beyond, who worked within the University partnership, there needed to be a selection process to identify which mentors would be involved in the study. I
decided that it would be unethical to place the further pressure of research on novice mentors and those who were deemed to be working towards improving their efficiency. Consequently, I needed to determine who the already efficient mentors were, prior to selecting a sample. My judgement was based upon the Southern University PE subject tutors’ criteria for efficient mentors. Ten university-based PE subject tutors, with over five years experience each, were asked to identify key characteristics of efficient mentors grouped into three clusters: mentors’ knowledge and experience of procedures and practice, mentors’ professional practice and mentors’ competencies, skills and qualities. The ten PE subject tutors then used the clusters of characteristics to identify at least four efficient mentors with whom they had worked in the past two years. From the list of mentors identified, six were selected based upon the distance of their school from the University as travel time had to be kept to a minimum. This sampling process was in line with what LeCompte and Preissle (1993) identify as reputational sampling, i.e. a sample based upon what experts in the field recommend. In the sample, there were two male and four female mentors. In addition to the six mentors invited to participate in the main study, I invited two mentors to take part in the pilot study.

It was anticipated that each of the six mentors selected would work with one year 4 trainee on their final fifteen week school placement and then with one year 3 trainee on their intermediate fifteen week school placement. This would provide data from twelve relationships. However, I recognised, first, that mentors in schools could change over the course of the research; and, second, that they might not be given a year 4 and year 3 trainee. With these possibilities out of my control, the planned sample size allowed room for some drop out. In the first phase of the study, when year 4 trainees were placed with the six mentors, there were four same-sex pairs (one male / male and three female / female) and two mixed sex pairs (one male mentor and female trainee and one female mentor and male trainee). In phase two, the sample size was reduced from twelve to six

25 Efficient mentors were those who subject tutors believed were able to carry out the Southern University partnership procedures in a timely fashion.
relationships. Prior to the start of phase two, one male and one female mentor did not receive year 3 trainees and one male mentor was promoted and relinquished his mentoring role. The remaining relationships that made up the study consisted of three female mentors, five same-sex pairs, and one mixed-sex pair. Figure 8 shows the case with its six embedded units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern University Partnership</th>
<th>BA (Hons) Physical Education with QTS 4 year course with 15 week school placements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 1: Year 4 trainees</strong></td>
<td><strong>PHASE 2: Year 3 trainees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1</strong> Female mentor (1) / female trainee yr4</td>
<td><strong>R2</strong> Female mentor (2) / male trainee yr4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R3</strong> Female mentor (3) / female trainee yr4</td>
<td><strong>R4</strong> Female mentor (1) / female trainee yr3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R5</strong> Female mentor (2) / female trainee yr3</td>
<td><strong>R6</strong> Female mentor (3) / female trainee yr3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8  The case with its six embedded units*

*Key:*  R1 – R6: Relationships 1 – 6

There were a number of similarities and differences between mentors, the trainees, and myself, which had to be declared because of the potential impact on the explanation and interpretation of data. Similarities included: race; a keen interest in teaching physical education and physical activity; and knowledge of the government, university and school requirements for ITT. In addition, all mentors and five of the six trainees were female like myself and I had worked with all participants prior to the start of the research in my capacity as senior lecturer, subject tutor and link tutor at Southern University. Good working relationships, already established, enabled an easy rapport, empathy and mutual respect for each other from the start of the research process. Differences included: my culture, age, status within the University; a broader and more in-depth understanding of mentoring literature; greater experience of ITT and in one instance, my different sex.
5.3.4 The strength and credibility of the study and possibilities for generalisation

The subjective nature of qualitative case study research such as this meant that perspectives would differ and there would be difficulties justifying its credibility (Yin, 1994). Like Edwards and Talbot (1999) and Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000), I claim that case study method should be judged on its own terms and does not have to demonstrate the positivist criterion of reliability. As recommended by Patton (1990) and Altheide and Johnson (1994), this study was strengthened by my commitment to search diligently for a greater understanding of mentoring and mentor / trainee relationships within the context. My in-depth awareness of the ITT culture enhanced interpretations (Altheide and Johnson, 1994) and the proposed combination of guided reflection through questionnaires, observations and focused interviews gave ‘a three point perspective’ (Edwards and Talbot, 1999, p.55) of the mentor / trainee relationships, to ‘… secure an in-depth understanding’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p.2). Respondent validation meant that interpretations were checked with mentors and trainees during interviews and, additionally, my reflexive approach meant I documented ways in which the research was conducted, the challenges encountered and how these were dealt with (Measor, 1999). This study did not aim to make formal generalisations of universal truths to a population of mentor / trainee relationships. It focused on units within one case in greater depth to maximise learning and understanding. Whilst this knowledge may not be formally generalised to the population of courses and mentor / trainee relationships, it can ‘… enter into the collective process of knowledge accumulation in a given field’ (Flyvberg, 2006, p.227). It was realistic to expect that qualitative (Tripp, 1985), naturalistic (Stake, 1995) and fuzzy (Bassey, 1999) generalisations would occur. For example, Tripp’s (1985) qualitative generalisations can be made by reading the findings for the first time and applying them to knowledge of similar cases to develop understanding (Bassey, 1999). Alternatively, naturalistic generalisation might be based upon the process of learning through which we acquire information, develop concepts and generalise them to other situations (Stake, 1995; Bassey, 1999). Additionally, readers could, through a ‘vicarious experience’, also make
‘naturalistic generalisations’ (Stake 1995, p.86). Such possibilities necessitated that the case report described events in detail, allowing the reader to feel ‘as if it was happening to them’ (Stake, 1995, p.86) and gain their own unique meaning(s) from the findings (Stake, 1995).

Bassey’s (1999, p.52) concept of ‘fuzzy generalisations’ demonstrates well how the findings of this study could be of use to practitioners in ITT. He claims that, where absolute certainty does not exist, a better way of identifying the value of the findings is by making general statements, which introduce ‘the element of uncertainty’, as for example, ‘Do y instead of x and your pupils may learn more’ (Bassey, 1999, p.51). This case report aims to make use of fuzzy generalisations. It invites practitioners in ITT to read about the findings, discuss them with colleagues, reflect on the issues, test findings in their own situations and ‘report the outcomes to whatever group will listen’ (Bassey, 1999, p.52). Overall, I encourage practitioners to ‘… discover their own paths and truths inside the case’ (Flyvberg, 2006, p.238). Like Bassey (1999, p.52), I claim that:

… in the use of the adjective ‘fuzzy’ the likelihood of there being exceptions is clearly recognised and this seems an appropriate concept for research in areas like education where human complexity is paramount.

In addition, I concur with Flyvberg (2006, p.238) who argues that:

the dense case study … is more useful for the practitioner and more interesting for social theory than either factual ‘findings’ or the high level generalisations of theory.

5.4 The selection of specific research techniques

In answer to the question “How should such a case study be delivered?”, I drew on the work of Denscombe (1998), Kumar (1999), Measor (1999) and Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) and others, as I sought to select the most appropriate techniques to examine and interpret the perceptions and behaviour of mentors and trainees within the mentor / trainee relationship. Consideration was given to ‘fitness for purpose’ when selecting data collection techniques that ranged from
unstructured field notes at one end to structured surveys at the other (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.243). Techniques most used in qualitative research included participant observation, journals, interviews, documents and video and audio recordings (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.243). In this research, I faced the challenge of selecting the most appropriate techniques that would provide a wide-angle view of the relationships and provide rich qualitative data. Severe time limitations did not allow me to spend long periods in schools with mentors and trainees. Consequently, the techniques chosen had to enable:

a. mentors and trainees to document their thoughts and experiences at the beginning, middle and end of the placement;

b. observation of interactions between mentors and trainees;

c. dialogue between myself, mentors and trainees, to check interpretations and add to existing data;

d. the identification of change over time.

I consequently argue a case for the combined use of guided reflection in the form of semi-structured questionnaires, observations and interviews as the most appropriate research techniques for this study. They complement each other and provide the breadth of focus required for a more comprehensive and sophisticated understanding. Figure 9 identifies the multi-techniques used and the process I undertook from stage 1 in weeks 3 – 4 to Stage 3 in weeks 12 – 14. At every stage mentors and trainees were asked to complete the guided reflection through questionnaires; and observation was carried out. Additionally at stages 2 and 3, individual interviews with mentors and trainees were conducted.
5.4.1 Guided reflection in the form of Questionnaires

A continuous flow of data was required to track mentors’ and trainees’ thoughts and views of their relationship as the placement progressed. Reflective journals advocated by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) were considered initially as an attractive tool to identify mentors’ and trainees’ perspectives from the beginning to the end of the placement. However, with limited time, mentors and trainees may have overlooked and neglected open-ended journal records and this could have reduced both the amount of data received and its depth. Questionnaires, on the other hand, were considered a more appropriate means of eliciting the required
data in my absence (Denscombe, 1998). Through a mixture of open and closed-ended questions, I used themes from the literature to prompt mentors and trainees, generate thinking and guide reflection.

Although, given the time limitations, mailed questionnaires were appealing, they have a low response rate (Oppenheim, 1992; Kumar, 1999) and use of the postal service could not guarantee efficiency. With continuity a necessity, it was important for mentors and trainees to receive and complete questionnaires on time. Hence, delivery and collection of questionnaires seemed the only way to guarantee success. Whilst this demanded time for travel it also gave me peace of mind and kept mentors, trainees and the research on track. Mentors and trainees were given a schedule for the whole process at the start, along with agreed and predetermined dates and times for the delivery and collection of questionnaires. In addition, mentors and trainees were contacted at least once by e-mail, offered assistance and were reminded of deadlines. Also, I gave them my telephone numbers and e-mail address and they were encouraged to contact me if assistance or clarification was needed. Thus, lines of communication were kept open to facilitate development of relationships between myself and the participants and completion of questionnaires.

Three questionnaires were administered at the start (week 3), in the middle (week 7) and at the end (week 12) of the placement:

• In Questionnaire 1, mentors and trainees gave background information about themselves, the school and the university. Also, they were encouraged to reflect on their relationships, use of interpersonal skills, active listening skills and mentors’ ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19);

• In Questionnaire 2, mentors and trainees reflected on and identified any changes in their relationships over the first six weeks. In addition to the themes addressed in Questionnaire 1, questions facilitated reflection on each trainee’s stage of learning to teach, the presence (or not) of Rogers (1957) core conditions, emotional intelligence skills and mentoring skills such as questioning, feedback and goal setting;
In Questionnaire 3, mentors and trainees reflected on the same themes as those identified in Questionnaire 2, reviewed their relationship over the placement and identified any changes. In addition, they addressed both their approach to ending the relationships and how these might continue after the placement. In a joint questionnaire [task 1(a) and task 1(b) and 2], mentors and trainees considered together Walker and Stott’s (1993) stages in an educational mentoring relationship, prior to reflection on and identification of broad stages in their own relationship.

Each time a questionnaire was administered both parties were given an introduction to the questionnaire, with definitions of all key terms used. Respondents were given a maximum of two weeks to complete the questionnaire, because of both its length and their restricted time. In addition they were advised to read both the definitions of key terms and all questions before they answered questions, to get a feel for the nature of the information required. As I realised respondents could feel over-burdened by the process, they were advised to answer a few questions at a time over two weeks, rather than attempt to answer all questions in one go.

Qualitative, less structured, word-based and open-ended questionnaires may have enabled the collection of additional rich and personal data (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.247) and allowed additional themes to emerge. However, in this case it was felt that open-ended questions alone might have restricted the range and depth of responses (Denscombe, 1998). Based upon my experience, I thought mentors and trainees needed examples and prompts to expand their focus, to generate thoughts and to increase their breadth and depth of reflection on a variety of aspects of mentoring and mentoring relationships. Without these, I feared their responses would remain limited and superficial. Consequently, combinations of closed and open-ended questions were considered to be the best fit for purpose (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Whilst closed-ended questions offered mentors and trainees optional answers (Denscombe, 1998; Kumar, 1999; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000), open-ended questions enabled them to give more depth and detail of their thoughts and feelings.
Although I believed this would capture their points of view (Patton, 1980) I acknowledged the risks of steering the research towards a more quantitative approach by using themes generated from the literature, and of increasing researcher bias through the use of closed questions. Even so, I considered there was greater value and benefit in extending mentors’ and trainees’ focus, range and depth of reflection on their own relationships. The sequences of probing, checking and justifying questions (Parsloe and Wray, 2000) enabled respondents to express their own perspectives, raise additional issues and identify their own realities. Despite all those efforts, there was always a worry that mentors and trainees would not complete questionnaires and/or answers would lack detail because of time constraints. Therefore, the development and maintenance of trustworthy and empathetic relationships between the respondents and myself was important.

The sequencing of questions was considered carefully as poor sequencing could negatively affect both the quality of responses received and the motivation of respondents to continue (or not) with the completion of questionnaires (Oppenheim, 1992; Denscombe, 1998; Kumar, 1999). Sequences of questions based on aspects of mentoring relationships included a mixture of question types. They included combinations of dichotomous questions (yes/no), semantic differential questions and multiple choice questions, each followed by open-ended questions to which respondents considered explanations, reasons and feelings from their own perspective (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). In line with Cohen, Manion and Morrison’s (2000) argument, it was anticipated that careful selection of open-ended questions enabled respondents to write free responses and to explain and qualify their views. Examples of question types can be seen in Appendices 1 and 2. The questionnaires were piloted in sequence. As a result, some questions were omitted from the main study because of the repetition of information in the answers provided. The pilot study is addressed in Section 5.9.

5.5 Observation

Observation is one of the earliest forms of research and has ‘… served as the bedrock source of human knowledge’ (Adler and Adler, 1994. p.377). It was an ideal technique to use in this research to study patterns of behaviour, i.e. what
mentors and trainees actually did during interactions in order to supplement what they said they did. Thus I was able to watch, listen and record firsthand what went on within interactions (Denscombe, 1998; Kumar, 1999). Whilst there was a possibility that only surface issues would be identified, I recognised also the potential opportunities over time to identify novel issues, raise questions (Edwards and Talbot, 1999) and ‘…discover things that participants may not freely talk about’ (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.305). Observations were believed to be appropriate for the purpose of this study because they complemented the data collected from questionnaires and informed further my interpretations.

5.5.1 The range of observation types

Observation types can be regarded as on a continuum which extends from systematic observation to participant observation (Kumar, 1999; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Systematic observation for the production of numerical data and the use of statistical analysis is linked with the quantitative paradigm. This approach is efficient for collecting direct pre-coded data in a short period of time, which is then systematically and rigorously analysed. Whilst this approach was attractive because of my restricted time, it threatened my position within the interpretist paradigm. This type of observation technique excluded ‘the intentions and motivations’ of participants, did not allow for ‘individual’s subjectivity’ and neglected ‘… the significance of the context’ (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, pp.309-310). Consequently critical non-routine events, classified respectively by Flanagan (1949) and Wragg (1994) as ‘critical incidents’ and ‘critical events’ that contributed insight, could get lost (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.310).

Conversely, participant observation, associated with naturalistic and qualitative observation (Denscombe, 1998), strongly supported my position within the interpretist paradigm. Participant observation here is defined as ‘the method in which the observer participates in the daily life of the people under study, either openly or covertly’ (Becker and Geer, 1957, p.28). This type of observation requires less equipment, facilitates the maintenance of the naturalness of the
setting, allows for rich insights, is sensitive to the context and makes possible holistic explanations (Denscombe, 1998). However, various difficulties and limitations include the demands made on the researcher, the high level of commitment required, possible dangers in the setting and difficulties with generalisation of data (Denscombe, 1998).

In this study, whilst it would have been beneficial for me to spend more time in schools to observe mentors and trainees in day-to-day activities, time constraints prevented this type of ethnographic observation. Indeed, although participation in mentors’ and trainees’ daily routines might have led to greater understanding of the dynamics of their relationship and insights in a variety of situations, it might have got in the way of their work and significantly impacted upon their behaviour. Nevertheless, it was important that mentors’ and trainees’ interactions were observed as they interrelated within their environment (Patton, 1990). Therefore, a position between the two extremes of the continuum of interview types was adopted. This allowed me to enter the world of mentors and trainees as a participant observer (I was known to be watching), through the lens of a video camera with a focus on…the physical environment and its organisation … the organisation of people … the formal / informal, planned / unplanned, and verbal / non-verbal [interactions within the environment and] the resources and pedagogic styles within the setting. (Morrison, 1993, p.80)

This peripheral position provided opportunity ‘to balance involvement with detachment, familiarity with strangeness, closeness with distance’ (Adler and Adler, 1994, p.379).

5.5.2 The researcher as a participant observer

There are several major concerns for those involved in participant observation. Firstly: the high possibility of observer bias because of the researcher’s own perceptions and interpretations (Adler and Adler, 1994). In relation to this, I worried most about the possibility of allowing my perspective as a subject and link tutor to colour my interpretations at the expense of mentors’ and trainees’ perspectives. Secondly: the impact of the researcher on participants’ behaviour,
known as the Hawthorne effect (Adler and Adler, 1994; Denscombe, 1998; Kumar, 1999; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Thirdly: the impact of the researcher’s competencies on the quality of the observation (Angrosino and Mayes de Perez, 2003). I recognised these challenges associated with participant observation and attempted to reduce the concerns. I checked and clarified issues with participants during interviews; reduced the ‘Hawthorne effect’ through the digital video recording of meetings rather than being present in the meeting room with the respondents; carried out many progressive layers of observations and used transcriptions of dialogue to capture all of what was said. Despite this, there still remained the possibility of researcher bias caused by my quality assurance roles of subject tutor, link tutor and university lecturer, knowledge of the literature, prior knowledge of the participants, and the Hawthorn effect caused by the participants’ awareness of the camera and my distant presence.

5.5.3 Video-recorded observations and methods of recording data

Video-recorded observations that can be likened to ‘a one-way mirror’ (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.306) are potentially very powerful (Erickson, 1992). They provide the opportunity for a more complete analysis, reduce dependence on the researcher’s prior interpretations and reduce the danger of reporting only things that occur frequently (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Additionally, video recorded data allowed me to carry out some systematic, quantitative data analysis of the types of verbal and non-verbal communication of mentors and trainees (listening skills, questions and interventions) as indicated in the literature. On the other hand, there was the danger of reactivity caused by the installation of a camera; and the fixed position of the camera limited what was seen within the context (Morrison, 1993). Whilst I acknowledged that the fixed camera would limit some aspects of the surroundings, this was considered to be minimal as mentor and trainee did not move around and always remained in focus. Moreover, it was hoped that the impact of the video camera would decrease during meetings as mentors and trainees became used to its presence (Denscombe, 1998).
Methods for recording observational data exist along a continuum ranging from very closed checklists associated with systematic observation to very open field notes and vignettes associated with participant observation (Adler and Adler, 1994; Edwards and Talbot, 1999). In this study, recorded data needed to include reference to the detail of participants’ actions and interactions (verbal and non-verbal) and to the organisation of the setting. The method, therefore, needed to be closer to the open-ended extreme of the continuum (Denzin, 1989; Adler and Adler, 1994; Edwards and Talbot, 1999). The semi-structured observational schedule provided a framework and guided my focus towards the participants’ overt behaviour, general characteristics of their dialogue and the content of meetings, but also allowed space for recording additional occurrences. Examples of how data were recorded in the observation schedules can be seen in Appendix 3a – b.

Video recorded mentor/trainee meetings were viewed repeatedly and additional notes made at each viewing. Whilst the first observation generated questions for the interviews, subsequent observations generated further notes and greater detail. This was likened to the stages of progressive observation identified by Adler and Adler (1994):

- holistic observation where the observer gets a feel for what went on;
- more focused observation as issues begin to emerge;
- special focused observations on unexpected aspects of the situation;
- observations to identify issues and problems.

The process progressively narrowed and directed my ‘… focus deeper into the elements of the research’ (Adler and Adler, 1994, p.381).

5.6 Interviews

Interviews have been described as social events between participant observers (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983; Silverman, 1993) and as conversations that develop knowledge (Kvale, 1996; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). While Denscombe (1998, p.109) likens an interview to a casual conversation, he acknowledges Silverman’s (1985) earlier view that interviews involve ‘… a set of
assumptions and understandings about the situation which are not normally associated with a casual conversation’. The most useful description of the research interview for this study was as ‘… a two-person conversation, initiated by the interviewer, for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information’ (Cannell and Kahan, 1968, p.527). The idea of a conversation gave the sense of a more relaxed atmosphere, which enabled some flexibility for me to ‘… modify … questions … explain them or add to them’ (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.268) and follow the lead of the mentor or trainee, whilst controlling the time.

Interviews are very suitable for case studies as they are ‘the main road to multiple realities’. They seek to establish the interpretations and multiple views of others (Stake, 1995, p.64) and when used with other techniques supplement, complement and corroborate data (Denscombe, 1998). For example, as they complemented observations and questionnaires this allowed me to explore participants’ motivations and reasons for their actions and responses (Kerlinger, 1970; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Perhaps the greatest advantage of the use of interviews in this study was the greater depth of information elicited, as mentors and trainees preferred talking to writing. Denscombe (1998), Kumar (1999) and Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) maintain this is the foremost advantage of interviews. I considered and disregarded paired interviews with mentors and trainees together. While the idea of paired interviews was appealing and would have saved time, the power imbalance between mentors, trainees and myself may have impeded responses.

In this study the first mentor and trainee interviews pursued and clarified the issues raised from questionnaires and observations completed in week 3 (stage 1) and in week 7 (stage 2). With data collated and analysed, questions were formulated for the interview that took place between weeks 8 and 10. This process was repeated in weeks 12 to 15 (stage 3) of the placement. Figure 10 shows the place of interviews in the research process and Appendices 4 and 5 give examples of interview questions at mid-placement.
Figure 10 The place of interviews in this research process

Key: Observation = Observation of mentor / trainee session
I accepted that conducting interviews would be time consuming and acknowledged other drawbacks such as the ‘interviewer effect’, mentors’ and trainees’ inhibitions, the ‘invasion of privacy’ and the ‘cost to the researcher of time for travel and transcription of data’ (Denscombe, 1998, pp.136-137). Hence, interviews were not an easy option, had to be carefully planned and throughout I needed to remain sensitive to the nature of the dialogue (Denscombe, 1998).

The preparation process was intense and had to be completed quickly. Data from questionnaires and observations had to be reviewed and analysed in a short period of time and appropriate questions formulated. In addition, a suitable time and room had to be arranged through the mentor, recording equipment checked and tapes purchased. Moreover, as all interviews fell within the same two weeks, this placed high demands on my availability during that period. Consequently effective time management, flexibility, negotiation and open lines of communication were essential. Despite these pressures, the advantages outweighed the disadvantages. The interviews provided, firstly, greater breadth and depth of data; secondly, a vehicle for sensitive issues, feelings, experiences and emotions to be addressed; and thirdly, the possibility for cross-examination of data.

As with questionnaires and observations there was an extended range of interview types to choose from (Patton, 1990; Oppenheim, 1992; Morrison, 1993; Denscombe, 1998; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000; Fontana and Frey, 2003). These ranged from quantitative and closed at one end to qualitative and open at the other. Based upon the qualitative nature of this study the interview type selected needed to be closer to the open-ended end of Morrison’s (1993) continuum. Hence, they needed to yield ‘subjective accounts’ through open-ended questions which provided ‘informal responsive knowledge’ and ‘captured uniqueness’ (Morrison’s, 1993, pp.34 - 36). Consequently, structured interviews were disregarded as they allowed little freedom, everything could not be planned in advance (Kumar, 1999; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000) and respondents had ‘little room for variation of response except when an infrequent open-ended question is asked’ (Fontana and Frey, 2003, p.363). On the other hand,
unstructured interviews at the other extreme of the continuum provided potentially too much freedom. For example, within the time limitations they did not allow me enough control to explore further all issues related to specific themes identified in questionnaires and observations. In addition, I realised that my passive stance may have restrained respondents’ talk (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983). Despite this, I needed mentors and trainees to ‘use their own words and develop their own thoughts’ (Denscombe, 1998, p.113), through the use of some spontaneous questions (Kumar, 1999).

With the interviews limited to one hour because of mentors and trainees’ time availability and with an extended number of issues to be addressed, semi-structured interviews were considered the most appropriate option. These could be placed somewhere around the middle of the continuum and struck a balance between quantitative / closed and qualitative / open types. Importantly, semi-structured interviews allowed for flexibility in the way issues were introduced and the extent to which informants developed their answers (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). I came to each interview with (prepared) open-ended questions that addressed a list of issues generated from questionnaires and observations. These allowed me to probe instances that occurred during interactions between mentors and trainees in the one-hour mentor sessions, encouraged respondents to elaborate on their answers (Silverman, 1993; Denscombe, 1998) and clarify the responses they gave in questionnaires. Such questions are popular with qualitative researchers as they allow for re-ordering of content, digression, expansion and further probing (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000).

In many ways the interviews used in this study can be classified as focused interviews, which Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) place in the semi-structured category. Focused interviews evolve out of the non-directive interview, introduce more interviewer control and address respondents’ responses to a known situation in which they have been involved and which has been analysed by the researcher prior to the interview (Merton and Kendall, 1946; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Information gained from the interview can then be
used to substantiate or reject previously formulated interpretations (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000).

5.6.1 Use of video recorded interviews

For me, the advantages of using video recordings of interviews outweighed any disadvantages. Recorded data captured both verbal and non-verbal cues, prevented the distraction of note taking, allowed me to remain alert to what was said and to probe (Loftland and Loftland, 1984) and provided a permanent record that would be revisited many times (Denscombe, 1998). Keeping a detailed record of what was said in interviews was important for rich and accurate descriptions. I acknowledged, however, that the presence of the camera could be intrusive and might intimidate the respondents (Denscombe, 1998).

Table 18 relates the detail of the fieldwork process and identifies how questionnaires, observations and interviews were combined during the fieldwork.
STAGE 1:  Week 3 of the placement  
Visit 1 (week two of the placement)  
1. Deliver:  
   i. reflective questionnaire to be completed by mentor (Q3M) and trainee (Q3T) during week 3 of the placement.  
   ii. the mini videocassette for filming the mentor / trainee hours (Obs3M/T) during week 3 of the placement.  

Visit 2 (end of week 3 of placement)  
1. Collect the reflective questionnaires (Q1M & Q1T) and the videocassette of the mentor / trainee hour.  
2. Deliver:  
   i. reflective questionnaire to be completed by mentor (Q2M) and trainee (Q2T) during week 7 of the placement.  
   ii. the mini videocassette for filming the mentor / trainee hours (Obs2M/T) during week 7 of the placement.

STAGE 2:  Week 7 of the placement  
Visit 3 (end of week 7 of placement)  
1. Collect the reflective questionnaires (Q2M and Q2T) and the digital videocassette of the mentor / trainee hour (Obs2M/T) in week 7.  

Visit 4 (beginning of week 9 of placement)  
1. Individual Interviews with the mentor (Itv1M) and trainee (Itv1T): Interview questions will focus on the data collected from the videoed observation (Obs1 & 2M/T) and the reflective questionnaires (Q1 & 2M & Q1 & 2T). The interview will aim to reflect upon, clarify and expand data received and will last no longer than one hour.  
2. Deliver:  
   i. reflective questionnaires to be completed by mentor (Q3M) and trainee (Q3T) during week 12 of the placement.  
   ii. the mini videocassette for filming the mentor / trainee hours (Obs3M/T) during week 12 of the placement.

STAGE 3:  Week 12 and 14 of placement  
Visit 5 (end of week 12 of placement)  
1. Collect the reflective questionnaires (Q3M & Q3T) and the digital videocassette of the mentor / trainee hour (Obs3M/T).  

Visit 6 (beginning of week 14 of placement)  
1. Individual Interviews with the mentor (Itv2M) and trainee (Itv2T): Interview questions will focus on the data collected from the videoed observation (Obs3M/T) and the reflective questionnaires (Q3M & Q3T). The interview will aim to reflect upon, clarify and expand data received and will last no longer than one hour.

Table 18  The Fieldwork Schedule
5.6.2 The researcher’s role in interviews

I was constantly aware of the effects my presence might have on participants during interviews. Whilst respondents may have talked more freely because they already knew me, they may also have withheld information if they felt threatened, embarrassed or antagonistic (Denscombe, 1998). I recognised the positive impact of good working relationships on the quality of the data (Jones, 1991). Hence, I worked hard to develop open, friendly relationships with respondents and remained sensitive to their needs and feelings throughout the duration of the research at the expense of my own time and energy. Having completed a one-year experiential course in the use of counselling skills prior to the start of the fieldwork, I used these skills to help put the respondents at ease and keep them motivated and supported, which was required of me as an interviewer (Oppenheim, 1992; Stake, 1995; Denscombe, 1998). I was not, however, a highly experienced interviewer and found it difficult at times to maintain a focus on the issues, manage time carefully (Fontana and Frey, 2003) and apply effectively active listening skills. Nevertheless, as a result of my good intentions and my skill level as an interviewer, mentors and trainees seemed comfortable, at ease most of the time and willing to discuss their views. Occasionally, I had to cut answers short or extend an interview, but this occurred more often at the start as I was becoming accustomed to the process.

5.7 Analysis of data

The advantages of qualitative analysis of data include valid descriptions ‘grounded in reality … richness and detail … a tolerance of ambiguity and contradictions [and] the prospect of alternative explanations’ (Denscombe, 1998, pp.220–222). Disadvantages include challenges with representation of findings, the possibility of significant researcher effect and the dangers of oversimplification of the descriptions (Denscombe, 1998).

Although my ITT experience and broad perspective on mentoring facilitated analysis of the data, I recognised the significant impact it could have on how this was interpreted. My internal judgemental ‘voices’ — of subject tutor, link tutor
and experienced educator with understanding of trainees’ development — were often difficult to silence. Hence, great effort had to be made to see and understand circumstances from the others’ perspectives through listening carefully to the voices of mentors and trainees and continuously crosschecking data. In addition, the need for reflection on the ‘baggage’ I brought to the research in the form of my background, values, sex and age (Sparkes, 1995) was constant.

There are a variety of methods available for the analysis of qualitative data because of its complexity and uniqueness and the difference in research questions (Punch, 1998). Consequently, there is ‘… no single way to do qualitative data analysis’ (Punch, 1998, p.190) as different techniques illuminate different aspects and the chosen way depends on the aims of the research and the research questions. However, what links all approaches is the rigorous interpretation of data so that it captures the complexities of what researchers try to explain (Punch, 1998; Silverman, 1993; Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). Therefore, whatever methods are used, processes need ‘to be systematic, disciplined … and transparent’ (Punch, 1998, p.200). Hence, it was important that I employed strategies that would enable me, in the shift between academic knowledge and knowledge gleaned from data, to hear what was said (Measor, 1999).

The aim of this study was not suited to analytic induction (Znaniecki, 1934), which focuses on induction and deduction and investigates and tests hypotheses that establish similarities between cases and developed concepts. Although grounded theory analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) was considered, this approach focused on the development of theory. Whilst the early stages of this process suited the needs of this study, I made no claim to develop theory. Rather, I intended to enhance understanding and indicate areas for further research, which could then lead to the development of theory. In addition, I wanted to ‘… enrich the thinking and discourse of educators’ (Stenhouse, 1985, p.50) and contribute to the educational debate among teacher training providers, teachers, mentors and policy makers. Throughout the process of transforming data, I was intent on the pursuit of discrepancy (Cole, 1993): that is, I was involved in a ‘cyclable process of data analysis’, which entails ‘progressive refinement or revision of results until
they are consistent with the data’ (Rose, 1982, p.124). Thus, I reviewed and checked repeatedly the tentative results, which were no more than hunches at the start (Rose, 1982). Whilst the process started with taking a ‘wide-angle lens’ to the data (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.148), it progressed to the ‘…microscopic examination of data, the formulation of accurate interpretations and the writing of detailed reports that examined concepts and demonstrated the links between them’ (Strauss (1987, p.4). Consequently, analysis was guided by a combination of Miles and Huberman’s (1994) framework for analysis of qualitative data, Measor’s (1999) stages of the exploration and mapping of data, and Cohen, Manion and Morrison’s (2000) stages of analysis. This was considered a best fit for the needs of this research. An outline of these approaches can be seen in Table 19.

| Miles & Huberman (1994, p.10) | i. data reduction;  
|                              | ii. data display;  
|                              | iii. conclusion drawing / verification. |

| Measor (1999) | i. naming categories and themes;  
|               | ii. summarising, listening-in roles (looking at the data from the perspective of the respondents);  
|               | iii. descriptive statements about each section;  
|               | iv. checking which categories and themes are appearing most;  
|               | v. checking that themes are appropriate and appearing in each research situation;  
|               | vi. comparing the data against itself;  
|               | vii. checking if any data is going against what comes up frequently;  
|               | viii. separating and presenting distinctions between data, describing, interpreting and implying. |

| Cohen, Manion and Morrison’s (2000, p.148) | i. ‘taking a wide-angle lens to gather data’, then  
|                                            | ii. sifting, sorting, reviewing and reflecting on the data to allow prominent features to emerge;  
|                                            | iii. prominent features are used as an agenda for subsequent focusing (similar to progressive focusing developed by Parlett and Hamilton, 1976). |

**Table 19** The process of analysis of qualitative data: Miles and Huberman’s (1994) framework; Measor’s (1999) and Cohen, Manion and Morrison’s (2000) stages of analysis
Gallagher (1995) supports this fit-for-purpose approach and suggests that although a researcher may undertake analysis in a number of ways to achieve meaning and understanding it should not be an exacting process.

Preparation for qualitative analysis was important because of the need to manage efficiently the massive amounts of data elicited. Questionnaires and interviews were planned carefully and, for greater ease of analysis, questions were organised into themes previously identified in the mentoring literature. Data received from questionnaires and observations were placed into the existing themes. Depth of understanding was achieved as I sorted information under themes, reflected on the occurring features, wrote descriptions and placed these in tabular form, cross-checked and compared data across stages and across relationships and identified unique features and those that occurred frequently. Cross-checking data against what mentors and trainees stated in questionnaires, said in interviews and did in meetings increased confidence in the quality of the findings. A schematic representation of the layers of analysis carried out can be found in Appendix 6.

Over time, through engagement in a continuous process of reading, thinking, recording, re-reading data and checking interpretations with mentors and trainees, I perceived how features within themes fitted together. Words were used ‘as a unit of analysis’ (Denscombe, 1998, p.174) to generate descriptive accounts from questionnaires, focused interviews and observations. In addition, numbers in the form of percentages were used as units to identify which types of mentor interventions, questions and trainee interventions occurred. The percentages thus generated informed word-based descriptions of the nature of the mentor / trainee dialogue, and in turn these enlightened accounts of the nature of the relationships (Onwuegbuzie and Daniel, 2003). By considering the count, readers could decide for themselves the adjective that best described what was happening (Onwuegbuzie and Daniel, 2003). I therefore argue that readers can extract greater meaning when counts are given in addition to narrative descriptions (Sandelowski, 2001). Thorough analysis of the data revealed the emergence of

26 A list of themes covered can be found in Chapter 6, Table 20.
patterns, facilitated naturalistic generalisations (Stake, 1995), fuzzy generalisations (Bassey, 1999) and emphasised discovery and learning rather than proof.

5.8 Ethical considerations

Many ethical issues were considered and judgements made about ethical dilemmas based upon a sensitivity to the rights of mentors and trainees (Cavan, 1977; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Throughout, commonsense and a sense of moral responsibility were applied (Punch, 1986), for example when mentors and/or trainees had to reschedule or delay interviews, or delay the collection of questionnaires due to their busy schedules. At all times, I paid attention to maintaining confidentiality, using information appropriately and making determined attempts to reduce bias (Punch, 1986; Kumar, 1999).

The needs of participants, the university, the research and the situation in schools demanded a very principled approach. Careful planning that demonstrated obligation to the participants’ safety and anticipation of and preparation for problems that might develop (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000) was essential. I made every effort to preserve the existing good relations between the University, schools, mentors, trainees and myself. Failure to do this could have potentially damaged the business of the partnership, my working relations with colleagues in the University and in schools and working relations between personnel in schools and those in the University. What follows provides an overview of the ethical issues addressed. These included the need for informed consent; costs / benefits ratio; confidentiality; betrayal; deception; anonymity and privacy (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992; Kumar, 1999; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000; Fontana and Frey, 2003).

5.8.1 Informed consent

Greater understanding of the mentor / trainee relationship was considered beneficial to all professionals involved in ITT. Consequently, it was ethical that participants be asked for information, provided that they first gave informed consent (Kumar, 1999).
Informed consent was thought to be highly desirable and it was considered important to respect the rights of the mentors and trainees, obtain their co-operation, allow them to volunteer and to opt out of the process at any time and prepare them for the demands of the process by providing a detailed explanation of procedures. In general, the participants’ ‘right to freedom and self-determination’ (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.51) was considered essential.

I provided University personnel, head teachers, mentors and trainees with documentation that outlined the planned research and the expectations of those involved, so that they might then make an informed decision (Schinke and Gilchrist, 1993; Kumar, 1999; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Prior to approaching mentors, trainees and schools, support and consent for the research was sought and gained from the Head of School (within the Faculty) at the University, my line manager, the Faculty Co-ordinator of University Partnerships and the Trainee Placement Co-ordinator. This was important in case any unforeseen problems arose that impacted on the business of the University partnership and schools, the roles of subject tutors, mentors and myself and the trainees’ progression on the course. Once University personnel gave their support, PE subject tutors were approached and asked to consent to take part in the selection of mentors. It was important they understood their part in the process and were reassured that there was no pressure to participate and that any information provided would remain confidential. Likewise, they were asked to keep the names of mentors they provided confidential; and I confirmed that once I had selected the mentors, I would not disclose the names. Once mentors were selected and trainees placed in schools, consent was sought from the mentors, trainees and head teachers of schools in that order. Mentors and trainees volunteered with full knowledge of what was involved. My documentation indicated clearly that once they consented and started the process, they could withdraw at any time without any repercussions on them or the school (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992). Additionally, they were ensured that findings would neither impact on partnership agreements with the University nor be used to inform trainees’ assessment.
Once the consent of mentors and trainees was secured, head teachers were informed of the research and asked for their support and consent to undertake the research within their school. Head teachers, mentors and trainees were encouraged to contact me by telephone or e-mail if further clarification was required and given two weeks to confirm their decision. Head teachers confirmed participation by return letters and all mentors and trainees signed a consent slip.

5.8.2 The cost versus benefits ratio

A number of potential costs, such as loss of dignity and trust, embarrassment, anxiety, harassment and lower self-esteem (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992; Kumar, 1999) were considered carefully in relation to the benefits for participants. I wanted to ensure that risk to participants was minimal, and equated ‘minimal risk’ with nothing more than what might be caused in everyday life (Kumar, 1999). The research required mentors and trainees to find time to complete questionnaires, arrange for video recordings of meetings and take part in interviews. As this added to the pressure of their everyday schedule, care was taken firstly in the selection of mentors who already did their job efficiently and, secondly, in keeping a close eye on any weak trainees who might find the research too much and need to opt out. Participants were assured interviews would not exceed one hour and arrangements were negotiated that suited their schedules. I was confident that participants would tell me if the expectations became problematic.

During interviews I probed more deeply into issues related to the professional and personal relationships between mentors and trainees. It was important that participants left the research with their self-esteem and dignity intact and with a sense of trust and good relations. Although it was likely at times that participants felt insecure, threatened and anxious when asked to examine issues related to their practice, such tense moments were alleviated by attempting to ground relationships with participants in Roger’s (1957) core conditions of empathy, respect and genuineness. This, at best, would help to reduced anxiety and establish a comfortable working liaison.
Despite the possible costs to mentors and trainees, I felt they could benefit from the satisfaction of taking part in the research and a greater awareness of their mentoring practice and mentor / trainee relationship (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). I believed questionnaires, observations and interviews maximised use of the limited time available in the least intrusive way.

5.8.3 Participants’ right to privacy

Issues of both confidentiality and loss of trust that might restrict access to personal information were taken seriously (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Consideration was given to ‘the participant’s right to privacy as opposed to the public’s right to know’ (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.60). It was clear that, if I intended to probe for personal information, participants had to be informed of this prior to the start of the research. Hence, they knew and expected I would probe to find out more about their relationships and how they functioned. They were also informed of their freedom to decide for themselves what personal information they gave and when they did this.

As anonymity goes hand in hand with confidentiality, it was obligatory that I protected the anonymity of participants (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Thus all names of participants and schools as well as the addresses of the latter were coded (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Yet even though every effort was made to maintain anonymity, it was important that mentors and trainees were notified that there was no guarantee of non-traceability. For example, despite the codes used, it was possible that a subject tutor in the university who worked with mentors might read the thesis, recognise the schools, mentors and trainees and thus be able to identify the participants. Mentors and trainees accepted this risk without voicing concern. It also worried me constantly that anonymity would be difficult to control, because there would be no way of checking what mentors and trainees said to their colleagues, peers and other University personnel.
5.8.4 Avoiding bias

Every attempt was made to reduce bias as much as possible. This meant avoiding hiding parts of the findings, focusing disproportionately on any one aspect of the findings to make a case, using the methodology inappropriately, using information in a way participants would be affected adversely (Kumar, 1999) and clouding the perspectives of the mentors and trainees.

The methodology was selected carefully, suited the aims of the research and minimised bias through both the use of mixed research techniques and participants’ clarification of data. Furthermore, findings represented the world from the point of view of participants in their natural context. The sample of mentors was selected carefully based on the opinions of experts; and the researcher ensured that no findings were used so that participants were affected adversely. Moreover, as an insider in the research, I recognised the need to maintain a high level of trust when working with colleagues and acknowledged the possible dangers should this trust be compromised in any way (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000).

Southern University, the awarding body for the degree, was not what Kumar (1999, p.196) called a ‘sponsoring organisation’ with a vested interest in the outcomes. Thus, there was no intention that this research would be used to inform management decisions about schools, mentors or trainees. Participants were assured of this prior to the start of the research.

5.9 The pilot study

Many writers identify the importance of conducting a pilot study so that problems are identified and resolved early on in the research process (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989; Oppenheim, 1992; Denscombe, 1998; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Hence, prior to the main research a pilot study using the complete research programme was carried out over one fifteen-week placement from September 2004 to January 2005.
The head teacher of one partnership school, not involved in the main study, was contacted and agreed to host the pilot study. Two mentors and two trainees in the school gave informed consent and subsequently piloted the research process and techniques. I met with the mentors and trainees and provided them with a schedule for the research process and explained the procedures involved. Throughout, they were encouraged to give honest opinions about the process and the tools used to gather data.

5.9.1 The research schedule

Participants in the pilot study found the schedule realistic although with little room for error. Thus, I learned it was important to ensure that:

a. lines of communication were open at all times;
b. questionnaires were delivered and collected at specific times and on dates set previously, as the postal service proved unreliable in the pilot;
c. mentors and trainees were reminded of the tight schedule and kept on track by telephone calls and e-mails. Otherwise, with busy work schedules, time restrictions for the completion of questionnaires and dates for recording mentor/trainee meetings might have slipped their minds;
d. clear instructions were given for the completion of questionnaires along with a list of definitions of key terms;
e. digital tapes for recording mentor / trainee meetings were given to mentors and labelled as there was no guarantee that mentors already had access to these;
f. I had easy access to a digital video camera. I offered this to mentors so that meetings could be recorded, as there was no guarantee one would be available for a mentor in a school on the day and time of their meeting;
g. at least half a day was allowed when I visited schools that were 2 hours drive away;
h. some flexibility was built into the system. This allowed mentors and trainees between 1 to 2 weeks for the completion of questionnaires and for meetings to be recorded.
It became evident that I had to take a strong lead in the process. This required good organisation and management of a very detailed fieldwork schedule.

5.9.2 The questionnaires

The questionnaires were long documents. Whilst this at first appeared daunting to mentors and trainees, they found the instructions useful, answered a few questions at a time and spread the task over one or two weeks. Once repetition was identified and removed this reduced the number of questions. As mentors and trainees worked their way through the reflective questionnaires they found the process of guided reflection interesting and insightful although time consuming. However, as they were not familiar with some of the terms used in the main study, it became obvious that mentors and trainees needed to be provided with a list of definitions of key terms.

5.9.3 Digital video recorded meetings

With mentor/trainee meetings scheduled weekly by mentors from the start of the placement for a regular day and time, no additional time was required for digital recorded meetings. Although mentors and trainees at first found the presence of the camera strange, they claimed that they forgot about its presence once they became more involved in discussions. The pilot study made me aware of the necessity to remind mentors and trainees that:

• a digital camera had to be booked in advance for the day and time it was required;

• the battery had to be charged or a mains line had to be available;

• the camera position needed to capture both mentor and trainee;

• the tape should be started and allowed to run for a short while prior to recording the meeting;

• a spare digital tape needed to be available in case the meeting lasted longer than one hour.
5.9.4 Interviews

As it was important to adhere to set days and times, participants were reminded ahead of time so that mentors remembered to book a quiet room. With interviews planned for one hour, questions with prompts were set prior to the interview to ensure all issues were covered. Good time management of the interview was critical and an appropriate balance was striven for between responses from mentors and trainees as well as time allocation for each question and elaboration on answers. Additionally, so that the researcher could focus repeatedly on what was said and done, interviews had to be video recorded. Consequently I travelled to each interview equipped with a digital camera, at least two tapes and a fully charged battery.

5.9.5 Analysis of data

With limited time to carry out the first layer of analysis of data from questionnaires and observations in preparation for interviews, data had to be attended to as soon as it was received. I took a wide-angle approach to the data, cross-checked what mentors and trainees said with what they did in meetings, made memos and formulated questions. It seemed appropriate and time efficient that questions were directed at the established themes in the order they appeared in the questionnaires.

Tapes of mentor / trainee meetings had to be transcribed to enable a closer look at the nature of the dialogue. Whilst observation schedules allowed notes to be made during viewing, further analysis of transcriptions enhanced the detail. In addition, it became apparent that for further detail to be recorded more space was required on the schedule.

5.9.6 Pilot study summary

The pilot study was an invaluable exercise as it raised my awareness of the necessity for good time management, and the development and maintenance of good relationships between participants and myself and meticulous organisation. The challenge of completing the fieldwork on time by keeping everything together and on schedule was daunting.
5.10 Summary

This chapter set out to make clear the research questions and the most appropriate approach, method and techniques for this study. I argued for my choice of a broadly interpretivist approach, based upon my values and the aim of the study, to explore and enhance understanding of the PE ITT mentor / trainee relationships within the natural working environment. Justification for the appropriateness of an exploratory case study method with embedded units was given. I argued, firstly, that this facilitated exploration and description of what occurred within the relationships; secondly, that it facilitated identification of areas for further research; and, thirdly, that its flexibility allowed for the use of mixed research techniques. Following on from this, a case was made for the use of multi-techniques and multiple layers of analysis to allow for greater breadth and depth of study and the production of a descriptive case study report. Through the detail and description of the report, it was argued that qualitative (Tripp, 1985), naturalistic (Stake, 1995) and fuzzy (Bassey, 1999) generalisations could be drawn by readers.

In this chapter I made clear that careful attention was paid to general ethical considerations for research, moreover that a significant effort to establish and maintain good working relationships between participants was essential, through an empathetic, caring, honest and respectful approach. Finally, I related how conducting a pilot study allowed me to fine-tune the instruments to be used for data collection in the main study, and prepared me well for the intense period of fieldwork that would follow.
CHAPTER SIX
The mentor / trainee relationships

6.0 Introduction

As stated in Chapter Five, the nature of this research was exploratory. My intention was to enhance learning and understanding of mentor-trainee relationships through descriptive accounts based on a what is happening here? type question (Edwards and Talbott, 1999). This chapter identifies, firstly, the origins of the data (Table 20) together with the layers of analysis carried out (Figure 13 and Appendix 6) that informed the descriptions that follow. Secondly, it introduces the schools’ environment for mentoring, the mentors and their trainees. Thirdly, it examines findings in relation to aspects of the interpersonal and developmental mentor / trainee relationships. In this section, I draw on the trainees’ development stage models of Maynard and Furlong (1995), Tomlinson (1995) and Leask (2001b); Clutterbuck’s (2001, 2003) behavioural matrix, Garvey’s (1994b) relationship dimensions; Walker and Stott (1993) and Clutterbuck’s (2001) relationship stage models as frameworks for analysis of trainees development, mentoring styles, relationship dimensions and relationship stages. Fourthly, the chapter reflects on the structure and content of weekly mentor / trainee meetings and the dialogue that took place between mentors and trainees during meetings. In this section, I draw on Bayliss’s (2001) clusters of communication skills; Heron’s (1990) intervention categories; and Parsloe and Wray’s (2000) question types as frameworks for analysis of mentor dialogue. Insights gained from the content of the meetings and the nature of the dialogue provide the basis for discussion, which adds to understanding of the mentor / trainee relationship.

This way of presenting the findings provides a picture of the nature of mentoring and mentor / trainee relationships within the Southern University partnership.
Focus is placed upon generic aspects of mentoring and PE ITT mentor / trainee relationships, rather than on the story of each relationship. Part One of the structure sets the scene by providing descriptive accounts of the environment for mentoring, and gives an introduction to the mentors and trainees. This logically precedes a descriptive and analytical account of relationships in Part Two, which is based on the reports of mentors and trainees. This is followed by a closer examination of mentor / trainee interactions in weekly meetings in Part Three, which provides a focus on one particular aspect of the relationship and supplements mentors’ and trainees’ reports. Figures 11 and 12 provide a map of the journey through the findings. Throughout the chapter fictitious names are used to protect the identity of institutions and participants.
PART ONE

The environment for mentoring

Introductions to mentors and trainees

Definitions of mentoring

Year 3 trainees’ development

Year 4 trainees’ development

Time for mentoring

PART TWO

Mentor / trainee relationships

Power imbalance

Inter-personal component (IPC)

Developmental component (DC)

Inter-relationship between the IPC and DC

Figure 11  Parts One and Two of the journey through the findings
PART THREE

Mentor / trainee meetings

Content

Target setting and assessment

Communication skills

Attending
Observing & listening
Responding
Trainees’ dialogue

PART FOUR

Overview of the findings

Figure 12   Parts Three and Four of the journey through the findings
6.1 **Origins of the data**

Themes that originated from the literature review were investigated over a fifteen week placement through the use of:

- questionnaires [Q] (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2) that enabled mentors and trainees to reflect on their practice and state their views;

- observations of mentor / trainee meetings [Obs] (Appendix 3(a) – 3(b) identified ways in which both parties interacted and informed an understanding of mentor / trainee relationships;

- individual interviews with mentors and trainees which probed further.

Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 give exemplars of interview schedules for mentors [Itv1M] and year 4 trainees [Itv1 T4] at mid-placement. Interviews enabled mentors and trainees to expand on what they had stated already in questionnaires and what they did in mentor / trainee meetings.

Table 20 shows an overview of the themes examined through questionnaires, observations and interviews at the beginning (Stage 1), middle (Stage 2) and end (Stage 3) of the placements.

Analysis of the data progressed from an examination:

a) within stages for each relationship,

b) across stages for each relationship,

c) within stages across year 3 and year 4 relationships;

d) across stages from all relationships.

A schematic presentation of the layers of analysis that produced the findings discussed in this chapter is shown in Figure 13 and Appendix 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q 1-3 Mentor</th>
<th>Q1-3 Trainees</th>
<th>Joint task Mentor &amp; trainee</th>
<th>Int 1-2 Mentor</th>
<th>Int 1-2 Trainees</th>
<th>Obs 1 – 3 Mentor &amp; Trainees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1M</td>
<td>Q2M</td>
<td>Q3M</td>
<td>Q1T 3/4</td>
<td>Q2T 3/4</td>
<td>Q3T 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal profiles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of mentoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor’s benefits from mentoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees’ preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School environment for mentoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors’ knowledge of mentoring literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors’ training in mentoring skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing, maintaining and ending the relationship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal/developmental relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to learn styles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions of the relationship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of learning to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of reflection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of problem solving competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbalance of power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core conditions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature and Content of Mentor / trainee meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of mentor and trainee dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20**  Origin of Data from across the themes examined through questionnaires, observations and interviews

**Key:** Q: Questionnaire; Int: Interview; Obs: Observations; M: Mentor; T3: Year 3 Trainee; T4: Year 4 Trainee
Discussion in sub-sections 6.2 – 6.8 was underpinned by data collected from questionnaires and interviews with mentors and trainees. Occasionally, data from observations was used to supplement claims.

6.2 Part One: The environment for mentoring

Data from questionnaires and interviews provided detail about the schools’ environment for mentoring. Community College and Foundation School were each large secondary comprehensive co-educational sports colleges that had Training School status with a remit for ITT. Both schools’ ITT policies aimed to provide training and support in accordance with the guidance of training institutions and learning environments that facilitated trainees’ development of knowledge and skills in relation to the Government Standards for ITT (DfES, 2002). Additionally, they appointed an ITT PT who oversaw trainees’ experience in school and the organisation of a weekly professional development programme for all trainees.

27 Training institutions such as Southern University that offer courses in ITT.
Conversely, St. James was a rural private girls’ school with pupils from nursery to university entrance age and the P.E. department was the only department that received trainees. Although St. James, unlike the other schools, had no ITT policy, they had appointed a PT to accommodate and facilitate the whole school experience of trainees and liaise with the University. With no set professional development programme in place, the PT and other specialist members of staff met with the trainee from time to time to provide information on whole school issues. Even so, Anetta (the mentor) claimed that ITT was important to the PE department. Whilst Community College and Foundation School had respectively sixteen and fifteen full time, female and male staff in the PE department, St. James had only one full time and five part time female members of staff. Community College was the only school that paid their mentor to undertake the mentor role.

All mentors claimed to believe their schools were collaborative, supportive and provided a rich learning environment for learning to teach. Mentors and trainees believed that the quality of their relationships was impacted by relationships within the PE department, as for example, between members of staff and the mentor. Although the two trainees at St James School claimed that the mentor was helpful, they suggested that other staff were much less supportive and that on occasions this caused them difficulties, especially at the start of the placement. In addition, Di (year 3 trainee at St. James) explained how she had felt bullied into doing a number of odd jobs for a member of PE staff and that her mentor did nothing about this. Di imagined that her mentor did not want to damage relations with her colleague and explained that this in turn impacted on her relationship with her mentor.

Table 21 shows the schools, the relationships, the mentors and trainees referred to throughout the chapter. Only one relationship (4) was mixed sex (female mentor and male trainee), all the others (1 – 3, 5 and 6) were female pairs.
Community College:
- Relationship 1 [R1]: Jane and Tess (Year 3 [T3])
- Relationship 2 [R2]: Jane and Ruth (Year 4 [T4])

Foundation School:
- Relationship 3 [R3]: Philippa and Chloe (year 3 [T3])
- Relationship 4 [R4]: Philippa and Michael (year 4 [T4])

St James School:
- Relationship 5 [R5]: Anetta and Di (year 3 [T3])
- Relationship 6 [R6]: Anetta and Amanda (year 4 [T4])

**Table 21** \textbf{Identification of schools, mentors and trainees}

### 6.2.1 Introducing the mentors and trainees


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor: Jane</th>
<th>R1 Tess [T3]</th>
<th>R2 Ruth [T4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex / Age</td>
<td>Female / 27</td>
<td>Female / 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring experience</td>
<td>3 years experience. Position in school: Head of girls’ PE and Co-ordinator of Key Stage 4 PE.</td>
<td>No experience of mentoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 22** \textbf{Profiles of Jane, Tess [T3] and Ruth [T4]}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex / Age</td>
<td>Female / 29</td>
<td>Female / 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring experience</td>
<td>4 years experience. Position in School: Head of PE Department and Director of Sport.</td>
<td>Poor 2-week experience of mentoring on this placement. The relationship did not work therefore transferred schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 23** \textbf{Profiles of Philippa, Chloe [T3] and Michael [T4]}
All mentors in the study were female and held senior posts in the schools. Their ages ranged between 27 years (Jane) and 29 years (Philippa and Anetta) and they had mentored for Southern University for 3 years (Jane) or 4 years (Philippa and Anetta).

The year 3 and 4 trainees were of a similar age, all 20 and 21 years old respectively, apart from Ruth who was 23. All year 4 trainees described poor mentoring experiences during their third year placement and Chloe, the third year trainee at Foundation School, explained how she had been transferred from her first intermediate placement school because of poor relations with the mentor. All the female trainees claimed they could relate well to their mentors because they had experienced similar teacher training courses, shared an interest in PE, were female and were under 30 years of age. Michael claimed the sex of his mentor did not matter. He believed his relationship with Philippa was strengthened as he shared her interest in PE; she was a good teacher and close to him in age.

Questionnaire data confirmed that all mentors and trainees were aware of University regulations, had received handbooks for guidance and felt prepared at the start of the placements. Yet, in interviews, mentors and trainees affirmed that they had no knowledge of mentoring literature, limited knowledge of the effective use of communication skills and had received no training in how to establish, maintain and end mentor / trainee relationships. In fact, mentors confirmed that they neither based their mentoring practice on mentoring theory nor took time to reflect on their mentoring practice. For example, Jane and Philippa both related how they relied on their own experiences of when they were mentored as trainees.
and stated that their mentors still remained significant people in their lives, either as very good friends and/or trusted advisors. Philippa claimed that one of her ITT mentors provided the model and motivation for how she worked with her own trainees. Conversely, Anetta made reference neither to ex-mentors nor to how her practice might have been impacted by her own experiences.

6.2.2 Mentors’ and trainees’ definitions of mentoring

All mentors and trainees claimed that prior to this study mentoring had not been defined for them and they had not consciously attempted to define mentoring for themselves. Mentors believed mentoring was a supportive and nurturing process that involved providing opportunities and giving advice, guidance and assistance. Ruth explained that she ‘wanted to be there for trainees, to guide them and to progress subject material’. Whilst like Jane, Philippa emphasised that she supported the trainee, she also identified the facilitative nature of the process.

When trainees were asked about a definition of mentoring and the processes involved, Chloe (T3) claimed, ‘I don’t really know’ and others struggled to reply. When prompted, trainees agreed mentoring was about guiding trainees and likened it to teaching and/or passing on knowledge, and/or giving suggestions and/or telling them what to do. For example, Ruth suggested the mentor was someone

… you can go to if you’re not sure about something, who gives you a bit of guidance, to say this is what you need to do, who has good relationships with other people, who has been in the position of the trainee, is my best friend so basically gets the best out of you … a confidante, good leader and a good teacher.

On the other hand, Tess likened mentoring to ‘one to one teaching’ and believed it was about ‘passing on knowledge to someone at an early stage of learning’.

Based upon what mentors and trainees told me, I suggest that mentoring in ITT was primarily a directive and nurturing process. For them, it was primarily about how mentors provided opportunities for learning to teach, passed on knowledge and gave advice, guidance and support.
6.2.3 Trainees’ development through the placements

I faced the dilemma of knowing where to start to address aspects of the mentor / trainee relationship. There seemed to be no ‘right’ place. For example, the developmental and interpersonal components of the relationship impacted upon each other and processes such as learning, reflecting and helping occurred simultaneously. It seemed to me that the ‘idiosyncratic’ (Elliott and Calderhead, 1994, p.173) nature of trainees’ development had potentially a considerable impact on the dynamic nature of the mentor / trainee relationship (Maynard and Furlong, 1995). Hence, it made sense that I firstly traced the trainees’ development through the placement.

Although my initial strategy was to write about each trainee’s development in turn, this proved repetitive and long-winded. Indeed, mentors and trainees gave very broad descriptions as they struggled to articulate development. Consequently, I decided that the most appropriate way to present these findings would be to give an overview of trainees’ development that emphasised similarities and differences as they progressed through the placement. Subsequently, in sub-sections a and b below, I present an overview first of the development of year 3 trainees and then of the year 4 trainees.

a. An overview of Year 3 trainees’ development

The first three weeks

The three mentors confirmed year 3 trainees took time to find their feet as they familiarised themselves with many new experiences and settled into the departments and schools. Mentors agreed trainees came with no prior experience of a school placement and had both limited knowledge and idealistic perceptions of teaching. Text Box 1 gives an insight into the unexpected challenges Tess faced once her busy timetable of teaching started.
Towards the end of week two, as Tess started to teach, she struggled to survive lesson by lesson and day by day. Tess explained that, suddenly, she felt unprepared and claimed that her expectations of the school placement workload (planning, teaching and extra-curricular commitments) were very unrealistic. By the end of week three Tess acknowledged she was ‘shattered’, but claimed that she did not want to give up her personal out of school coaching commitments and ignored advice from school staff, who warned her it would be impossible to maintain such a schedule with a heavy placement workload.

Text Box 1:  Challenges faced by Tess at the start of her school placement

Initially, Jane believed Tess was ‘an enthusiastic and able trainee who had a strong character’. Jane emphasised also that Tess’s subject knowledge was weak in many activity areas, her planning was poor and she had not involved herself in department-run extra-curricular activities. Both Jane and Tess explained how the impact of these limitations became exaggerated as Tess was reluctant to give up her own personal extra-curricular coaching commitments to make the school placement work a priority.

Just as Tess had expressed how unprepared she was for the placement workload, Chloe also explained:

As a pupil I did not have to think about why and how teachers did things, I just got on with taking part. I knew it was going to be hard, but I didn’t know it was going to be sort of as hard as it is.

Philippa was clear that Chloe was a weak year 3 trainee, who needed a lot of assistance as she only survived lesson by lesson. Whilst Philippa thought Chloe had ‘lovely personal qualities, was committed, wanted to succeed and worked very hard’, she believed there was ‘something blocking Chloe’s ability to use feedback and improve’. Despite Chloe’s commitment to work, she had limited success with planning and was slow to demonstrate any progress. Philippa emphasised that, in her experience, these difficulties were exaggerated in Chloe’s case and not common to all year 3 trainees.
Like Tess and Chloe, at the start of the training Di thought teaching was not quite what she expected. She acknowledged that ‘… getting going was an anxious time’ and that she was un-settled at the start. Whilst initially Anetta felt she could not trust Di’s commitment to the placement because of Di’s sporadic absence from school, positive changes occurred in week 3. At that point Anetta believed that Di had started to demonstrate full engagement with the experience and worked hard. Subsequently, as Di moved from her very idealistic stance, she now ‘survived’ in most activity areas and dealt with some difficulties in others.

Mid-placement

Anetta expressed satisfaction with Di’s increased confidence and the ways in which she dealt reasonably well with difficulties when she taught activity areas for which she had greater subject knowledge. Conversely, she emphasised how Di sometimes struggled with lessons and only just ‘survived’ when she taught activity areas for which she had limited subject knowledge. At this stage, Anetta maintained that Di’s reflections remained shallow and she still needed assistance with problem solving.

Philippa’s accounts of Chloe’s practice indicated she continued to work hard and had a very good rapport with the pupils, who ‘loved her’. Occasionally, in stronger activity areas she demonstrated satisfactory use of space and appropriate resources and organised whole-class activity. Even so, for most of the time she often struggled and only survived lessons. As she did not remember what she had planned, she delivered material ‘poorly’. In addition, Chloe continued to need a lot of assistance with reflection as she found it difficult to identify what needed to be refined. Although Philippa claimed that she battled daily with the choice of whether or not to place Chloe on a ‘cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23) is a Southern University procedure for dealing with trainees who are under performing in any particular section of the DfES (2002) standards. See Section 1.6.
University, 2005a, p.23), she acknowledged that, finally, she allowed the University subject tutor to make the decision for her. As he thought Chloe had the qualities of a teacher, he did not believe she needed to be placed on a ‘cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23). Whilst Philippa agreed Chloe had good personal qualities for teaching, she recognised it would take Chloe a while to learn, make changes and progress. Although she went along with the subject tutor’s judgement, she remained doubtful and concerned that Chloe might not reach a satisfactory grade within the time available.

By mid-placement Jane expressed frustration that Tess had not progressed and had underperformed. Tess failed to take advice on board, had not achieved her potential and depended solely on staff for teaching ideas. Jane highlighted how Tess was very inconsistent and likened how Tess taught one good lesson and six just satisfactory lessons to ‘taking a step forward then three steps back’. Yet, even though Jane maintained that Tess just survived for most of the time, and she threatened to place her on a ‘cause for concern’, she did not. Tess described her own process as follows:

When I delivered a good lesson my confidence increased, then, when I just survived a difficult group my confidence was knocked and I had to build it back up again.

Tess maintained that she had developed more of an idea of what worked and did not work in lessons and had gradually got to know the pupils better. Also, she identified how she had made some decisions with less support from staff as she had become more familiar with departmental procedures. Yet, despite this, Tess acknowledged her ongoing struggle with the placement and her lack of engagement. This is shown in more detail in Text Box 2.
Tess acknowledged that:

- she listened to departmental staff, who warned her it was impossible to maintain her personal schedule of extra-curricular activities and told her school work had to be her highest priority. Even so she said:
  …I just thought to myself yup, yup, I know that I’ve just got to (give up the out of school activities), you know, but then I didn’t do anything about it.
- she spent little to no time in reflection on her own practice and ‘hated’ the paperwork involved in planning and evaluating.
- she needed to give greater thought and effort to her work, but instead, stayed in her comfort zone and neither managed her time nor progressed material well.

**Text Box 2  Tess’s views on her practice at mid-placement**

**The end of the placement**

In the final stage of the placement Anetta indicated that Di had improved her subject knowledge, identified what went well and what needed to be refined in lessons, had began to pay greater attention to the learning needs of pupils and sometimes refined practice without guidance. Anetta believed that as Di’s confidence grew, she became more critical and attempted to solve problems on her own, especially when teaching stronger activity areas. Consequently, she suggested that Di was a good teacher and deserved to pass the placement.

Unlike Di, by the last month of the placement neither Chloe nor Tess had made much progress. Philippa emphasised that whilst Chloe was committed and worked hard and there was more evidence of pupils’ learning, Chloe’s delivery of content remained problematic. Philippa, in frustration, claimed she had never before experienced a trainee who forgot to do such important things that the structure of the lesson fell apart. She explained that Chloe’s progress had been slow even for a year 3 trainee. For example, if she ‘… was not confident doing something she would avoid doing it no matter how important it was’. Hence, at times she would not include a warm-up or demonstrate a skill. Yet despite these weaknesses, Chloe’s teaching was deemed to be satisfactory and she passed the placement.
Jane became exasperated as she explained that towards the end of the placement Tess had still made little effort to improve her practice. She claimed nothing much had changed and Tess ‘only survived’ as her teaching still fluctuated primarily because of lack of planning. Tess also acknowledged her poor performance over most of the placement. She stated:

I was just forgetting stuff e.g. lesson plans … because I was disorganised myself and then I was rushing plans, I hadn’t thought about the little details and then that was affecting my teaching.

Tess expressed disappointment that she had not seen a subject tutor from the University until very late in the placement and claimed she needed ‘someone she knew to come in and give her a kick up the backside’.

After the Christmas break and in the penultimate week of the placement, Jane unexpectedly expressed great surprise and relief that Tess was now focused on the placement and had finally stopped all out of school commitments. By Jane’s accounts this resulted in a significant difference in teaching performance. For example, Tess demonstrated better control in lessons, pupils remained on task and some progressive learning took place. Jane explained that as this enabled her to take a step back she allowed Tess some increased independence.

Jane indicated that she struggled to find positive things to say about Tess’s teaching in the final report. Even so, she maintained ‘she won’t have a problem in the final placement if she makes schoolwork a priority’. Although Tess passed her placement, she was disappointed with herself and her final report. In the final research interview, she acknowledged that on her final placement she would need to make school work a priority and stated ‘I’m just not going to do anything [outside of school], just do the placement and that’s it’.

All mentors and trainees reported on the struggle trainees experienced when their timetables changed and they were asked to teach different activity areas. Without exception, all trainees found the transfer of pedagogical principals from teaching one activity to another difficult, particularly when subject knowledge was weak. Di claimed it ‘was like starting over again’. Likewise, they all agreed that
development was not a linear process. They indicated that often when they demonstrated success in one aspect of teaching, simultaneously they only survived as they attempted a new activity or a new teaching style.

Reflections on Year 3 trainees’ development

Despite my attempts as researcher to guide reflection in questionnaires and probe further in interviews, aspects of trainees development was articulated in very vague terms by all mentors and trainees. It was very difficult to identify just what trainees could do and what level of competence they had achieved. The only indication given was through vague terms such as ‘good’ or ‘poor’. This suggested to me either that mentors and trainees were not able to give specific detail because they lacked knowledge and understanding of the process and theory or that they reflected superficially on trainees’ development; or a combination of the two. I discovered that mentors were not familiar with the use of the University grading descriptors that might have enabled them to think more deeply and articulate the trainees’ attainment and progress more clearly.

Based on the mentors’ accounts, all trainees only reflected superficially on their practice and all experienced difficulties as they transferred pedagogic knowledge across activity areas that they taught. Subsequently, development was not linear and fluctuated across broad stages of development (Fuller and Brown, 1975; Maynard and Furlong, 1995; Tomlinson, 1995; Leask, 2001), from lesson to lesson and day to day, depending on their learning focus, their subject knowledge, the group they taught and how they were feeling at the time.

It is important to note Jane’s claim that Tess’s very limited progress was affected throughout the placement by her lack of engagement and poor performance. Yet despite this, Jane neither attempted at any time to place Tess on a ‘cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23) nor asked for a subject tutor visit early on in the placement. Also, it is interesting that whilst Tess appeared aware of the problem, she chose to do nothing to improve the situation. In fact she disregarded advice, wanted someone to come in and save her and then, unexpectedly in the penultimate week, decided to change her practice. It seems
strange to me that despite Tess’s lack of progress and ability to demonstrate consistency in her teaching, her performance was deemed to be satisfactory and she subsequently passed the placement.

Whilst Chloe, like Tess, also struggled, she did so for different reasons. In my view, there are several important issues to consider here. Firstly, Chloe’s lack of progress featured throughout the placement. Secondly, Philippa battled internally with the difficult decision whether or not to place Chloe on a ‘cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23) and ultimately wanted the subject tutor to relieve her of this problem. Thirdly, despite Chloe’s limited attainment and progress and Philippa’s reservations, she also passed the placement.

b. An overview of Year 4 trainees’ development

The first three weeks

Mentors expected that year 4 trainees would settle more quickly into their final placement because of experience gained on the year 3 intermediate placement, followed by opportunities to increase subject knowledge and understanding during two semesters in the university. All mentors described year 4 trainees as being further along the developmental continuum than year 3 trainees. From mentors’ and trainees’ accounts it was clear to me that Ruth, Michael and Amanda were committed to placement work and were under no illusions, either about the extent of the workload or the expectations of mentors and the University. Jane indicated she was impressed early on with how Ruth settled quickly and integrated well into the department. Similarly, Philippa emphasised that Michael:

… fitted in well, appeared comfortable, which was very important and helped tremendously, acted like a teacher, was given responsibility, which he was eager to accept. Michael knew what he had to do.

On the other hand, Amanda was a shy year 4 trainee. She found the start of placement difficult and was very unsettled. She associated this with the nature of the private school environment and the department’s ‘sink or swim’ approach to trainees and personal issues, which caused her intermittent absence from school.
Mid-placement

By mid-placement, all mentors agreed that the year 4 trainees demonstrated ‘good’ rapport with pupils, ‘good’ classroom management skills and paid attention, with varying degrees of independence and success, to the progression of whole class learning. Yet, in general, mentors’ reported that reflection was shallow and trainees required assistance with problem-solving, especially in areas of least subject knowledge. However, mentors noted also that as trainees began to engage with pupils more easily, they confidently gave pupils greater freedom to explore and problem-solve and addressed the needs of different ability levels in areas of strong subject knowledge. Even so, from mentors and trainees’ accounts it was clear to me that there were still times when, on the one hand, trainees addressed the needs of individuals in areas of stronger subject knowledge, whilst, on the other, in areas of weaker subject knowledge they only survived or focused on whole-class learning. For example, Jane claimed that when Ruth taught activities in which she had weak subject knowledge she required additional help with planning, with ‘reading’ what went on in the class and with problem solving. Overall, Ruth’s progress fluctuated between stages of survival and moving on (Maynard and Furlong’s, 1995). She explained:

I was teaching a group with a particularly difficult pupil. This got me down and I lost confidence and back-tracked before building up [confidence] again.

The end of the placement

By the end of the placement, mentors reported that year 4 trainees had gained even greater confidence, were more independent and able teachers who attempted to address individuals’ learning needs and were more critical of their own practice. All mentors emphasised that at this stage, year 4 trainees had to be able to teach on their own, as this was a requirement in their first post, which was only months away. Yet, whilst mentors believed it was essential they stepped back, they claimed they did not abandon trainees completely. Anetta believed that Amanda was ‘more able to stand on her own two feet … more confident,
knowledgeable and prepared and capable of being responsible for her own progress to a greater degree’. Unlike Amanda, Ruth and Michael described how their learning had plateaued in the last month even though their mentors had not identified this. On reflection, Michael claimed his progress ‘…levelled off’ … It did not go down … I stayed at a good level sort of thing … but yeah, it plateaued’.

Mentors indicated that year 4 trainees, just like year 3 trainees, experienced problems when the timetable changed and they taught new activity areas. Philippa claimed that Michael suffered less in this respect because his subject knowledge across all activity areas was sound.

**Reflections on Year 4 trainees’ development**

As with year 3 trainees, I struggled with identifying year 4 trainees’ levels of attainment in relation to the QTS standards (DfES, 2002). With bland explanations being typical, it seemed almost impossible to identify the idiosyncrasies of trainees and I was struck that neither mentors nor trainees reported that they had experienced any difficulties. Mentors indicated that from the start of the placement, as might be expected, year 4 trainees settled with less difficulty as they were further along the developmental continuum than year 3 trainees. Whilst trainees were reported to have gained significantly in confidence and accommodated more frequently for pupils’ individual learning needs, their levels of reflection on practice still remained shallow, especially in activity areas of least subject knowledge. In addition, as with year 3 trainees, problems were caused as year 4 trainees attempted to transfer pedagogic knowledge from one activity area to another. Trainees’ development across the placement was not linear and they fluctuated between broad stages of development (Fuller and Brown, 1975; Maynard and Furlong, 1995; Tomlinson, 1995; Leask, 2001). Also, towards the end of the placement, both mentors and trainees emphasised that if trainees were to be ready to enter their first posts, they needed to be left to deal with lessons on their own. While I recognise the importance of this, from my experience, I sense it meant that trainees were just left to get on and were not challenged further to increase their teaching skills, as in the case of Ruth and Michael, who experienced a plateau in their learning.
6.2.4  

**Time spent with trainees**

None of the mentors believed that their schools gave them enough protected time to mentor trainees. Whilst Community College gave Jane one hour of protected timetable time per week for mentoring, and paid her to mentor, St. James only protected one of Anetta’s 35-minute timetable slots in a week. Unlike both Community College and St. James, Foundation School gave Philippa no protected time and she was expected to find it from within her busy schedule.

While finding additional time to mentor was not considered by Jane to be an issue, Philippa indicated that she regularly felt guilty of not spending enough time with trainees. For example, she was unable to find the time she needed for Chloe and believed this impacted negatively on the development of their relationship. On the other hand, Anetta claimed that she found the time she needed from her own free time. Despite time issues and the goodwill necessary to get the job done, all three mentors chose to mentor, enjoyed mentoring and found the process professionally and personally beneficial.

Mentors found it difficult to estimate the time spent with trainees and emphasised they could only give approximate times. Table 25 shows how much time mentors believed they spent with trainees during a week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>Time spent on days without M/T meeting</th>
<th>Time spent on days with M/T meeting</th>
<th>Time spent in a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>1 – 2 hours depending on the needs of the trainee More with Tess</td>
<td>Approximately 4hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippa</td>
<td>55 minutes</td>
<td>1½ – 2 hours. More with Chloe</td>
<td>Approximately 5hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anetta</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Up to 45 minutes</td>
<td>Approximately 2hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 25**  

**Scheduled and unscheduled time with trainees**  

**Key:**  

M/T – mentor / trainee
Time spent with trainees varied daily from trainee to trainee in relation to their needs, the situation and the demands placed on mentors’ time. Jane and Philippa emphasised that working with a weaker trainee demanded more of their time. For example, because Tess under-performed, Jane spent more time with her as she:

- checked frequently and ensured everything was ok;
- discussed lesson plans for each lesson;
- provided additional detail when lessons were evaluated;
- sought advice from her past mentor when she struggled to cope with what she perceived was a difficult relationship.

Mentors spent both scheduled and unscheduled time each day with trainees. An example of how Jane distributed her time can be seen in Table 26. While the activities were similar for all mentors, the length of time spent on each activity differed from mentor to mentor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled time:</th>
<th>Un-scheduled time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Gave feedback either immediately after a lesson, or at a time when she and trainees were free;</td>
<td>i. The ‘chat’ at the start of the day, during breaks and after school;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. collected written and verbal feedback from other staff and consulted with them about trainee’s teaching;</td>
<td>ii. discussion of issues raised and proposed work;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. mentor / trainee meeting;</td>
<td>iii. notation of issues in a notebook to be addressed at mentor / trainee sessions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. notified staff of the weekly targets and focus for each trainee after mentor / trainee meetings;</td>
<td>iv. attention to phone calls and e-mails from trainees out of school hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. collaborated with the PT about professional sessions and on trainee’s progress and needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 The nature of Jane’s distribution of time spent with trainees

All mentors had one scheduled mentor / trainee meeting per week with year 3 and 4 trainees. Observations showed the time spent varied between mentors and from
week to week. The range of time spent by mentors in meetings with year 3 and four trainees is shown in Table 27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Jane</th>
<th>Philippa</th>
<th>Anetta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr4 trainee (T4)</td>
<td>52 mins</td>
<td>36 mins</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr3 trainee (T3)</td>
<td>27 mins</td>
<td>39 mins</td>
<td>22 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27  Average time mentors spent with trainees in weekly meetings

Jane spent more time with Ruth (T4) even though Tess (T3) had problems that needed to be addressed. On average, there was little difference in the time Philippa spent with Chloe (T3) and Michael (T4) even though Michael was a stronger and more experienced trainee than Chloe who was very weak. Anetta, like Jane, spent slightly less time with the year 3 trainee and in general less time with trainees than Jane and Philippa. Perhaps this was because St. James’s protected only a 35 minute free period weekly. In an interview Di, Anetta’s year 3 trainee, emphasised that the recorded meetings with Anetta were the longest of all the weekly mentor meetings held.

Philippa and Anetta did not seem to be ‘on call’ (as Jane put it) for trainees. Whilst Jane offered and dealt with phone calls and e-mails out of school hours, Philippa would reply to text messages from trainees but did not expect this to happen frequently. Anetta did not wish to be contacted by trainees at all, unless they were ill and had to get in touch to say they were unable to attend school.

Philippa claimed that staff in the PE department were honest with trainees about their availability and assured trainees that all of their needs would be addressed at the earliest opportunity. Also, as she wanted trainees to think they could approach her, she encouraged a lot of ‘walk and talk’ between jobs. Anetta indicated she spent more time with year 3 trainees at the start of the placement, otherwise, she would help any trainee when asked and networked with other staff to facilitate trainees’ developmental needs. Unlike the full-time PE staff at Foundation School
and Community College, staff members in the St. James’s PE department were not always available as the majority of them worked part-time.

Trainees at Community College and Foundation School claimed they were satisfied with the time mentors spent with them. This was not the case at St. James as Chloe and Di said they required more time, especially in the initial stages of their placements. On the other hand, all trainees acknowledged how busy their mentors were and valued whatever time they gave them.

**Reflections on the time mentors spent with trainees**

Mentors were very busy people in their schools and had little allocated time to undertake their role of mentoring. Mentors indicated they spent between 2 and 5 hours per week in order to get the job of mentoring done although the University regulations identified only a one hour per week time allocation for mentoring. This matter was made even more difficult for mentors as not all schools complied with the University regulations. There appeared to be an expectation that mentors would ‘find time’ in their already busy schedules and do what they could in the limited time that they had. Moreover, only Community College used funds received from the University to pay mentors to mentor. I speculate that limited funding from the University impacts on the amount of time schools are prepared to allocate to mentoring.

Although mentors claimed that they spent more time with both year 3 and weak trainees, it is interesting to note from observation data that Jane’s meetings with Tess (T3) were shorter than those with Ruth (T4); and that Philippa’s meetings with Chloe (T3) were on average only 3 minutes longer than those with Michael (T4). Despite it all, trainees valued whatever time their mentor gave them.

**6.3 Part Two: The mentor / trainee relationships**

Mentors and trainees said they had not given much thought to the nature of the mentor / trainee relationship. Yet when prompted, they all acknowledged the inherent interpersonal and developmental components and recognised and related well to the broad stages of relationship development identified in Walker and
Stott’s (1993) model (Section 3.6.1, Table 12 and Appendix 2). Interviews revealed that all mentors and trainees believed that a successful interpersonal relationship was important to the growth of a successful developmental relationship and mentors highlighted how trainees needed to feel at ease to make good progress. Even so, mentors confirmed they had not planned strategically to establish the best conditions for mentors and trainees to work together so that they developed an effective dyadic relationship. Instead, they followed University procedures and did what seemed either appropriate at the time and/or whatever came naturally to them. Sub-sections 6.3.1 – 6.3.3 examine, firstly, the power imbalance in favour of the mentors and, secondly, the development of the interpersonal and developmental components of the relationship.

6.3.1 The power imbalance in favour of mentors

The assessment role of mentors meant they were responsible for the continuous formative and summative assessment of trainees and had the power to pass or fail them. All trainees accepted that mentors had a duty to pass or fail them. Indeed, mentors and trainees recognised and accepted the power imbalance in favour of mentors as, for example, Jane compared the relationship to that of a boss and employee. From the start Anetta expected trainees to recognise that as mentor, she was ‘in charge’. Mentors acknowledged they had no conscious strategy that dealt with the power imbalance and claimed it had not impacted on their relationships. Yet, when I probed further, trainees identified that, as they were conscious of the mentors’ power to pass or fail them, they tried to do whatever was expected of them so that they did not upset the PE staff and the mentor. Text box 3 demonstrates how mentors’ power as formal assessors impacted on trainees.
During her third year placement Ruth recalled that she became aware of how her mentor made the placement ‘heaven or hell’ and she ‘stressed continually about being failed’. She emphasised that her current aim was to please Jane and the department as she needed to pass the final placement and attain the best results.

Chloe claimed that staff told her Philippa had failed trainees in the past, which she said made her nervous.

Di explained that in her dealings with Anetta, she did not want to do anything that would ‘rock the boat’ and get in the way of her passing the placement.

Text Box 3  The impact of the power imbalance

Whilst mentors and trainees acknowledged the power imbalance in favour of mentors, neither mentors nor trainees mentioned the power that trainees could have over mentors if the latter thought their reputations were threatened. For example, based upon my experiences as a subject tutor, mentors have expressed concern on more than one occasion. They feared being deemed ‘weak’ if a trainee was placed on a ‘cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23), or failed, or did not ‘enjoy’ the placement. In this research, I speculate that Jane exemplified this when she relinquished some of her power. For example, she threatened Tess with a ‘cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23), but then neither issued it nor sought advice from the subject tutor when Tess consistently under-performed and did not commit to the placement. Similarly, Philippa relinquished some of her power to the subject tutor when she thought Chloe was failing and she avoided making the difficult decision of whether to place Chloe on a ‘cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23) or not. Yet despite this, neither Jane nor Philippa claimed to feel threatened by the circumstances.

6.3.2  Interpersonal component of the mentor / trainee relationship

This sub-section addresses mentors’ and trainees’ perceptions of the impact that core conditions (Rogers, 1957), rapport and trust, expectations and boundaries, stability and openness had on the development of their interpersonal relationship.
Also, I focus on mentors’ and trainees’ awareness of the broad stages of development in their interpersonal relationship.

Although mentors and trainees revealed that they had no knowledge of Roger’s (1957) core conditions they were nevertheless aware of empathy, respect and honesty / genuineness. Indeed, they stated that if these core conditions did not exist, rapport and trust could not be built. Text Boxes 4, 5 and 6 give snapshots of mentors’ and trainees’ views on the need for empathy, respect and genuineness / honesty. Even though mentors and trainees said that genuineness / honesty was essential if trust was to be built, some contradictions are provided in Text Box 6.

Text Box 4  Mentors’ and trainees’ views on empathy

- Trainees and mentors believed empathy was important and mentors were able to be empathetic because they had experienced similar ITT training.
- Trainees’ claimed mentors were empathetic to their levels of fatigue caused by the demands of the workload and the difficulties they encountered when they taught new activity areas.

Text Box 5  Mentors’ and trainees’ views on respect

- Mentors and trainees identified the importance of respecting each other as unique human beings.
- Jane respected Ruth’s ideas, listened to her opinions, appreciated her work ethic and willingness to overcome weak areas and her ‘upfront and honest aura’. Ruth maintained they both made an effort to experience the other’s reality and in so doing got the best out of each other.
- Jane was quick to point out that despite Tess’s behaviour she continued to provide support and assistance whenever it was required to facilitate Tess’s progress.
Mentors and trainees acknowledged that without honesty (genuineness) trust would not develop.

Jane emphasised the need to be honest and up-front about expectations and trainees’ strengths and limitations, Ruth identified the need to be honest about her feelings in meetings.

Yet, data from observations suggested Jane rarely confronted trainees’ limitations. While Jane claimed she told Tess about her poor performance, she disclosed neither her extreme frustration nor thoughts about the possibility of Tess failing the placement.

While Philippa claimed honesty was important, she disclosed in interview that she was not honest and up-front about her concern that Chloe could fail.

Trainees were not always honest. Di explained she was only honest with Anetta up to a point as she did not mention anything she thought would impact upon her passing the placement. Whilst Tess claimed she was honest and up-front with Jane, she disclosed neither the reasons for her lack of commitment to the placement or her failure to change her behaviour until the penultimate week of the placement.

Text Box 6  Mentors’ and trainees’ views on honesty / genuineness

Mentors and trainees acknowledged that the establishment of the core conditions and how they built rapport and trust quickly were important processes for which they were both responsible. All mentors and trainees agreed that good rapport and trust gave trainees the confidence to attempt new things and learn from their mistakes and enabled mentors to grant trainees greater freedom and independence.

In general, mentors’ and trainees’ rapport and trust was built only when mentors were firstly, supportive, approachable and friendly; secondly, made regular contact during the day through informal chats and kept to an agreed schedule; and thirdly, maintained boundaries. In addition, all trainees acknowledged for them to build rapport and trust it was important that they showed willing, took the initiative, acted on advice, respected boundaries and did what was asked.

Nevertheless, Tess failed to do these things throughout most of the placement. Examples in Text Box 7 indicate firstly (bullet points 1 and 2), what trainees thought they were required to do to establish rapport and trust; and secondly (bullet points 3 and 4), situations that hindered this.
• Michael emphasised the need to ‘show willing, work hard, be friendly and self-motivated’.
• Ruth ensured she listened carefully to advice and applied it to her practice.
• Tess failed to commit, did not take advice and made little effort to do what was expected, Jane acknowledged she did not trust her and this impacted on the quality of the relationship.
• Anetta claimed that at the start of the placement Amanda and Di had taken days off school due to illness. As she was, therefore, unsure of their commitment and did not trust them, they had to prove themselves to her before she could develop rapport and build trust.

Text Box 7  Factors impacting on the development of rapport and trust from trainees’ perspective

a.  The importance of setting expectations

Mentors claimed it was important that they familiarised trainees with both the school’s and department’s procedures and established expectations early in the placement. They recognised the importance of this for their professional working relationships, especially in the light of the power imbalance addressed in Section 6.3.1. Examples of school and departmental expectations are given in Text Box 8.

• Statements about school policies;
• Statements that trainees were expected to be punctual, organised for teaching, smartly dressed for work and had a committed work ethic;
• Clear arrangements made for observations, discussions, meetings;
• An awareness that all aspects of trainees’ work would be discussed with staff involved in the training and the PT, except for private matters which would remain confidential between mentor and trainee.

Text Box 8  Examples of mentors’ expectations identified at the start of the placement
Trainees emphasised that it was important that they knew mentors’ expectations as this helped them to identify where they stood and enabled them to settle more easily. For example, Ruth claimed that as she knew Jane’s expectations this ‘motivated her to do well, but also helped her to avoid letting Jane down’. While trainees explained they were given opportunities to state their own expectations, they had felt no need to express these and hence their expectations remained implicit. For example, Tess implicitly expected that Jane checked she was OK and took an interest in how she felt about the placement, talked about non-school topics, had a laugh and a joke and engaged in banter whilst she still kept a professional distance, held weekly meetings and offered feedback on progress towards targets. It was notable, therefore, that whilst she expected so much from her mentor she herself never committed wholeheartedly and gave so little until so late in the placement.

b. The importance of a stable relationship

It seemed to me that the first steps in the establishment of a stable relationship were to set clear expectations and schedules. In questionnaires, mentors and trainees were asked to position and comment on their relationship on Garvey’s (1994b) stable – unstable continuum, and in interviews they were asked to add detail. Stability here referred to consistency of practice (Garvey, 1994b). All mentors and trainees believed a stable environment was essential if they were to build and maintain the rapport and trust that would support trainees’ learning. Also, mentors emphasised that for them stability only existed and trust developed as trainees demonstrated a consistent approach to their work. Ruth and Tess and Michael and Chloe all believed their relationships with Jane and Philippa were stable and the mentors felt the same way. Trainees’ highlighted that, in these relationships, schedules were consistent, mentors kept to their word, and consistently did what was agreed and planned. Ruth explained how, in contrast, her previous mentor’s inconsistency and lack of responsibility had hindered her learning and progress during her year 3 placement. She claimed that she had had only three or four 10 – 20 minute meetings throughout the placement in which he said ‘everything alright? … Right, what else do I need to do? … What else do you
have to do’? As this was her first placement, she had neither known what was expected nor been able to inform the mentor of what was required. Although Anetta, Di and Amanda agreed that their relationships were initially unstable, they emphasised that stability gradually developed as Amanda and Di improved their attendance and settled into the placement.

Mentor and trainee perceptions of the relationship differed only in the case of Jane and Tess. From Jane’s perspective the relationship remained unstable throughout the placement and, for her, this hindered the development of trust. However, Jane pointed out how she had remained consistent and reliable even though she had not been able to depend on Tess to get things done. Yet, conversely, Tess believed the relationship was stable. I imagined that either Tess was in denial or, because of Jane’ consistency, was unable to see how her own performance destabilised the relationship.

c. The need for relationship boundaries

Questionnaire and interview data indicated that although all mentors and trainees believed relationship boundaries were important, they were unable to define clearly what these were, apart from the need for confidentiality. They suggested there was ‘a line’ that should not be crossed so that professional distance was maintained, and mentors expected trainees to know where this should be drawn. Interestingly, whilst Anetta thought it was not important to disclose boundaries, she expected and kept very strict boundaries with trainees. Similarly, whilst Tess suggested that personal and social boundaries were important, she thought there was no need either to state or to discuss these as she already knew what they were.

Whilst it appeared that all mentors agreed it was inappropriate to have a close personal relationship with trainees outside of school, they drew the line in different places. Philippa perceived that socialising with trainees at departmental events enabled them to see her in a different ‘light’ and as a ‘normal person’ and that this helped them as they settled and relaxed into the department. However, she warned of the danger that mentors who socialised with trainees might not be able to maintain an appropriate professional distance. Although Ruth, Tess,
Michael and Chloe appreciated they were given opportunities to socialise with mentors and departmental staff outside of school, they also recognised that they needed to maintain a professional distance. Conversely, Anetta believed socialising with trainees outside of school hours was inappropriate, never engaged in such activities and Di and Amanda accepted her policy.

d. The open-closed dimension of the relationships

Questionnaire and interview data indicated that mentors and trainees thought it was helpful to have a relationship that was more open than closed. When prompted to be more specific, they acknowledged that mentors had to limit their openness so that they maintained an effective professional distance and did not cross ‘the line’. Unlike Anetta, Jane and Philippa claimed they would have listened to trainees’ personal issues as part of their role. However, they agreed with Anetta that it was inappropriate to disclose their own personal issues to trainees.

In the early stage of the placement, all mentors and trainees described their relationships as ‘closed’ and ‘cautious’. Jane emphasised that, from her experience, year 4 trainees settled in quickly and swiftly became more open. This was unlike year 3 trainees who ‘in general, were friendly, agreed with most things and did not always give their views’. Philippa remarked on how quickly Michael (T4) settled and mutual trust developed. She expressed disappointment that because of time restrictions she had been unable to spend more time with Chloe (T3) to facilitate the development of rapport and trust. She explained that she had not got to know Chloe as well early on in the placement as she had done with Michael and others, and felt guilty because she perceived that this impacted negatively on their relationship. On the other hand, whilst at the start of the placement Anetta claimed that she kept strict boundaries and remained ‘closed and formal’, she also perceived that it was important to ‘appear approachable’.

As the placement progressed, Tess and Ruth, and Chloe and Michael claimed they opened up increasingly to their mentors. Michael said he felt able to confide in Philippa, while Tess, Ruth and Chloe said they talked only very superficially
about their personal lives. When Ruth compared this to her experience on her year 3 placement, she disclosed how she had been unable to open up to the mentor or approach him for help. She stated that she had ‘hated’ the closed nature of that relationship and maintained that it had a negative impact on her progress. Anetta and her trainees agreed that they took time to become more at ease in each other’s company. Moreover, Anetta claimed that she only trusted them and relaxed slightly once Di and Amanda had established themselves as ‘good teachers’. Di affirmed this as she acknowledged how Anetta’s attitude towards her changed once her teaching improved.

By the end of the placement mentors claimed that their relationships with year 3 trainees retained a sense of formality, but they were friendly, some trust had developed and trainees discussed more personal issues with mentors. However, for Jane and Tess this did not happen until the last two weeks of the placement. On the other hand, relationships with year 4 trainees had progressed further. Jane and Ruth and Philippa and Michael reported that their relationships with mentors had become more relaxed and informal and, as levels of trust developed, trainees were able to be open. Philippa and Michael claimed they had established, in their view, ‘a friendship’. Although Anetta and Amanda did not emphasise the levels of trust and degrees of openness reported by Michael and Ruth, they claimed trust and mutual understanding had increased and their relationship was friendly. Indeed, Amanda maintained she had opened up more towards the end of the placement.

e. Reflections on the interpersonal component of the relationship

Although mentors and trainees acknowledged the importance of the interpersonal component of their relationships, they had not given it much thought and I prompted them to think more broadly and deeply about what they did and how they did it.

Mentors were in charge and relationships were hierarchical with implicit boundaries that maintained professional distance. Whilst all mentors and trainees acknowledged and accepted the imbalance of power in favour of the mentor,
because of their status in the school and their assessment role, they claimed nevertheless that this did not impact on their relationships. I was struck by what appeared to be mentors’ and trainees’ lack of awareness, or denial, or failure to think much about this issue. They certainly did not seem to have considered the complexity of power relations and/or their impact. On the other hand, I also knew that the mentors had not received any education or training that might have raised their awareness and improved their understanding of these issues, or helped them to develop strategies that could be used to deal with problems should they arise. When I probed further in interviews, it became clear to me that trainees were very aware of the impact of mentors’ power to pass or fail them. They claimed they did not want to say or do anything that might have damaged their chances of passing the placement. In addition, I became aware that mentors’ responsibility for passing or failing a trainee impacted on how genuine / honest they were with trainees. This seemed particularly true if trainees underperformed and difficult decisions had to be taken. Based upon my subject tutor experience, I suggest that Tess’s and Chloe’s lack of progress potentially unnerved, worried, frustrated and threatened Jane’s and Philippa’s confidence and reputation as mentors. In turn, their ability to be genuine with trainees was inhibited as they tussled with the difficult decision to place trainees on a cause for concern.

Rapport and trust appeared to be essential to minimise the impact of the imbalance in power, to settle trainees, to allow them to open-up to mentors and feel at ease and to ask questions, try new things and take risks. However, with strict implicit boundaries in place, mentors remained closed and this limited the openness of the relationship. In my view, this potentially limited depth of trust, as well as the possibility for the development of the strong emotional bond required for deep reflection and transformation (Brockbank and McGill, 2006).

I infer from what mentors and trainees told me that the interpersonal component of the relationships works best when: mentor expectations are established; routines are consistent; relationships are stable and rapport and a basic level of trust is built quickly and maintained. With these conditions in place, trainees become more open when mentors remain approachable, empathetic and friendly.
6.3.3 Developmental components of the mentor/trainee relationship

In interviews, mentors emphasised that all trainees were different and their work with them depended upon what each individual brought to a placement, her / his commitment to the workload and the progress s/he made. Whilst questionnaire and interview data suggested that mentors encountered more problems with year 3 trainees, there were exceptions. For example, Amanda (T4) had a more difficult start to her practice than the other year 4 trainees. Conversely, by Anetta’s accounts, Di (T3) was able to teach, worked hard and progressed well.

This sub-section examines the nature of the mentors’ and trainees’ developmental relationship through an examination of mentors’ ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19 [Sections 2.3 and 3.6]) in relation to trainees’ development at the beginning, middle and end of placements. To aid this analysis, Clutterbuck’s (2003) behavioural matrix model (Appendix 1, E) was used and mentors and trainees were asked to plot where they situated their relationship along the vertical axis (directive – non-directive) and the horizontal axis (challenging – nurturing) at the beginning, middle and end of the placement. This enabled me to establish the extent to which mentors were engaged in combinations of coaching (directive and challenging function), guardianship (directive and nurturing function), counselling (non-directive and nurturing function) and networking (non-directive and challenging function).

Based upon data from questionnaires and interviews, it became apparent that mentors’ and trainees’ perspectives on the ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19) differed, although they all agreed that the four ‘helping to learn’ styles were used throughout the placement. Mentors emphasised they shifted between

styles from one lesson to the next, and/or one day to the next, and how this depended upon the needs of a trainee at a particular moment in time.

**a. Mentoring styles used with year 3 trainees**

Jane and Philippa agreed that at the start of an intermediate placement a year 3 trainee needed her mentor to be more directive and nurturing (guardian) because, as Jane explained, ‘everything was new to the trainee’. Jane emphasised how the timetable included the trainee’s stronger activity areas\(^{34}\) so that she built confidence and settled into the department. Whilst Jane pointed out some challenge was important to ‘keep the trainee on her toes’ she stressed this had to be realistic to establish a ‘feel good factor’. On the other hand, while Anetta claimed her style was directive and she challenged Di (coach), she also believed she also provided some nurturing.

Although Chloe and Di agreed that their mentors were more directive, Tess perceived Jane’s style to be equally directive and non-directive. All year 3 trainees maintained that their mentors’ style was more challenging than nurturing at the start. Although Chloe and Tess acknowledged some nurturing, Di emphasised that she did not feel nurtured and described how at the start she felt ‘dropped in at the deep end’ and ‘left to sink or swim’. Although she explained that Anetta was supportive and helpful, she had been demoralised by other staff who were very critical and gave no constructive feedback.

By mid-placement both Jane and Philippa claimed their style remained predominantly directive and nurturing (guardian) because of Tess and Chloe’s limited progress. In contrast, Anetta thought her style was equally directive and non-directive and more challenging than nurturing (coach and networker). From Anetta’s point of view, Di managed her own learning and, as her confidence grew, she was able to leave her to ‘get on, on her own’ while she networked to facilitate development. While Di concurred with Anetta, Tess and Chloe’s perspectives

\(^{34}\) Stronger activity is a practical activity (e.g. gymnastics) in which the trainee has greater subject knowledge and experience.
again differed from those of their mentors. Tess perceived there was no change in Jane’s challenging style (coach and networker) and although Chloe believed Philippa’s style was more nurturing than challenging, like Tess, she claimed their relationship was equally directive and non-directive.

From Jane’s and Philippa’s perspective there was no change in their predominant guardian style as Tess and Chloe moved into the last month of the placement and they still nurtured and drove the relationships. They perceived that the challenge for trainees had increased slightly but, when compared to past year 3 trainees at this stage, they considered that challenge still remained ‘at a very low level’. Tess and Chloe’s perspectives contrasted with those of their mentors’ as they maintained the styles were equally directive and non-directive and more challenging than nurturing (coach and networker).

In contrast, Anetta and Di agreed that Di drove the relationship, set her own targets and enjoyed the freedom as she got on with her work on her own and monitored her ITDP. Di claimed that her lesson plans were no longer checked and lessons were no longer observed all of the time. Even so, Anetta explained that while her style was non-directive and challenging (networker) most of the time, she slipped into a more directive and challenging style (coach) when Di taught weaker activity areas. Figures 14 (Jane and Tess) and 15 (Anetta and Di) show examples of two contrasting profiles and the shifts in mentors’ ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19) with two year 3 trainees at three stages in the placement. The profiles show differences in styles in relation to a weak trainee (Figure 14) and a more able trainee (Figure 15) and the differences in mentors’ and trainees’ perspectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tess’s development</th>
<th>Jane’s perception of her use of ‘helping to learn’ styles</th>
<th>Tess’s perception of Jane’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 1 – 3. Settling in, performing routine tasks, surviving lessons, not committed &amp; fatigued.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More directive and nurturing</td>
<td>More directive and nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 4 – 7. Surviving lessons, weak planning, weak evaluations, fatigued. Teaching fluctuated between poor and satisfactory with the occasional good lesson.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More directive and nurturing</td>
<td>Equally directive and non-directive and more challenging than nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 8 – 15. Surviving, teaching performance still fluctuating, until week 14 when planning improves and challenge increases slightly.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More directive and nurturing, but with increased challenge</td>
<td>Equally directive and non-directive, more challenging than nurturing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14** Stages in Tess’s development and perceptions of Jane’s ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19)

**Key:**
- **D** = directive [mentor drives the relationship]
- **ND** = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]
- **C** = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]
- **N** = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee]
### Figure 15  Stages in Di’s development and perceptions of Anetta’s ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Di’s development</th>
<th>Anetta’s perception of her use of ‘helping to learn’ styles</th>
<th>Di’s perception of Anetta’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 1 – 3. Moved through being idealistic to surviving.</td>
<td>![Diagram](coach Guardian net worker counsellor ND More directive and more challenging)</td>
<td>![Diagram](coach Guardian net worker counsellor ND Equally directive and more challenging than nurturing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 4 – 7. Progressing and moving on in stronger activity areas, but dealing with difference in weaker areas. Di agrees although she feels sometimes that she is only surviving in some weaker areas.</td>
<td>![Diagram](coach Guardian net worker counsellor ND Equally directive and non-directive and more challenging than nurturing)</td>
<td>![Diagram](coach Guardian net worker counsellor ND Equally directive and non-directive and equally challenging and nurturing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 8 – 15. Progressing and moving on. Demonstrates some concern for individual learning needs, but reflections are shallow. She has become more aware of individual needs since mid-placement. Development fluctuates.</td>
<td>![Diagram](coach Guardian net worker counsellor ND Primarily non-directive and challenging)</td>
<td>![Diagram](coach Guardian net worker counsellor ND More non-directive, more challenging than nurturing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **D** = directive [mentor drives the relationship]
- **ND** = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]
- **C** = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]
- **N** = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee]
b. Mentoring styles used with year 4 trainees

Questionnaire and interview data identified that mentors’ styles varied at the start of the year 4 placement. Jane confirmed that in the first four weeks she drove the relationship and her style tended to be more directive and nurturing (guardian) as Ruth settled into a routine. Yet while Ruth agreed that Jane was more nurturing than challenging, she perceived their relationship to be equally directive and non-directive (guardian and counsellor). On the other hand, from the start Philippa and Michael agreed their relationship was more non-directive. For example, as Michael settled quickly, he became pro-active in the department, preferred to get on with things and asked for assistance only when needed. Both maintained that he did not need a lot of nurturing and invited challenge (coach and networker).

Michael claimed there was no need for Philippa to look over his shoulder and ‘as he was happy’ Philippa let him get on independently. However, whilst Michael described their relationship as equally challenging and nurturing (networker and counsellor), Philippa believed it was more challenging than nurturing (networker). She emphasised that an appropriate balance of both was needed so that Michael was motivated as he dealt with situations. In contrast to Jane and Philippa, Anetta maintained her styles were equally directive and non-directive and more challenging at the start (coach and networker). This was unlike Amanda, who perceived the mentoring style to be predominately directive and challenging (coach).

As the placement progressed for Philippa and Michael, they both agreed that Philippa’s style became increasingly non-directive and challenging in nature (networker). As Ruth settled into her schedule, improved her teaching performance, and gained greater confidence, Jane perceived her styles to be equally directive and non-directive and more challenging (coach and networker). However, Ruth’s perceptions differed. While Ruth agreed Jane’s style was equally directive and non-directive, she maintained Jane continued to be predominantly nurturing (guardian and counsellor). Whilst Ruth expressed her concern that she was too dependent on Jane, she realised she had to try things before she asked for help and also acknowledged she was given greater responsibility and freedom as
her confidence grew. In addition, she maintained that she was challenged as she taught a variety of activities; some in which she had little experience, some easy and difficult groups, and when Jane distanced herself and/or left her alone as she taught. This affirmed the shift towards greater challenge identified by Jane.

As Amanda settled, developed greater confidence and improved her teaching, Anetta, like Jane, perceived that her styles were equally directive and non-directive and more challenging than nurturing (coach and networker). In contrast to Anetta’s perception, Amanda believed that as their relationship became more non-directive it was equally challenging and nurturing (networker and counsellor). Like Philippa, Jane and Anetta agreed that it was important to get the levels of nurture and challenge right so that trainees progressed.

In the last month of the placement, mentors described their relationships with year 4 trainees as primarily non-directive and challenging (networker). Ruth was the only year 4 trainee who described her relationship with Jane as being equally directive and non-directive, although she agreed that it was more challenging than nurturing (coach and networker). Jane explained she still re-assured Ruth in those final weeks, even though she took a step back and allowed her to get on as she taught on her own. Similarly, Philippa described how she was there in the background if Michael needed her and provided support through the job application and interview process. Likewise, Anetta explained how she had left Amanda ‘to get on and manage her own learning’ and how she then was ‘used as a sounding board when required’. All three mentors placed a significant emphasis on year 4 trainees teaching on their own at the end of the placement, as they perceived this would be required of them in their first post. Figures 16 (Jane and Ruth) and 17 (Philippa and Michael) show examples of two contrasting profiles and the shifts that took place in mentors’ styles with year 4 trainees in relation to their development at three stages in the placement. The figures also show the differences in mentors’ and trainees’ perspectives.
### Ruth’s development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks 1 – 3.</th>
<th>Settling in, good rapport and behaviour management, routine tasks, surviving lessons, fatigued.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ruth’s perception of her use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Jane’s perception of Ruth’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Ruth’s perception of Jane’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Coach** | D  
**Guardian** | N  
**Networker** | ND  
**Counsellor** |
| **More directive and more nurturing** | Equally directive and non-directive and more nurturing |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks 4 – 7.</th>
<th>Gained confidence, tried new things, took more risks, moving on in strong activity areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ruth’s perception of her use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Jane’s perception of Ruth’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Ruth’s perception of Jane’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Coach** | D  
**Guardian** | N  
**Networker** | ND  
**Counsellor** |
| **Equally directive and non-directive and more challenging** | Equally directive and non-directive and more nurturing |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks 8 – 15.</th>
<th>Confidence high, increased freedom, calmer, more at ease, can think on feet and paid greater attention to pupils’ learning. Ruth experienced a plateau in last month. Stayed in comfort zone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ruth’s perception of her use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Jane’s perception of Ruth’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Ruth’s perception of Jane’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles** | D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee] |
| **Coach** | D  
**Guardian** | N  
**Networker** | ND  
**Counsellor** |
| **More non-directive than directive and more challenging than nurturing** | Equally directive and non-directive, more challenging than nurturing |

**Figure 16** Stages in Ruth’s development and perceptions of Jane’s ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19)

**Key:**  
D = directive [mentor drives the relationship]  
ND = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]  
C = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]  
N = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael’s development</th>
<th>Philippa’s perception of her use of ‘helping to learn’ styles</th>
<th>Michael’s perception of Philippa’s use of ‘helping to learn’ styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeks 1 – 3.</strong> Has a working knowledge of schools, feels more confident from the start, can manage time well. Plans lessons and gets on with teaching. Dealing with difference and progressing and moving on in stronger activity areas.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /> More non-directive and challenging</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /> More non-directive and equally challenging and nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeks 4 – 7.</strong> Moving on. Can critically evaluate his practice, he is thinking why things happen and has developed form just describing practice.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /> More non-directive and challenging</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /> More non-directive and more challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeks 8 – 15.</strong> Critically evaluating practice. Solving problems independently but occasionally needing guidance. Claimed he would always attempt to solve a problem before asking for guidance. Trainee hit a plateau in the last 4 weeks of the placement.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /> More non-directive and more challenging</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /> More non-directive and more challenging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 17**  Stages in Michael’s development and perceptions of Philippa’s ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19)

**Key:**
- **D** = directive [mentor drives the relationship]
- **ND** = non-directive [trainee drives the relationship]
- **C** = challenging [mentor stretches trainee]
- **N** = nurturing [mentor nurtures trainee]
c. The active – passive dimension of the relationships

Southern University expected that Mentors facilitated the trainees’ learning throughout the placement and that trainees were busy as they did what was expected of them so that they achieved the required standards. Questionnaires invited mentors and trainees to plot and comment on where their relationships sat on Garvey’s (1994b) active – passive continuum at the beginning, middle and end of the placement. In interviews, they were able to extend their explanations. Based on the data provided, levels of activity varied and in most cases trainees became more active than mentors as they developed. Unlike other relationships, Jane claimed she remained more active than Tess (T3) throughout the placement. Whilst Jane accepted she expected to be more active at the start with an inexperienced year 3 trainee, she emphasised that it was unusual that she had to undertake so much work just to keep Tess going. She claimed, ‘I have put a lot of effort and extra work into mentoring Tess. If I hadn’t she would have failed by now’. Tess recognised Jane had been more active in the relationship and stated Jane was ‘very good at sorting anything I ask about … while I do try to take action I am not as quick to respond’.

On the other hand, Philippa and Chloe (T3) were equally active throughout because of Chloe’s learning needs. In contrast, Ruth (T4), Michael (T4), Amanda (T4) and Di (T3) became more active than mentors as their confidence increased, their teaching improved and they accepted greater responsibility. Unlike Jane, both Anetta and Philippa believed that they were passive in the last month of the placement.

d. Reflections on the developmental components of the mentor/trainee relationship

Year 4 trainees started their placements further along the developmental continuum than year 3 trainees. Based on mentors and trainees’ accounts, it seemed apparent to me that how mentors used the four ‘helping to learn’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001, p. 19) and how they moved along the vertical and horizontal axes of the continuum was dependant upon their perceived needs of the trainees.
At times, when trainees struggled or attempted something for the first time and found the work challenging, mentors were more directive and nurturing (guardian) and both members of the pair were involved actively in facilitating the trainee’s attainment and progress. As trainees developed greater confidence and their teaching improved, mentors increased the challenge. Even so, they still remained active and directive in the relationship, until trainees gained in confidence, used their initiative and could be granted greater independence. At this point, the mentoring style shifted and became non-directive and either equally nurturing and challenging (networker / counsellor) or primarily challenging (networker).

At this stage trainees seemed to become more active than their mentors. I questioned, however, just how much trainees such as Michael and Di, who demonstrated confidence and ably delivered material and controlled classes, were ‘left to get on’ at the expense of being challenged continuously to develop their practice and become the best they could be. Additionally, I questioned the emphasis that mentors placed on year 4 trainees who got on, on their own, towards the end of the placement because of their impending employment. I wondered whether this shift in mentoring style happened at the expense of actively working with trainees right up to the very end so that they improved the quality of their practice. Alternatively, as in the case of Jane and Ruth, I wondered, as Ruth suggested, whether Jane had encouraged Ruth to become too dependent and, if this in turn had slowed Ruth’s progress towards independence and self-confidence.

It was interesting to note that trainees’ perceptions of mentoring styles sometimes varied from those of their mentors. I wondered what impact this had on trainees’ attainment and progress, especially if neither mentors nor trainees were aware of the differences. It seemed to me that the contrast in perceptions varied most in the mentors’ relationships with the two year 3 trainees who under-performed. Unlike their mentors, Tess and Chloe indicated that mentoring styles were more challenging and equally directive and non-directive (coach and networker) for most of the placement. I inferred that the mentors’ styles appeared challenging
because Tess and Chloe struggled with the achievement of all tasks and found they were constantly challenged to survive. In addition, I suspected they perceived that they equally drove the relationship because of the amount of work they did to survive.

Figure 18 provides a visual representation of the dynamic nature of the mentor / trainee relationship in relation to trainees’ broad stages of development (Maynard and Furlong, 1995), mentors’ styles (Clutterbuck, 2001) and relationship dimensions (Garvey, 1994b). The two-way arrows show how development can fluctuate (progress and regress) between stages, mentors’ styles and dimensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>MENTOR AND TRAINEE EQUALLY ACTIVE</td>
<td>STABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>Non-directive</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealistic expectations</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited subject knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited reflective and problem solving skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsettled in new school environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVIVING THE EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding what works and does not work</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Trainee becoming more active than mentor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved reflective and problem solving skills</td>
<td>Non-directive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trainee becoming more open / mentor closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding strengths and limitations</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving subject knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with whole class activity and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing whole class learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEALING WITH DIFFICULTIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much progress. Satisfied with what</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Trainee very active / mentor passive</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works and not Challenging self to try anything new.</td>
<td>Non-directive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trainee open / mentor closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATEAU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasingly more critical, proactive and</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking control</td>
<td>Non-directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving problems independently</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good subject knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting new challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning to deal with individual pupils’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18  Dynamics of the mentor / trainee relationship
6.3.4 Reflections on the inter-relationship between the interpersonal and developmental components of the mentor / trainee relationship

I was keen to better understand how elements of both the interpersonal relationship and the developmental relationship worked together. I wondered to what extent these two components inter-related and facilitated trainees’ ability to reflect deeply, plan and evaluate thoroughly, challenge their practice, attempt new things and thus continuously develop their teaching ability and, ultimately, become independent learners who drove the relationship and fulfilled the QTS standards at a very good level. I imagined that, because of the lack of education and training for mentors and trainees, they were expected to already possess the necessary competencies for promoting successful interpersonal and developmental relationships.

Mentors and trainees identified an inter-relationship between the interpersonal and developmental components of their relationships. Yet, their restricted ability to articulate their practice in any depth and detail limited my ability to be specific about the interrelationship. Trainees referred to how they settled and progressed better if they felt at ease with their mentor and were able to be open. Similarly, mentors mentioned that they wanted to be friendly, approachable, empathetic and ‘there’ for trainees, to facilitate their progress towards attaining the standards and greater independence. Without exception, all mentors and trainees placed emphasis on the need to build rapport and trust so that developmental relationships flourished.

On reflection, the power imbalance that was caused by mentors’ status within the school and their assessment role meant that mentors remained closed in the relationship and so kept professional distance. In addition, trainees identified how they did not want to do or say anything that might damage their chances of passing the placement. In turn, these elements limited the openness of relationships. I suggest this ultimately arrested the development of an emotional bond, depth of reflection and challenge and therefore the chances trainees had of swinging into the double-loop learning process and achieving transformation. However, it was important that levels of rapport and trust had been developed to
the point where trainees felt able to share some personal concerns with mentors. In turn, as this gave them greater confidence they asked more questions and tried out new things.

In Figure 19, I represent my concept of the inter-relationship between the interpersonal and developmental components of the mentor / trainee relationship. The Figure exemplifies trainees’ possible pathways from a closed relationship, in which trainees were dependent on mentors whose style was directive, as they engaged together in a single loop learning process for improvement with no possibility of transformation (A); to open and equal relationships, independent of mentors whose style was non-directive, as they engaged together in the double loop learning process, with every possibility of transformation (B).
Figure 19  Interrelationships between the interpersonal and developmental aspects of the mentor/trainee relationship
Based upon mentors and trainees’ accounts, Philippa’s and Michael’s relationship bore the closest resemblance to pathway B. Yet, even though they claimed the relationship became open, Philippa remained more closed than open and it was difficult to know the extent of openness. They both maintained the mentor’s style was non-directive from the start of the placement and that early on Michael became very independent. All other relationships either remained directive and closed in the bottom left hand quadrant (A) or progressed through to the lower quarter of the upper right hand quadrant. In the latter trainees became more open with mentors, gained in confidence, improved their teaching and mentors gave them greater independence and responsibility (C). In contrast to A, B and C, it seemed possible also, that a mentor who worked with a confident and able trainee could have progressed along pathway (D), if the mentor had left the trainee to get on, on their own. I suggest that pathways A, C and D would not have provided opportunities for the development of the emotional bond required for swinging into the double-loop learning process, and thus could not have resulted in transformation. Pathways A, C and D therefore, remained within the confines of the single-loop learning process for improvement. On pathway D, I speculate that learning takes place slowly, by trial and error, in a relationship with limited rapport and trust. For example, I wonder if Di was on pathway D as she was often left on her own and managed and monitored her progress within a relationship which appeared to be more closed than open.

6.3.5 Re-defining or ending the relationship

In the final research interview, mentors explained that past trainees had kept in touch by text, e-mail and the occasional visit and maintained it was always good to see them and hear how they had got on. Philippa in particular was keen to stay in touch with ex-trainees and many had returned often to join departmental parties. While she was always happy to give advice in a professional capacity and to develop a friendship, she acknowledged this really depended on the trainee. Both Jane and Anetta were happy to stay in touch with trainees and be consulted on professional issues.
Michael expressed the wish for his relationship with Philippa to continue and hoped it might become a good friendship. Like Ruth (with Jane), Chloe wanted Philippa to be an advisor and friend. Conversely, while Amanda and Di wanted to continue the professional relationship with Anetta they had no interest in the development of a friendship. Unlike other trainees, Tess had no intention of continuing either a professional or interpersonal relationship with Jane, but thought she might see her from time to time at sporting fixtures. It seemed unlikely to me that most of these relationships would develop into true friendships.

6.4 Part Three: What weekly mentor / trainee meetings revealed about the relationships

The University and the PE teaching profession expected the weekly meetings to be the longest period of time mentors and trainees sat together and reflected on trainees’ progress. Study of the mentor / trainee meetings therefore, provided a window to view and examine further the processes involved in PE ITT mentoring and the nature of the relationship.

Sub-sections 6.4.1 – 6.4.3 examine the content of the mentor / trainee meetings and what mentor / trainee interactions during meetings tell about the nature of target setting and assessment, the communication skills used by mentors and trainees and the nature of mentors’ and trainees’ dialogue. Data collected from observations provided the basis for the claims made and gave another perspective of the mentor / trainee relationships. This added to the richness of the findings. As observation data were supplemented by interview data this made it possible to clarify and confirm what mentors and trainees both said and did.

6.4.1 The content and nature of the mentor / trainee dialogue in meetings

During interviews, all mentors described the weekly session with trainees as a meeting and recorded meetings suggested to me that this was an appropriate description. In the time spent mentors and trainees caught up on what had happened during the week, addressed a random list of topics and decided what action trainees needed to take in the following week. Jane affirmed that in
meetings both parties built the relationship and ‘got the job done’. She believed these meetings provided ‘quiet time for deeper thinking’ as opposed to comments made in passing or in a ‘quick five minutes’. For example, she stated:

It’s a stepping stone … it’s like … so you’ve had a week now, we’re going to move up a step and it’s almost like a transition, isn’t it? Where do we go from here? … plus numerous other things come up.

Observation data indicated that, in general, there was little variation in either the topics covered in meetings or the order in which these were addressed. This is shown in Table 28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics covered in meetings with year 4 trainees</th>
<th>Topics covered in meetings with year 3 trainees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How trainee felt;</td>
<td>How trainee was;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support available from mentor and department;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassurance that things would get done in time;</td>
<td>How things had gone in the previous week;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee’s explanations of what she did and how pupils responded in lessons she taught;</td>
<td>Discussion about what happened in each lesson, how pupils responded, what to do next with advice from the mentor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards to be ticked off, those still to be achieved; and action mainly, but sometimes targets for the next week;</td>
<td>Standards achieved, sometimes targets for the next week although this was brief;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What evidence to collect and where to file it;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University based tasks;</td>
<td>University based tasks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor group;</td>
<td>Tutor group;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school events e.g. Ofsted, parent meetings, athletics events;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 An example of the typical order of topics covered in mentor / trainee meetings

With no agenda negotiated at the start of meetings, mentors arrived with a list of items that had to be addressed and trainees followed their lead. While Jane spent a
lot of time on ‘how the week went’ and trainees reported back on what happened, Philippa spent most of the time on lesson de-briefs and reviewing lesson feedback from other staff. Jane and Philippa sometimes checked briefly if trainees had achieved the previous weeks targets / action and as a meeting progressed they set a number of action points that trainees had to address during the following week.

Alternatively, with Di and Amanda, Anetta spent most time looking at the ITDPs, trainees ticked targets and standards that had been achieved and identified action that had to be taken the following week so that trainees could achieve other standards. Unlike Jane, in meetings, Philippa and Anetta did not include any chitchat about things other than work.

In general, based upon what I observed in meetings, mentors and trainees took stock of what trainees had done during the week and created a list of actions for them to achieve in the coming week. All meetings were led by the mentors’ agendas and trainees seemed happy as passive recipients as they followed the mentors’ lead. With a ‘shopping list’ of items that had to be covered, there was no time for depth of reflection on any one topic, despite Jane’s claim to the contrary.

6.4.2 Target setting and assessment of trainees

In interviews, mentors and trainees confirmed they ensured trainees achieved the DfES (2002) standards and followed University procedures. For example:

i. PDP action plans were prepared by trainees prior to the placement;
ii. year 4 trainees arrived with their intermediate placement final report;
iii. mentors and year 4 trainees examined the intermediate final report and used this as they identified what trainees needed to achieve;
iv. ITDPs were created with varying degrees of mentor assistance;
v. trainees taught and mentors and other staff gave verbal and / or written feedback;
vi. trainees carried out other weekly duties;
vii. weekly progress was recorded and targets set on official Secondary School Liaison [SSL]1 forms;
mentors’ interim and final reports were submitted on official forms (SSL2 and SSL3)\(^35\) on the specified dates.

Mentors claimed that they recognised the importance of maintaining a process of progressive target setting with trainees as this enabled trainees to meet the standards by the end of the placement.

All mentors confirmed that trainees managed their ITDPs. Subsequently, as trainees wrote and up-dated their ITDPs they identified what needed to be achieved and reported their needs to mentors. Yet, discrepancies appeared between what mentors and trainees reported. For example, Anetta claimed that she and the trainees planned and created the ITDP together at the start of the placement. Conversely, Amanda (year 4 trainee) stated:

> I wrote it [ITDP] (and) she just sort of flipped through it. Most weeks in our mentor meeting I’ll have it out in front of me and I’ll just sort of tick it and she’ll just like look over my shoulder.

Hence, whilst Anetta was clear that as the placement progressed trainees became more able to set their own targets and action points, it was not clear how specific or useful these were.

Mentors claimed that, at the start of the placement, they had neither matched the results of a teaching needs analysis\(^36\) with trainees’ PDP action plans, intermediate teaching reports and requirements of the standards as identified in the ITDP, nor produced their own individual progressive learning program for trainees.

 Whilst data from observations indicated that both Jane and Anetta’s trainees had not completed their ITDPs by week 3, it was difficult to define when they did so. Similarly, it was not possible to confirm when Philippa’s trainees completed their

\(^{35}\) SSL2 interim: Tickbox report on development of teaching competence submitted at mid-point of the placement (Southern University, 2005 /06). SSL3: Written final report submitted to the University at the end of the placement.

\(^{36}\) Teaching needs analysis: a baseline assessment of the trainees teaching needs.
ITDPs. For example, the ITDP was never mentioned in Michael’s meetings and whenever Philippa asked Chloe for hers she never had it with her. Without a strategic overarching plan in place, I suggest that planning was reactive. In general, observation data suggested that weekly target and action setting was based upon what came up in lessons. Although during interviews mentors and trainees claimed the standards were achieved, in my view there was no strategic planning that underpinned how this happened.

Observations showed that when mentors and trainees met, they discussed trainees’ work superficially and completed the required paperwork. While action points were identified, ticked off, and new actions set, no clear link was made either to the ITDP targets or associated standards. I found it difficult to identify either the previous week’s targets or those set for the following week. In addition, identified targets, when set, were vague and unhelpful, as for example, ‘assessment and pacing’. In Michael’s case, vague targets set in week twelve such as ‘use of the (assessment) levels’ resembled closely those set in week seven. Examples of targets are given in Table 29. Table 30 shows an example of what happened in Jane’s meetings with Ruth at the beginning, middle and end of the placement (read across the rows) in relation to the ITDP, target setting, and monitoring of attainment. This is representative of the other meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jane</th>
<th>Philippa</th>
<th>Anetta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>Use of dartfish in athletics</td>
<td>Observe a PSHE lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Use of assessment levels</td>
<td>Send out letter to parents about the offsite activity experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep going</td>
<td></td>
<td>Write the 3 units of work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29  Examples of targets set by the mentors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITDP</td>
<td>Not completed To do week 4 – then set weekly targets</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of previous weeks targets/action</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly targets set for the following week</td>
<td>None Prioritised settling in: happy with school, group, timetable, activities and department</td>
<td>Assess pupils’ attainment Pacing</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tasks/action set for the following week</td>
<td>Organisation: Completing observation sheets Photocopy material for GCSE(^{37}) and BTEC(^{38}) lessons Get ahead with lesson plans Learn pupil’s names Ask for assistance re getting gym apparatus out.</td>
<td>Take it easy to cope with the injury; Experience tutorials with the group; to deal with the problem pupil; Cope with the tutor group; work towards completing the university tasks; keep the learning objectives specific.</td>
<td>Preparation for: Parents evening Job interview GCSE rounders lesson Improve tennis demonstration Check had met all standards and had appropriate evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 30**  
**Target setting and monitoring attainment through Ruth’s placement**

Observations confirmed that mentors and trainees did not establish clear assessment criteria that enabled judgements to be made on the quality of trainees’ weekly attainment. Whilst mentors and trainees agreed that University grading

---

37  General Certificate of Secondary Education.  
38  Business and Technical Education Council.
criteria were a good idea as an aid to establish trainees’ level of attainment, these were not used as the placement progressed. Instead, as mentors intimated in interviews, they judged quality by the evidence trainees presented for a particular target / standard. Yet, observation data identified that no evidence was examined before action, targets or standards were ticked off as completed.

In addition, in interviews mentors acknowledged they did not use University grading criteria for guidance when they wrote trainees’ final reports. Furthermore, when I examined trainees’ ITDPs at the end of the placement I found no additional action stated for any of the targets and / or standards. This suggested that all year 3 and 4 trainees had achieved targets and standards at a very good level and had no further action to take. This was clearly not the case with Tess and Chloe, as evidenced by their mentors’ comments. In addition, in the year 3 and 4 trainees’ final reports, I found that mentors had not identified any specific targets for the intermediate placement and the NQT year respectively; instead they alluded to general areas for further development, such as monitoring and assessment, and information and communication technology (ICT). Furthermore, I noted that in Chloe’s final report Philippa made no reference to the severe difficulties with the delivery of material that Chloe had faced as a teacher.

I suggest that the data on target setting and the assessment of trainees’ attainment highlighted many important issues for consideration. Firstly, whilst mentors and trainees indicated that University procedures were carried out, it became apparent to me that they only paid scant attention to the procedures. These procedures were meant to guide mentors and trainees through a developmental process that, in my view, facilitated trainees’ attainment of the standards at a very good level. Based on observation data, pairs went through a process of to-do lists and ticked boxes when they perceived trainees had ‘done’ a standard. Trainees and mentors focused very little on either what trainees learned from action taken, or the level of attainment trainees had achieved, or any further action required that might improve their level. In addition, mentors relied on trainees to manage and up-date their ITDPs and expected them to indicate what they needed to do next. Hence, mentors took very little ownership for the guidance of the trainees through a
logical progressive development programme, which had the ITDP at its centre. As a consequence of this casual approach to planning and development, trainees’ reports were vague and not very informative for the next step in their career, as for example, either their next placement or first post. In my view, strategic planning for development, progressive target setting and formal assessment were not rigorous.

6.4.3 Mentors’ and trainees’ use of communication skills

In Chapter Four, discussion highlighted the importance of good communication skills for mentoring (Tomlinson, 1981; Shaw, 1992; Corbett and Wright, 1994; Field, 1994; Long, 1997; Parsloe and Wray, 2000; Clutterbuck, 2001; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). For example, literature suggests that clusters of communication skills required for effective dialogue include attending, active listening and responding (Clutterbuck, 2001; Bayliss, 2001; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). This sub-section addresses mentors’ and trainees’ use of communication skill clusters and the nature of their dialogue.

Questionnaire and interview data revealed that Jane, Philippa, Anetta and their trainees agreed that good communication skills were important and that they possessed these skills. Although mentors confirmed that they had not been trained to use communication skills and were not familiar with all of them, they knew they needed to listen and use open-ended questions, recognised that feedback was important and were aware of the need for positive body language. On the other hand, they did not reflect on the nature of their dialogue with trainees and were not aware of how skilfully they applied these skills to enhance what took place. For example, Jane stated ‘hopefully I would pick up any tense body language … I hope I listen well to trainees’ verbal communication’. Likewise, she ‘hoped’ she had good relaxed and open body language ‘to put the trainee at ease’.

a. Attending to the setting and preparing for the meeting

Preparation of the setting and one’s self for interaction is considered to be important (Bayliss, 2001). Interview data revealed that mentors recognised that it was essential that they booked a quiet room, although they claimed they could not
always obtain one. In all observed meetings mentors and trainees had varied experiences: for example, whilst most were not interrupted, there were a few distractions in others. Jane preferred privacy as she and the trainee met in what she described as ‘familiar and comfortable meeting rooms’ that were naturally bright, with chairs and desks appropriate for work. This was not always possible and one of her meetings with Ruth was held in the staff room in which other staff milled around. One meeting with Tess was conducted on the floor of the sports hall with many interruptions from pupils. For each of the recorded meetings, Philippa managed to book a quiet room with natural lighting and appropriate furniture for working. Whilst Anetta met with Amanda in the PE office and staff left the room, distractions nevertheless occasionally occurred when people knocked on the door and the phone rang. One meeting with Di took place in the PE office and the other two in a quiet senior common room with comfortable chairs and low coffee tables. In both venues workspace was limited: for example, in the PE office, worktops were small and cluttered and in the senior common room coffee tables were too low to write on comfortably. It is important to note that the need to record meetings could have impacted on the nature of the space used, and in all recorded meetings seating arrangements had to ensure the video camera captured both mentor and trainee.

In a hectic and busy school day mentors acknowledged they had little time to settle and did not have the luxury to prepare themselves mentally for meetings. Observation revealed that trainees brought the required paperwork to meetings — for example, teaching files and SSL1 forms — but none of them came with an agenda and / or specific items for discussion. There was no evidence to suggest that Ruth, Tess, Amanda and Di prepared anything for the weekly meetings. In contrast, there was an expectation from their mentor that Michael and Chloe prepared the SSL1 report on weekly progress.

I suggest that mentors were aware that they were required to pay attention to the setting and prepare themselves for meetings. However, their busy schedules may have prevented them from doing so and appropriate rooms were often unavailable. Although trainees brought the necessary paperwork to the meetings, they had not
prepared for the dialogue by reflecting on their attainment and progress in relation to standards, targets and action, and had not noted key issues for discussion.

b. Observing and listening to the whole message

Mentors and trainees need to listen attentively (Clutterbuck, 2001; Rigby, 2001; Wallace and Gravells, 2005; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). When mentors listen effectively, they pick up all the relevant verbal and non-verbal cues; ‘not just words, but … all of the subtle nuances between the words … the feelings that go along with the story’ (Frankland and Sanders, 1995, p.107). Mentors and trainees claimed they were good listeners and knew it was important that they paid attention both to what was said and to their own and others’ body language.

Philippa claimed that her body language was open and engaging and that she read body language well. Conversely, like Jane, Anetta acknowledged that she was unaware of her own body language yet hoped it supported what she said. Indeed, data from meetings provided no evidence that suggested either mentors or trainees observed and read each other’s body language. For example, despite Philippa’s claim that her body language was always engaging and positive and she was a good listener, at the start of two of Michael’s recorded meetings and one of Chloe’s, her posture was more closed than open. She appeared very detached and tired, avoided eye contact and paid no attention to either of the trainees’ non-verbal messages. For example, she neither acknowledged Michael’s closed upper-body and frequent shifts of position that could have suggested he was uncomfortable and/or lacked confidence. In addition, in an interview Philippa expressed concern that she intimidated Chloe, but was unsure of how she did this. When I asked her about Chloe’s frequent closed upper-body position, shift of arms and very soft fragile voice in meetings, Philippa admitted she had not been aware of the signs I had identified. On the other hand, in interview, Ruth reported that Jane picked up on her moods from time to time and recognised when something was wrong without her having to say anything. This was corroborated by observation data that evidenced Jane observed Ruth’s anxiety and fatigue and reassured her when she said ‘Just keep going, you’re doing well … the best thing you did was have those few days off to rest, you were shattered. You’re tired
today’. Apart from this example, during mentor / trainee dialogue there was no other evidence that mentors attended to trainees’ non-verbal messages as they conversed. When mentors were asked how they had let trainees know they had been listened to and heard, they claimed they took appropriate action after meetings based upon what had been said. In general, trainees claimed they felt heard by mentors and in turn listened to their mentor’s verbal messages, took advice on board and did what was asked. Tess was an exception as she claimed she listened but took no action.

Observation data suggested to me that whilst mentors and trainees attended to the ‘gist’ of what was said and responded with relevant information, they did not listen effectively. For example, they talked either at the same time as the other, or tried to out-talk each other, or jumped in and cut the other off. Also, at times they finished the other’s sentences or got their ideas in quickly before the other had finished. An example of how mentors and trainees jumped in before the other had finished speaking is shown in Text Box 9.

| M:  | I am assessing all my lessons, after, it’s just actually getting a proper written   | [lesson evaluation] just for my |
| P:  | So, so you’re giving them feedback immediately, you yourself know, but it’s actually trying to monitor … |
| M:  | It’s the actual lesson evaluation that I need, … the actual monitoring of the kids, … how they are progressing, making sure I know so obviously not only to plan the next lesson |
| P:  | So then these – |
| M:  | That’s the other thing teachers have been saying about is that, which is just … assessment cause as I go from unit to unit and |
| P:  | If I show you, I think I have stuff in my assessment packet, so if you … |

**Text Box 9**  An example to show how Philippa and Michael jump in and interrupt the message being transmitted by the other

In addition, trainees were often quick to acknowledge and agree with what the mentor had said and frequently said ‘Yeah’ as the mentor spoke. This might have
suggested they were either anxious, or wanted to show they were attentive even though they may not have listened carefully to what was said. An example of this can be seen in Text Box 10.

| J | If you say something right out of the blue that’s completely random and different because somebody else is there they’ll go ohh what’s going on? |
| R | Yeah — |
| J | You know it might be you fall flat on your face but — |
| R | Yeah — |
| J | — at the end of the day don’t change anything. |
| R | Yeah. |

**Text Box 10  An example to show how Ruth is quick to say ‘yeah’**

On reflection, I suggest that mentors and trainees were not aware of how well they listened and seemed unaware of what they communicated through their own body language, even though they hoped they did not send any mixed messages. In addition, as they did not listen effectively to the whole message they might have missed valuable information communicated both verbally and non-verbally.

c. **Responding: paraphrasing, reflecting-back, summarising and silence**

Responding skills are identified as an important cluster of communication skills (Bayliss, 2001). These involve gaining understanding from attending and listening and feeding it back so that the recipient understands better and then acts on their understanding. In addition, responding skill involves making statements and asking appropriate questions to facilitate exploration of the issues (Egan, 1998; Frankland and Sanders, 1995; Bayliss, 2001). Successful responding therefore depends upon accurate perceptions of what has been heard followed by the confidence to challenge appropriately (Egan, 1998). The listener, by paraphrasing and reflecting the other’s words and feelings, demonstrates that she is attending, but also gives the recipient a chance to hear the message they had sent.
Additionally, summarising provides focus and direction and silence allows time for thought.

Whilst mentors and their trainees had not received training to facilitate reflective dialogue they were familiar with the terms “paraphrasing” and “reflection”. Although they understood that reflection meant looking back at what happened, as for example during a lesson de-brief, they had never associated this with how they reflected-back feelings and / or words in conversation. When in dialogue with trainees, mentors were unaware whether or how much they used these skills. Observation data confirmed that on rare occasions mentors paraphrased and clarified what had been said, and / or confirmed what they heard as they reflected-back one or two words. Similarly, whilst trainees very occasionally reflected-back words, they never reflected-back feelings. Questionnaire and interview data indicated that mentors were familiar with summarising and used it to confirm targets and remind trainees of what needed to be done. Yet, observation data confirmed that, in dialogue, Jane, Philippa and Anetta rarely summarised. For example, there were no brief summaries at the start of meetings that set the scene and identified where trainees had reached the previous week. Similarly, mentors rarely summarised either as they came to the end of a topic or before they moved on to the next, and only summarised occasionally at the end of meetings. Text Box 11 shows one of the brief, yet rare, summaries that took place at the end of a meeting.
A: Right regards the targets. What have you got as the 3 targets?
D: 1. Do a PSHE lesson, go and see X and observe a lesson.
    2. Off site activity that’s the …
A: So that first one, you’ve got to find X and organise. Off site activity, first
    Monday back I will give you that letter.
D: And I will just do that and put the girls’ names on it.
A: And if you sign it and I will counter sign it.
D: Yeah.
A: And then you take it to the office.
D: Yeah
A: You need to find all the girls and give it to them. They can take it home,
    and make sure you tell them when it has to be back.
D: And 3. Do my units of work.
A: And then you’ve got to complete 3 units of work over the half term and
    hand them in on Monday.
D: Yeah.
A: Happy with that?

Text Box 11  Example of Amanda’s summary at the end of a meeting with Di

The use of silence to allow time for thinking before responding was rare during
any meeting. Whilst mentors and trainees remained silent as the other read
documents or wrote, mentors acknowledged they had not thought of using silence
as a skill that gave trainees time to think before they spoke.

Data from observations and interviews made it clear to me that mentors and
trainees knew little about using these responding skills. Consequently, they were
rarely used effectively in dialogue.

d. Responding with enabling interventions

This section focuses in greater depth on the nature of verbal interventions used in
mentor / trainee dialogue during meetings. As indicated in Chapter Four, whilst
authoritative interventions (informative, prescriptive and confronting) are related
to how the practitioner directs and guides the trainee as for example, ‘giving
instructions and raising conscientiousness’ (Heron, 1990, p.6), facilitative
interventions (supportive catalytic and cathartic) encourage a trainee ‘to become more autonomous and take more responsibility for themselves’ and their progress (Heron, 1990, p.6).\textsuperscript{39}

The patterns of interventions that emerged from the dialogue of mentors are examined here. Tables 31 and 32 show the distribution of Jane’s, Philippa’s and Anetta’s use of authoritative and facilitative interventions in recorded meetings (across the rows) at the beginning, middle and end of the year 4 (Table 31) and year 3 (Table 32) trainees’ placements (down the columns).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authoritative (informative, prescriptive &amp; confronting)</th>
<th>Facilitative (supportive, cathartic &amp; catalytic)</th>
<th>Other: checking fact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Anetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 Distribution of mentors’ authoritative and facilitative interventions with year 4 trainees (Ruth, Michael and Amanda)

\textsuperscript{39} Section 4.1.4 c iii., Table 15 gives definitions of the categories of authoritative and facilitative interventions.
Mentors used authoritative interventions over 50% of the time, in 8 and 7 of nine meetings with year 4 and 3 trainees respectively. Facilitative interventions were used less. The three exceptions to this pattern came in Anetta’s end of placement meeting with Amanda (T4) when she increased the use of facilitative interventions considerably; in the mid-placement meeting with Di (T3) when facilitative interventions exceeded authoritative interventions by 1%, and in Jane’s mid-placement meeting with Tess (T3) when she used 2% more facilitative interventions.

Unlike Jane, whose use of authoritative interventions increased as facilitative interventions decreased from the beginning to the end of Ruth’s (T4) placement, the reverse was true for Anetta in meetings with Amanda (T4). While Philippa used authoritative interventions more so in the mid-placement meeting with Michael (T4), these decreased in the end of placement meeting. In contrast, although all mentors use of authoritative interventions with year 3 trainees decreased in the mid-placement meeting, they increased again in the end of placement meeting.

Tables 31 and 32 also show that mentors from time to time asked trainees to check facts. For example, in meetings mentors confirmed times, days, teaching groups etc. However, these interventions only rose above 13% on one occasion.

As Heron (1990) suggested, I expected mentors would use a variety of combinations of authoritative and facilitative interventions. It was, therefore,
important I examined the distribution of the six categories of interventions that made up the clusters of authoritative and facilitative interventions. I identified, firstly, the categories of authoritative and facilitative interventions mentors used most with year 4 and year 3 trainees and secondly, established how mentors used combinations of interventions to facilitate learning. Tables 33, 34 and 35 show the distribution of categories of authoritative and facilitative interventions used by Jane, Philippa and Anetta during meetings (down the columns) at the beginning, middle and end of the placement (across the rows).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JANE</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR 4T</td>
<td>YR 3T</td>
<td>YR 4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative interventions</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronting</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalytic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathartic</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 Types of authoritative and facilitative interventions used by Mentor Jane in dialogue with Ruth (Yr 4) and Tess (Yr 3) at the beginning, middle and end of the placement
### Table 34
Types of authoritative and facilitative interventions used by Mentor Philippa in dialogue with Michael (Yr 4) and Chloe (Yr 3) at the beginning, middle and end of the placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR 4T</td>
<td>YR 3T</td>
<td>YR 4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative interventions</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescriptive</strong></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confronting</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitative interventions</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalytic</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cathartic</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Checking</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 35
Types of authoritative and facilitative interventions used by Mentor Anetta in dialogue with Amanda (Yr 4) and Di (Yr 3) at the beginning, middle and end of the placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR 4T</td>
<td>YR 3T</td>
<td>YR 4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative interventions</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescriptive</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confronting</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitative interventions</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalytic</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cathartic</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Checking</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It became apparent that distribution varied from meeting to meeting, from trainee to trainee and from mentor to mentor. While Jane (Table 33) and Philippa (Table 34) used informative interventions most with both trainees, Anetta (Table 35) made greater use of supportive interventions with the year 4 trainee, but was more informative in meetings at the start and end of placement with the year 3 trainee. In all meetings Jane predominantly used combinations of informative and supportive interventions; and, similarly, Anetta also utilised clusters of supportive, informative and prescriptive interventions. Jane and Anetta made the least use of confronting, catalytic and cathartic interventions. Overall, Philippa’s distribution of interventions across meetings with both trainees was more evenly spread across the range of interventions. However, although Philippa made more use of confronting and catalytic interventions than Jane and Anetta, the percentage never rose above 19% and 24% respectively in any of the meetings.

Of the authoritative interventions, informative and prescriptive interventions were used most by all mentors; and of the facilitative interventions, supportive interventions were used mainly by Jane and Anetta. Philippa, unlike the others, used catalytic interventions as much or more than supportive interventions in three of the six meetings, two of which were with Chloe (T3). Text Box 12 gives examples of the categories of interventions used by mentors.

Observation data suggested to me that, whilst ways in which mentors used combinations of categories of interventions varied, more often than not mentors gave information (informative), were supportive of trainees (supportive) and directed what trainees needed to do (prescriptive). In general, mentors rarely challenged trainees to identify limitations in their practice, or directly challenged weak practice, or facilitated self-discovery and self-directed learning or encouraged trainees to share feelings. Hence, overall they were more authoritative than facilitative. This meant that mentors directed and guided trainees more often than they encouraged them ‘to become more autonomous and take more responsibility for themselves’ and their progress (Heron, 1990, p.6).
Throughout the placement, the nature of interactions in meetings suggested that there was little reflective dialogue and relationships remained primarily driven by mentors who remained more active in the process than trainees. Hence, at best, only single-loop learning for improvement was achieved. This contrasted with mentors’ and trainees’ perceptions of a swing as the placement progressed from directive to non-directive mentoring styles, and a shift from mentors being equally active with trainees to the latter more active than their mentors as their independence increased.
**INFORMATIVE interventions** added to trainees’ knowledge, understanding and meaning about procedures, processes, pupils, events in the school, the department calendar and pedagogy.

The mentor provides information about pupils’ National Curriculum assessment levels:

‘You can also have 2 people that are a [level] 4, one’s a really good [level] 4, not a [level] 5 a really good 4 and ones just 4 …’

**SUPPORTIVE interventions** affirmed trainees’ worth as human beings. For example, mentors praised trainees’ qualities, actions and attitudes; re-assured and helped put things into perspective, often reminded them of the help available within the department and offered positive feedback.

A mentor reassures her trainee:

‘You know, you will get them where you want them and you’ll feel such a sense of achievement. It will get there’.

**PRESCRIPTIVE interventions** prescribed action trainees needed to take. For example, they were told how to do things and what they might say to pupils.

A mentor prescribes what a trainee should do in a lesson to test if pupils have understood:

‘The other good thing to do then [is say] … right ok … put your hands up, who can tell me what the key points I’ve just said, very quickly. Give me one, … and you can walk around and say what are you looking for in your partner?’

**CATALYTIC intervention** (with one supportive intervention) elicited self-discovery, self-directed learning and problem solving.

A mentor asks her trainee, ‘How’s the week gone?’

T: Yeah, good. I sort of done a football lesson, taught a football lesson for the first time this week. S was very impressed.

M: Good.

T: But I sort of came away and I was a bit, I wasn’t really too sure if the kids were 100% with what they were doing, but and she’d said to me before that like they get like half way through the lesson and like and then they just go (breathes out / deflate) and they sort of —

M: Are they bottom set?

T: Yeah, I would say. They are a couple in there that are quite good but um they do really well, like they, they do the skill that you’re teaching and then literally half way through the lesson just can’t do it.

**CATHARTIC interventions** encouraged trainees to share their feelings or mentors and trainees share some light laughter to ease tension.

A mentor asked her trainee, ‘How are you?’ and empathised ‘You’re going to get very tired, um, but you’ve coped well with it’.

**CONFRONTING interventions** identified the limitations of trainees and challenged their actions and practice.

A mentor confronts a trainee head on about her planning as she read her final placement report.

M: Ok, how’s this (planning) going to be?

T: Pretty crap.

M: No I would not say crap but you … often left planning lessons to the last minute, which often resulted in poor quality planning and delivery of lessons … tried to rush planning in order for her not to take work home …

**Text Box 12  Examples of categories of interventions used by the mentors**
e. Mentors’ use of questions

The use of appropriate questions enables learners to identify strengths and limitations as they move from superficial evaluation to deeper and more specific analysis (Parsloe and Wray, 2000). Closed questions are considered to be least helpful, as they allow only for short answers, limited reflection and curtailed learners’ contribution to the dialogue (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). On the other hand, open questions are thought to be more advantageous as they help learners to develop their understanding and come to their own conclusions (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). Combinations of awareness raising, reflective, justifying and hypothetical questions are considered effective (Parsloe and Wray, 2001).

Tables 36, 37 and 38 show the percentage distribution of open and closed questions used by mentors in recorded meetings with year 4 and year 3 trainees at the beginning, middle and end of placements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Tess</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36 The distribution of closed and open questions used by Jane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37 The distribution of closed and open questions used by Philippa
Table 38  The distribution of closed and open questions used by Anetta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from questionnaires and interviews revealed that mentors believed their questions were more open than closed. However, observation data confirmed that Jane (Table 36), Philippa (Table 37) and Anetta (Table 38):

used more closed questions. In all meetings the percentage of closed questions was between 51–94% of all questions asked. Philippa’s use of open-ended questions increased marginally at the end in meetings with both trainees. This was also true for Jane and Anetta in meetings with year 4 trainees, rarely used layered questions that either examined trainees’ practice or fleshed out learning or aided reflection. Instead, mentors acknowledged whatever trainees said, added information and / or advice and then moved on quickly to the next issue, occasionally asked a very open question that generated little dialogue.

Tables 39, 40 and 41 show mentors’ percentage distribution of Parsloe and Wray’s (2000) categories of questions used in meetings (down the column) at the beginning, middle and end of placements (across the rows) with year 4 and 3 trainees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Question Types</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Tess</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Raising</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39  Distribution of question categories used by Jane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Question Types</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Raising</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40  Distribution of question categories used by Philippa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Question Types</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Raising</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41  Distribution of question categories used by Anetta
A number of similarities became evident in the way mentors used types of questions during meetings. In general, however, the use of question types, like interventions, varied from meeting to meeting, mentor to mentor and trainee to trainee:

a. **justifying** questions, that encourage trainees to extend their explanations, give further reasons, expand on their feelings and confirm and check facts, were used most of the time with all trainees;

b. limited use was made of **awareness-raising** questions that developed trainees’ self-awareness and committed them to further action. Overall, Philippa and Anetta made more use of awareness raising questions than Jane;

c. no mentor used above 13% of **reflective** questions as they replayed trainees’ words, paraphrased what was said, clarified what had been heard and understood, or encouraged trainees to talk more;

d. **hypothetical** questions such as What if …? or How about …? to introduce a new concept or to challenge trainees were used occasionally by Philippa, but not used at all by Jane and Anetta.

From what the data revealed, I suggest that mentors did not use questions effectively to facilitate the move from superficial evaluation to more specific analysis (Parloe and Wray, 2000). The predominance of closed questions would have limited trainees contribution to the dialogue and hindered severely their depth of reflection and understanding. Additionally, trainees were not encouraged to come to their own conclusions (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). This evidence strengthened my belief that mentors neither facilitate effective reflective dialogue nor the swing from a single to double loop learning process.

f. **Trainees’ dialogue**

To have a more complete picture of the nature of the mentor / trainee interactions in meetings, it was equally important to examine the nature of trainees’ dialogue and establish the interrelationship between what mentors and trainees said and how they said it.
Trainees’ contributions to dialogue were short and superficial. I suggest that this was a consequence of mentors’ limited use of catalytic and confronting interventions; greater use of closed questions rather than open-ended questions and lack of layered questions that might have fleshed out learning. Tables 42 and 43 show the distribution of characteristics identified in trainees’ dialogue in meetings (down the columns) at the three stages in the placement (across the rows). The column headed “average” gives the average percentage use of the category identified in the first column.

### Table 42  The nature of year 4 trainees’ dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr 4 trainees</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 words</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging and agreeing</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting-back</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 43  The nature of year 3 trainees’ dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr 3 trainees</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 words</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging and agreeing</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting-back</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42  The nature of year 4 trainees’ dialogue

Key: Year 4 trainees: R: Ruth; M: Michael; A: Amanda

Table 43  The nature of year 3 trainees’ dialogue

Key: Year 3 trainees: T: Tess; C: Chloe; D: Di
Jane’s, Philippa’s and Anetta’s trainees demonstrated many similar patterns. In general, on average over 50% of all trainees’ dialogue in the nine meetings consisted of very brief comments of between one and three words. Whilst year 3 trainees’ use of such short responses was marginally less than year 4 trainees’, on average Chloe’s (T3) use of 1 – 3 word comments was higher than the others.

On average, year 3 and 4 trainees acknowledged and agreed with what mentors said 58% of the time by saying such things as ‘yeah’, ‘cool’ and ‘ok’. Although Di’s (T3) 49% average was lower than the others; Chloe’s (T3) 71% average was highest. While year 4 trainees did this less at the middle and end of the placement, the average for year 3 trainees decreased at mid-placement but then increased again at the end.

For approximately 22% of the time, trainees reported back on what pupils did, what they would do, what teachers said about the lessons they taught and gave descriptive accounts of what went on during the week. Those with greater confidence, such as Michael and Di, gave more information than Chloe who lacked confidence. Text Box 13 gives an example of how Di reported back on what she did during the week.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>It’s [ITDP] all on the computer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Well it’s not. I’ve done most of it, but all my early targets I’ve written down, I’ve just got to put them in there. I’ve done a lot of them. There are some I have to do but a lot of them relate to going to see the SENCO and EAL lady.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>And it’s all about finding out the girls’ background in my class and most of them are … I’ve got to come to a parents’ evening but that obviously when it …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yep there’s one coming up soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Yep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>After half term second or third week in next half term so…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I’ve done things like taken responsibility for a tutor group. So I’ve taken them on my own on Tuesday and Wednesdays, and I go to tutorials on Mondays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yeah they’re a nice little group aren’t they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Yeah they are really nice. I’ve got to watch a PSHE lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Right we need to organise that then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>After half term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Text Box 13** Year 3 trainee (Di) reports back on what she did during the week

Trainees spent on average only 11% of the time analysing their own practice and pupils’ learning and in most cases this analysis was superficial. Observation data showed that when all trainees attempted to analyse they described what happened and suggested what went well. Occasionally, they identified how they could refine pupils’ performance or their own practice. In recorded meetings, Year 3 trainees analysed less than year 4 trainees. Overall, year 4 trainees increased analysis at the end of the placement. No clear pattern emerged for all year 3 trainees. For example, although Tess and Di analysed most at mid-placement, Chloe’s analysis decreased at mid-placement and remained low at the end.

Extracts from mentor / trainee dialogue in Text Boxes 14 and 15 show examples of the range of analysis that took place in meetings with Di (T3) and Michael (T4).
Year 3 trainee
D  Yeah, I did umm two lots of tasks sheets, one for netball, one for dance, no, one for netball, one for gym, and they went well.
A  Did they? Did the kids respond well to them?
D  Yeah. The netball one particularly, the year one’s. They did well to do them but they weren’t that much different, because all the standards in that lesson are quite similar there’s not two different extremes, if you know what I mean?
A  Yeah.
D  But the netball one worked really well because it had R in it.
A  Oh yeah.
D  So she you know? It was just shooting and different sort of areas to shoot from and umm, they did well.
A  And that helped her to achieve?
D  Yeah, yeah, it did. Yeah.
A  Umm, are you going to continue that?
D  Yeah.
A  With that group?
D  Yes.
A  Yeah.
D  Yeah.
A  What other things might you do with them?
D  Umm, [PAUSE] Got them today actually. Ah, I could do [HESITATION] Could do, just within like, umm the games and things, I could put different conditions on it and things.
A  Yeah, because there’s quite a range in that group, isn’t there?

Text Box 14  Trainee’s analysis: Extracts from Anetta’s and Di’s dialogue
Year 4 trainee

P  Yeah, it is good. Umm, ok so that’s that. Yeah, just cross out. [PAUSE]. Ok how have you umm, found that using, how have you found that using the levels …

M  Well this week when I was-

P  Has kind of challenged them?

M  Yeah when I was assessing them this week for end of year assessment, I actually incorporated the levels from the start this week to get that high level. Say [to pupils] this is what you need to get if you want to reach a 4 or give certain key words like consistency and things like that actually are important and straight away got them on to actually doing, cause they will be practicing free shots over the unit.

P  Umm.

M  Straight away they incorporated shots even if they felt they couldn’t do it they’re trying to incorporate them. So they were pushing themselves in the sense …

P  Umm.

M  They’re actually thinking about what shot should I do.

P  And have you, have you started incorporating these levels earlier into the unit?

M  No I didn’t do, no until I got, until I got told by one of the teachers you tend to say rather than just say you need to be able to do this, you need to be able to do that, actually give them a level and say this is the end result sort of thing. So I’ve only just started incorporated that into my lessons. Previous lesson before has been evaluated and now when I was evaluating as well this week.

Text Box 15  Trainee’s analysis: Extracts from Philippa’s and Michael’s dialogue

Trainees rarely questioned mentors, and on average this made up approximately 5% of their dialogue. Most of the time when trainees questioned mentors they checked information as for example, ‘Do you mean non-doers’? or ‘We’ve covered everything haven’t we?’. In addition, when Chloe was unsure she sometimes answered Philippa’s questions with a question or asked questions to clarify what Philippa meant in an effort to understand what she had been told. Examples can be seen in Text Box 16.
“Are they gonna be able to tell you that team building and communication skills were what they were looking at? Do you think?”

Yes.

Right ok. What if they can’t? How are you going to coax it out of them?

By prompting questions?

Ok, so what sort of, what sort of questions would you be asking?

Chloe seeks clarification.

Ok? So visualise, visualise yourself delivering something. Umm, and umm, let me think of the best way, what about if you have on your little boards —

Umm.

— with like the key points on it and you literally have that up somewhere?

Would that be for the pupils to see?

For you.

Text Box 16   Examples of Chloe’s questions

Trainees expressed feelings rarely and overall this made up on average only 3% of their dialogue with mentors. Meetings were very busy and mentors often did not encourage the expression of feelings. Trainees did not challenge face-to-face the practice of mentors or other staff at any point during the placement.

Reflections on trainees’ dialogue

I suggest that the limited and superficial dialogue of trainees reflected the higher percentage of authoritative interventions and closed questions used by mentors. When trainees did contribute to the dialogue, it was to report back on what they had done during the week and what others had said about their teaching. Analysis was superficial as, for example, they described what happened and identified what was good about it and what could be better. In general, trainees followed as mentors led and were passive recipients of information and advice. Overall, trainees did not demonstrate that they drove the process or the relationship at any point, and never challenged the practice of their mentors.
6.5 Part Four: An overview of the key points drawn from the findings

Very little time was allocated for mentoring in ITT. Mentors who were already busy members of staff were given less than an hour of protected time during the school week to fulfil the mentoring role. The one-hour per week suggested by the University was an unrealistic amount of time, as mentors claimed they spent between two and five hours per week with trainees. The lack of time for mentoring seemed to be reflected in the weekly meetings in which mentors and trainees took stock of all that had happened in the week and covered superficially a ‘shopping list’ of items, rather than engaged in reflective dialogue focused on specific issues.

ITT mentoring was not defined clearly for either mentors or trainees and neither group had considered a definition prior to this research. Mentor education and training was minimal within the partnership and focused on procedures. With no mentoring theory that underpinned mentors’ practice this was based on personal experience and/or advice from their own previous ITT mentors. Subsequently, mentors and trainees found it difficult to articulate the process in any detail and depth. Mentors saw the role primarily as one in which they advised, guided and supported trainees. Only one mentor mentioned a facilitative function. Trainees agreed and included teaching as a mentoring function.

The relationship was hierarchical with implicit boundaries that helped mentors and trainees to maintain professional distance. Mentors and trainees indicated that there was a line they could not cross and this limited the openness of their relationship. Mentors’ status in the school, together with the power to pass or fail trainees, created a power imbalance in their favour. Although mentors and trainees recognised the imbalance of power existed, and stated it had not impacted on their relationships, in reality neither group had given this concept any prior consideration. Yet, data suggested that trainees were careful that they neither said nor did anything that threatened their passing the placement. In addition, mentors experienced difficulties when they had to make decisions associated with the
assessment role as for example, whether or not they placed weak trainees on a cause for concern and/or failed them.

Mentors and trainees had not given any thought to the interpersonal and developmental components of the relationship and/or how these worked. Although mentors and trainees believed the two components were inter-related, they were unable to articulate specifically how this occurred. Trainees suggested that as they settled, relaxed and became more open with mentors, they took more chances, made and learned from mistakes and progressed their learning. In turn, Mentors confirmed they were able to increase trainees’ challenge and responsibility and allow greater freedom.

Based on mentors’ and trainees’ perspectives, trainees’ development was not linear and shifts in mentoring styles were identified that corresponded with trainees’ needs. As the relationships became stable and as trainees gained confidence and demonstrated improvements, styles shifted from directive and nurturing, to directive and challenging, to non-directive and challenging. Mentors emphasised, however, that they reverted to a directive and nurturing style if trainees lost confidence as they attempted something new and struggled to progress. These shifts in styles suggested that in addition to advising, guiding and supporting trainees, mentors also coached, networked and sometimes counselled (Clutterbuck, 2001). Interestingly, trainees’ perceptions of mentoring styles sometimes varied from that of their mentors, but mentors and trainees never discussed this.

Observation data provided a contrasting perspective with regard to the skills that mentors and trainees used and the nature of the developmental relationship. Communication skills, required for reflective dialogue, were limited, despite mentors’ and trainees’ claims to the contrary. Mentors did not use a range of communication skills that facilitated exploration of issues in any depth. The dominance of authoritative interventions and closed questions restricted trainees dialogue and development towards empowered self-learners and in turn there was no chance they entered the double-loop learning process and achieved transformation (Brockbank and McGill, 2006).
Throughout recorded meetings at the beginning, middle and end of the placement, mentors drove the relationship, whilst trainees remained passive recipients and learning remained within the single-loop process. This scenario supported mentors’ and trainees’ definitions of mentoring that highlighted the advising, guiding and supporting functions of the role. Yet this contradicted mentors’ and trainees’ claims that towards the end of the placement mentoring styles became non-directive and primarily challenging, with trainees more active than mentors.

Whilst mentors and trainees claimed that they had completed University procedures that led to the trainees’ final assessment, the process was not rigorous. Little attention was paid to what trainees learned as a result of the action they took each week and what they needed to do next in order to raise their level of attainment. Standards were ‘ticked off’ without thorough examination of the evidence; mentors were dependent on trainees who monitored their own ITDP and told mentors what they needed to do next. This less than rigorous process led to vague mentor reports, which were neither very useful for trainees and their mentors nor for when trainees moved to the next placement or into the NQT year.

I now consider the implications of these findings in Chapter Seven.
CHAPTER SEVEN
The nature of mentoring and mentor / trainee relationships within the Southern University Partnership: The conclusions

7.0 Introduction
In this chapter I reflect critically on the findings against existing mentoring literature, and throughout indicate the contribution this study makes to knowledge of PE ITT mentor / trainee relationships. The path this chapter takes is similar to that of Chapter Six. I address, firstly, the context and environment for mentoring; secondly, the communication skills used by mentors and trainees and thirdly, the mentor / trainee relationships. Discussion leads to identification of a model of mentoring that exists within this context. In addition, I reflect on some aspects of the research process, make recommendations for further action and indicate how work has progressed based upon the findings of this study.

The thesis has applied the work of authors from across the fields of education, business and the health professions: firstly, to reinforce the presence of challenging issues for those involved in PE ITT that need to be addressed by the partnership, the profession and policy makers. These issues include: lack of funding, status and time available for mentors; the expectation of a combination of assessment and caring within a mentor’s role and the impact this has on the assessment process and the mentor / trainee relationship; the clashes in ideology and values and the lack of mentor education and training.

Secondly, the study makes a contribution to knowledge as it captures the dynamic nature of the mentor / trainee relationship over time within the PE ITT context. The study extends knowledge of: the shifts in dimensions of the relationship and mentors’ mentoring styles with year 3 and year 4 trainees over time; mentors’ and trainees’ awareness of their process throughout the placement and the nature of mentor / trainee dialogue in weekly meetings. This study also shows the value of
using a combination of reflective questionnaires, interviews and digitally recorded observations of interactions, which together provided a wealth of accessible material that made constant cross-referencing possible. This approach enabled me to access mentors’ and trainees’ perspectives together with what they actually did during interactions to provide a comprehensive picture of what was happening. Prior to undertaking this research no study had recently examined the interactions of mentors and trainees during weekly meetings as the placement progressed in four year courses. I believe this study of such interactions has provided valuable insights into the nature of mentoring and the mentor / trainee relationship in this context.

7.1 The reality of the PE ITT mentoring context

An examination of the context of mentoring in PE ITT within this study confirms Barnes and Stiasny’s (1995, p.13) view that it is ‘externally imposed’ by Government and driven by professional outcomes and assessment. With school-based training a reality, HEIs have to work in partnership with schools to provide PE ITT. Consequently, through handbooks and annual conferences, Southern University provides schools with specific regulations and guidelines for mentoring as an essential element of what Government considers to be a successful partnership. It is true that while the University pays schools for their part in the process, such payment is minimal because of limited available funding (Homer, 2001). There is no doubt that PE ITT mentoring within the Southern University partnership takes place within a formalised structure and that mentoring relationships are what Garvey (1994b) classifies as formal (they have to happen) and public, as those in the partnership (schools and university) know the relationships exist. Within this context and in relationship with their mentors, trainees work towards achievement of the QTS standards and mentors monitor trainees’ progress and assess their competence. Within this centrally driven, competency-based context, ‘hard’ outcomes act as a ‘measure of success’ (Colley, 2003, p.163). For example, performance is measured by a set of standards and monitored by audits of evidence and performance. I suggest, therefore, that those in PE ITT within the Southern University partnership are caught up in the ‘audit
society’ (Power, 1997) and ‘performativity’ culture (Ball, 2005, p.6). I argue in the following sub-sections that this context and the lack of mentor education and training renders mentoring in PE ITT at Southern University a ‘narrowly conceived’ concept (Little, 1990) operated in terms of a ‘technicist’ (Jones, 2001, p.91) training approach based upon Government’s prescribed must-dos. In turn, the short, fifteen-week relationships between mentor and trainee during the PE ITT placements are primarily closed and directed and thus are highly unlikely to facilitate a transformational learning outcome for the trainees.

7.1.1 The concept of mentoring in PE ITT within the Southern University partnership from my perspective

A comprehensive review of mentoring literature confirmed for me that there are difficulties with both a definition of the term “mentor” and implementation of the mentoring process across different contexts. I agree with Roberts (2000) who argues that to form a concept of mentoring and reflect critically on it requires an understanding of what it means (Section 1.0). Nevertheless, this study has found that firstly, Government has adopted an ill-defined concept in relation to ITT; and that, secondly, neither Government, nor the profession, nor the University have clearly defined the nature of the processes and relationship involved. As Colley (2003, p.39) suggests, there seems to be great mileage in allowing the public to be seduced by a mythical portrayal of mentors as ‘inspirational characters’ with ‘extraordinary qualities’, and mentoring as a wonderful, caring process with mentors involved in close developmental relationships with mentees. It is hard to object to a process that promises to offer so much. Perhaps, therefore, it is not surprising that fifteen years after the adoption of mentoring within ITT, I found no definitive answer to the question, ‘what is mentoring in PE ITT?’. Whilst the CUREE National Framework (2005b) provided some insight into the place and nature of mentoring in CPD, it did not provide clarity about the process or the relationship in ITT.

It became clear to me that the externally enforced goals, imposed matching of mentors and trainees and the mentor’s assessment role clearly distinguishes it from the classical concept in which individuals choose each other and generate
their own goals as they develop mentoring relationships (Morton-Cooper and Palmer, 2000; Roberts, 2000; Brockbank and McGill, 2006). In addition, both Government (DfES, 2002) and Southern University emphasise ‘training’ when they refer to mentoring. For example, the University’s description of a mentor’s role centres on ‘the need to train’ trainees towards professional competence (Southern University, 2005b, p.17). I argue that the use of such language in documentation places mentoring in PE ITT within the Southern University partnership at the fundamental end of Dagenais’s (1991, p.2) ‘continuum of human developmental relationships’. The notion that mentoring is a form of training distinguishes it from the holistic concept of mentoring, which embraces a combination of personal and professional development and encompasses thinking, feeling and developing together (Corbett and Wright, 1994).

Yet, conversely, many professionals in the field of education (Maunder and Dixon, 1992; Smith and Alred, 1994; Frost, 1994; Corbett and Wright, 1994) make claims for a more holistic focus for mentoring in ITT that include aspects of personal and professional development. These appear to be legitimate and appropriate for teacher preparation if weight is given to two arguments. Firstly, Tomlinson’s (1995, p.16) case that teaching requires much more than training in a ‘rigid set’ of techniques for specific situations. Secondly, Fletcher’s (2000) and Capel, Leask and Turner’s (2001) claim that mentoring is more about the education and development of trainees. I believe that the discrepancies in the nature of expectations and practice between the technical and the holistic ideals are a consequence of the lack of clear concept of PE ITT mentoring.

Just as neither the Government nor the University have defined mentoring, this study has identified that in this particular context mentors and trainees themselves had not given any thought to a definition. Subsequently, mentors interpreted and implemented procedures in the time available and, as Jones and Straker (2006) indicate, they are influenced and guided primarily by their own experiences of how they were mentored as trainees. When prompted in interviews, however, mentors and trainees described mentoring by its imagined functions. They perceived that mentoring was primarily about guiding, advising and supporting
trainees through their training. In addition, Philippa mentioned the facilitative nature of the process and Tess suggested, that mentoring involved teaching and passing on knowledge. I can confirm, therefore, that mentors and trainees within this PE ITT context describe mentoring as a primarily directive process underpinned by support.

I suggest that the hazy concept of mentoring that exists is exacerbated, in this context, by the absence of any form of mentor education and training. Subsequently, there is limited understanding of the complexities of the context, the nature of the mentoring process and the various relationships between mentor and trainee. Mentors have little knowledge of mentoring theory; and at annual mentoring conferences, information and procedures take centre stage with actual study of mentoring theory ignored. This scenario does not reflect the ideal propounded in the substantial literature, which advocates an educative approach to mentor preparation for the role (Maynard and Furlong, 1995; Barnett, 1995; Garvey and Alred, 2000a; Fletcher, 2000; Clutterbuck, 2001; Brockbank and McGill, 2006; Jones and Straker, 2006).

7.1.2 The school environment for mentoring

This study qualifies the need identified by Hill, Jennings and Madgwick (1992), Shaw (1992) and Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) for a whole school approach to ITT that provides a collaborative school environment conducive for learning. During interviews, mentors as well as trainees emphasised the importance of ‘good’ relations within the matrix of relationships, especially within the PE department. Di and Amanda emphasised that difficulties with unsupportive part-time staff at their school impacted negatively on their progress. It was also noted that relationships between other members of staff and the mentor, as well as other members of staff and trainees, could impact upon trainees’ relationships with their mentors. For example, Di felt bullied by another member of the PE staff and, as the mentor did nothing to resolve the problem, this impacted negatively on the mentor / trainee relationship.
a. **Time for mentoring**

None of the literature examined either indicated or justified the amount of time a mentor in ITT needed to spend with a trainee. This study has established that, within this context, perceptions of the time required for mentoring varied between the University, the schools and the mentors. Although Southern University expected schools to allocate one hour weekly to mentors so that they could undertake their role with trainees (Southern University, 2005a, 2006a), in reality, two of the three schools protected no time for mentoring. The third school, on the other hand, protected one hour and paid the mentor for mentoring trainees. Furthermore, mentors’ perceptions of the time required to undertake their role with trainees differed dramatically from the university’s recommendation of one hour a week. Mentors indicated that between two to five hours per week is more realistic, especially when working with weak trainees. Without exception, mentors confirmed that during a fifteen-week placement schools expected them to find time to meet the expectations of Government, the University and trainees. Consequently, mentors had first to maintain their own teaching and administrative responsibilities as senior members of staff, and then did whatever they could for trainees within any remaining time available.

Although the University expected weekly mentor meetings would provide the opportunity for pairs to spend a block of time together, practice varied and depended upon mentors’ time availability. This study has established that, firstly, busy schedules impacted considerably on the time mentors spent in preparation for meetings: an aspect of attending that Bayliss (2001) considered important for effective communication. Secondly, whilst in general mentors noted a list of items during the week for consideration in meetings, none gave any prior thought to a formalised agenda\(^40\) for these meetings. Thirdly, as Egan (1998) and Bayliss (2001) suggest, mentors recognised that it was important they booked appropriate

\(^{40}\) A formalised agenda means a specific, negotiated agenda addressing what the trainee has learned in relation to the action, targets and standards, and the trainees’ learning needs for the coming week.
rooms for meetings as this allowed for intensity of focus. In reality, however, whilst most mentors secured use of a quiet and private room, sometimes they had to settle for whatever space was available. This was often due to limited availability of suitable rooms. Fourthly, in the time available during meetings, mentors caught up on what happened during the week from the trainees’ perspective, and content was packed and varied. This did not allow for depth of focus on any one aspect of trainees’ learning. For example, limited attention was given to what the trainee learned from the action they had taken during the week and how this might be transferred to other pupil groups and activity areas. Observations also indicated there was a danger of mentors and trainees going over old ground as they engaged in lesson de-briefs addressed previously in the week, or caught up on lesson de-briefs that had not been carried out during the week because of lack of time. Finally, whilst trainees had no explicit time expectation of mentors, they all valued their mentors, were empathic about their mentors’ busy schedules and expressed gratitude for the assistance and support given to them.

This study clearly establishes that in a fifteen-week placement, the maximum time recommended by the University for mentoring, combined with the lack of time given to mentors to carry out their role, does not adequately support the mentoring process which demands time for deep reflection and working with trainees whose progress is slow. The study has also shown that mentoring and mentors in school are not regarded as deserving high status. In general, the limited time allocated supports, at best, a reductionist, technicist, approach to mentoring. This is propagated by and couched in the language used in Government’s policy documentation and in the guidelines produced by the University, both reflecting Ball’s (2005, p.12) notion of ‘depthlessness’. I argue, therefore, that such lack of general regard militates against the holistic and humanistic approach and depth of reflection that is widely supported in the literature. I speculate that the lack of status and time given to mentoring reflects the limited funding given to schools for mentoring in ITT (Homer, 2001).
b. The assessment process

Analysis of the questionnaires and interviews conducted for this research indicated that formative and summative assessment took place throughout the placements on a daily basis, lesson by lesson, during de-briefs and in discussion in mentor / trainee meetings. The assessment process facilitated trainees’ learning to teach; enabled mentors and trainees to complete SSL1 weekly review forms and provided information for mentors’ interim and final reports. Even so, this research found that the assessment process within this context lacked rigour.

Tomlinson (1995), Capel (1997) and Haydn (2001) suggest that assessment often starts the teaching / learning process in order to identify where learners are and how best to start working with them. Yet, no evidence was found in this study to suggest that, firstly, the mentors’ assessment process ‘established a clear baseline of evidence of achievement’ (Haydn, 2001, p.301); or, secondly, that mentors objectively established trainees’ levels of attainment and objectively ‘monitored progress’ (Haydn, 2001, p.298). Although mentors and trainees claimed they used year 3 trainees PDP action plans and year 4 placement reports to inform the ITDP, mentors and trainees neither planned nor wrote up the ITDP at the start of the placement as recommended by the University (Southern University 2005b, 2006b). Similarly, mentors neither carried out a teaching needs analysis in conjunction with the ITDP nor produced their own developmental ‘learning to teach’ programme for trainees at the start which could have informed future target-setting. In addition, once trainees had written up their ITDP, weekly target-setting was negligible and vague. For example, any targets and action identified were reactive and driven by trainees’ teaching needs at that moment. It became clear that the ITDP was regarded as merely a list of ‘things’ trainees had to do that were ticked-off once completed, rather than as a tool that could be used to inform and monitor a development plan that facilitated effective progress in learning to teach. In addition, discussion in weekly meetings did not identify assessment criteria for judging what the trainee had learned and how well a trainee had achieved set targets and action. Mentors neither checked nor discussed the quality of evidence that supported trainees’ claims that the previous week’s targets had
been met and/or standards had been achieved; and they did not identify further
targets to enhance trainees’ attainment level. It is clear both from observations and
mentors’ own admissions that no use was made of the University grading criteria
at any time during the placement, to determine whether trainees were achieving at
an unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or very good level. This scenario clearly
demonstrates a subjective assessment process that lacks rigour and, therefore,
validity.

This study also highlights the conflict between the supporting and caring
functions of mentors and the judgemental nature of assessment, as indicated by
Barnes and Stiasny (1995) and Colley and Jarvis (2007). The relationship between
one mentor/trainee pair exemplified the danger of the formal assessment role
being undermined by the informal nurturing role, as presented by Wolf (1995) and
Colley and Jarvis (2007). In this case, the mentor’s formal judgement about the
trainee’s competence was compromised by her reluctance to ‘… pass negative
judgements’ (Wolf, 1995, p.98) on someone who had good personal qualities for
teaching, even though she did not demonstrate the required level of teaching
competence. The relationship of another mentor/trainee pair, on the other hand,
highlighted the danger of a mentor not taking the difficult decision to place a
trainee on a ‘cause for concern’ (Southern University, 2005a, p.23) which could
have facilitated the development of effective professional practice. From my
experience as a subject tutor, I speculate that in both cases the mentors might also
have been safeguarding their own reputation. Based on the evidence produced by
this study, I strongly suggest that the conflicts these mentors faced potentially
hindered the development of an enabling relationship and threatened the rigour
and validity of effective formal assessment of both trainees. I see this as a major
concern for the partnership, as mentors act as ‘gatekeepers to the profession’
(Jones and Straker, 2006, p.181).

This study has confirmed that there was no overarching strategic plan, with
progressive developmental steps and objective assessment procedures, that could
have led to trainees’ achievement of the standards at a very good level. Lacking
this strategic structure, the process appeared to be merely reactive. Practice as revealed in this study does not reflect Bayliss’s (2001) requirement that helpers, such as mentors, need to plan carefully for goal setting. In addition, the study indicates that mentors were reluctant to ‘… pass negative judgements’ (Wolf, 1995, p.98) on trainees who were underperforming. It is clearly open to question, therefore, whether this less than rigorous process can enable trainees to achieve the highest attainment levels.

7.2 The communication skills of mentors and trainees as demonstrated in weekly mentor / trainee meetings

This study makes its most substantial contribution to knowledge and understanding, in this context, by examining extensively the communication skills used by mentors and trainees during their interactions in weekly meetings. It has established that weekly meetings did not focus on learning through reflective dialogue, which raises trainees’ awareness and progresses depth of learning. Rarely was there reflection on practice that might have facilitated making meaning of ideas and processes such that it could be transferred to other situations, which Moon (1999) associates with deep learning. With learning contained to specific lesson contexts, dialogue explored neither transfer of learning across lessons, teaching activity areas and groups of pupils, nor facilitated greater understanding and appreciation of theory / practice links. Indeed, all trainees found the transfer of pedagogical principals from teaching one activity to another difficult, particularly when subject knowledge was weak. For example, one trainee claimed that when the timetable changed and she taught new activity areas it ‘was like starting over again’.

Although mentors and trainees alike believed they were good communicators, I found that neither group reflected upon the skills they used during interactions nor gave any depth of thought to the nature of mentor / trainee dialogue in meetings. As mentors and trainees had not been trained in the use of communication skills, they were aware neither of whether they used such skills nor how much they used them. I argue that this severely restricted their ability to engage in reflective dialogue. Additionally, trainees did not come prepared with an agenda based on
their own personal reflections. I speculate therefore, they did not take much time to engage in PRS\(^{41}\) (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.15) and consequently were unable to contribute much to the dialogue. I suggest that the combination of mentors’ limited ability to facilitate reflective dialogue with trainees restricted reflection is likely to restrict learning in this context to Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning cycle. In turn, if as Brockbank and McGill (2006) suggest, the double loop learning process is necessary to make transformation possible, then circumstances in this context appear to inhibit trainees’ thinking outside the box, prevent the swing into the double loop learning process (Argyris and Schon, 1996) and curtail chances of transformation.

Importance is placed by Bayliss (2001) and Brockbank and McGill (2006) on the use of active listening skills (attending, observing, listening and responding) for mentors as they listen to mentees’ feelings and words and connect with them as people. Yet, this study found that mentors and trainees were unaware of the range of active listening skills and did not make the best use of the clusters of skills to facilitate effective reflective dialogue in meetings.

Frankland and Sanders (1995), Egan (1998) and Brockbank and McGill (2006) claim that awareness of the messages one sends through one’s own body language, and the ability to observe as well as read non-verbal communication in others, are essential to sending clear messages and attending to the whole message received. Yet, in this study, mentors and trainees were shown in numerous instances to listen only to parts of verbal messages: for example, mentors and trainees often talked at the same time, or tried to out-talk each other, or interrupted (Chapter Six, Text Box 9). They were also shown to be unaware of either their own or the other’s non-verbal messages. Hence, mentors and trainees may have frequently either sent mixed messages and/or missed parts of the messages sent by the other. In addition, as Frankland and Sanders (1995), Egan (1998 and

---

\(^{41}\) PRS is ‘personal reflective space’, or ‘intra-personal dialogue’. This is focused quality time used to sort thoughts and ideas, (Clutterbuck, 1998, p.15).
Brockbank and McGill (2006) suggest, reflecting-back words and feelings and paraphrasing content are important to clarify what is heard and to enhance understanding of the messages sent. However, this study found that mentors and trainees rarely reflected-back words or feelings nor paraphrased content. Thus, for these reasons, messages received may have been inaccurate or unclear (Brockbank and McGill, 2006) and mentors and trainees may have lost chances to communicate empathy, caring and attention (Frankland and Sanders, 1995). Furthermore if, as Egan (1998) claims, summarising provides focus, clarity and direction, it is significant that mentors and trainees in this study rarely made use of summarising at the beginning, during or at the end of meetings.

Frankland and Sanders (1995), Egan (1998), Parsloe and Wray (2000) and Brockbank and McGill (2006) emphasise that it is important to use questioning techniques to move learners from superficial evaluation to deeper and more specific analysis, and highlight that the use of combinations of question types facilitates deeper probing. Yet, this study found that a high percentage of closed questions, few excessively open-ended questions and limited use of a range of question types were used by mentors in the dialogue situations. This is likely to have severely limited trainees’ contribution to the dialogue, curtailed their reflection and failed to encourage trainees to develop further their depth of understanding (Chapter Six, 6.4.3, e and f). Based on observations, I argue also that trainees’ exploration of issues, reflection and specific analysis were restricted further as mentors used more ‘authoritative’ than ‘facilitative’ (Heron, 1990, pp.5-6) interventions in meetings (Chapter Six, 6.4.3, d.). Mentors made neither the best use of Heron’s (1990) catalytic interventions to enhance trainees’ self-directed learning nor cathartic interventions that probed further about how trainees felt about their experience. Additionally, the combination of confronting and cathartic interventions was rare even though Frankland and Sanders (1995), Bayliss (2001) and Brockbank and McGill (2006) claim confronting is essential for challenging and moving the learner on; and Heron (1990) suggests cathartic interventions also help to ease the tension created by confrontation. Mentors’ limited use of such interventions may not be surprising in light of Heron’s (1990) claim that practitioners used cathartic and confronting interventions least well, as
they require high levels of emotional competence for which many are untrained. Based upon the application of Heron’s (1990) classification of interventions, my observations suggest strongly that, in this context, mentors primarily direct and guide trainees and do not make best use of combinations of interventions that could facilitate the development of autonomous learners who take greater responsibility for their learning.

### 7.3 The mentor / trainee relationship

The research established that neither mentors nor trainees articulate easily their complex mentoring relationship. Both parties found it difficult to speak about their practice and process in any depth and did not routinely reflect on the nature and development of the relationship. When provided with examples from the literature in questionnaires and during interviews, mentors’ and trainees’ accounts remained superficial, even though they began to register links with what they had experienced.

Mentors and trainees are ‘imposed’ on each other (Hall and Kinchington, 1995, p.55) and relationships are intense and sometimes uncomfortable (Hill, Jennings and Madgwick, 1992) as was the case with at least one of the mentor/trainee pairs, Jane and Tess. My insider knowledge of how trainees are placed with mentors confirms no consideration is given to the personalities involved. Consequently, there is no guarantee whether mentors or trainees will immediately get on, if only superficially, or grow to like each other. The success of pairings, therefore, is dependent on the interpersonal competencies, communication skills and level of motivation of both parties as they get to know each other and make an effort to make their relationships work. With PE ITT mentor/trainee relationships short lived (15 weeks) there is an assumption that mentors and trainees will establish rapport and trust quickly as they get on with what has to be done. Hence, it is an advantage if the matching is compatible and a pair is able to relate immediately. Conversely, the challenge is greater when mentors and trainees, like Jane and Tess, find it difficult to relate to each other.
7.3.1 The imbalance of power in favour of the mentor

There is no reason to doubt that mentors and all others in the ‘mentoring matrix’ (Taylor and Stephenson, 1996, p.31) hold greater power than trainees because of their status in the school and the University and the role they play in the assessment process of trainees.

There is a consensus of opinion amongst mentors that trainees need to know and understand that mentors are in charge and have a job to do. Similarly, trainees fully recognise and accept that mentors are in charge and hold the power to pass or fail them. This study strengthens Velija et al.’s (2008) findings that with trainees the dependent party, trainees anticipate mentors’ perceptions of them and modify their behaviour in order to please and not ‘to rock the boat’ (Di, T3). I suggest, therefore, that whilst this may keep trainees safe, it is at the cost of repressing their thoughts and feelings, which, as Jones (2001) indicates, inhibits authentic dialogue and hinders development. However, this study goes further as it highlights that neither mentors nor trainees believed that the power imbalance impacted on their relationship. Consequently, mentors consciously neither put procedures in place that dealt with the imbalance, nor reflected on or monitored the level of threat to trainees. In my opinion, this lack of knowledge or lack of awareness or denial was a threat to the success of the mentor/trainee relationship.

I argue that with mentors in charge, with trainees reluctant to ‘rock the boat’ (Di, T3) and with the mentors’ dialogue predominantly authoritative, the relationships in this context are rendered hierarchical, controlling, directive and potentially disempowering for trainees. These are all characteristics which Gay and Stephenson (1998) and Colley (2003) associate with mentoring relationships externally driven by the imposed goals of powerful institutions.

7.3.2 Setting expectations, boundaries and establishing rapport and trust

Through the analysis of questionnaire and interview data, this study indicates the need for mentors to establish operational procedures at the start of the placement to motivate and settle trainees. For example, operational procedures included times to meet, frequency of meetings, teaching arrangements and staff contacts...
(Chapter Six, Text Box 8). In addition, mentors perceived that it was important that they made their expectations known to trainees about such aspects as attendance, the need for confidentiality, time keeping, punctuality, work ethic and teaching kit (Chapter Six, Text Box 8). Mentors saw setting operational procedures and expectations as a means of establishing the stable relationship that Garvey (1994b) indicated was so important for the growth of rapport and trust. As exemplified in the relationships between Jane and Tess, Anetta and Amanda and Anetta and Di, when stability was threatened, the development of trust was inhibited.

There was no evidence to suggest that mentors engaged trainees in discussion about the perceptions they brought to the placement, as recommended by Smith and Alred (1994), Elliott and Calderhead (1994) and Tomlinson (1995). In addition, the data did not suggest that mentors, at the start of a placement, made any attempt to get to know trainees better or share information about themselves through use of the learning style inventories as suggested by Garvey (1994a, 1994b) or instruments such as the Myers-Briggs indicator recommended by Cranwell-Ward et al. (2004). Furthermore, trainees indicated in questionnaires and during interviews that, whilst there were opportunities for them to express their expectations, they did not feel the need to do so. This was clearly the case with Tess. Although Tomlinson (1995) and Cranwell-Ward et al. (2004) strongly recommend that realistic expectations be set at the start of the relationship, I question whether this can be achieved in this context if trainees are not engaged in discussion about their perceptions and do not make their expectations explicit.

Although Cranwell-Ward et al. (2004) and Brockbank and McGill (2006) emphasise the need for professional boundaries to be established at the start of the relationship, this study found that boundaries were taken for granted and remained implicit. Mentors and trainees claimed in questionnaires and during interviews that there was no need to discuss boundaries as both parties were expected to know how to behave. Consequently, there was no discussion on either the professional and personal limits of the relationship, or the code of ethics that was followed.
Despite mentors and trainees claims that they knew what the boundaries were, both parties found them very difficult to articulate. Whilst mentors and trainees thought it important that they maintained professional distance and claimed there was a line that could not be crossed, mentors drew this ‘line’ in different places. For example, whilst Philippa socialised with trainees out of school, Anetta believed this was inappropriate. Additionally, although mentors claimed they did not enter into therapy-based counselling with trainees, as advised by Clutterbuck (1998) and Brockbank and McGill (2006), Jane and Philippa listened to trainees’ personal issues as part of their perceived role. At the same time, all mentors were adamant that it was inappropriate for them to address their own personal issues with trainees.

With no strategy for matching mentors and trainees, little attention paid to establishing trainees’ perceptions and expectations and no defined explicit boundaries, I argue that relationships in this context are at risk of breaking down or progressing ineffectively for one or both of the mentoring pair.

**7.3.3 Dynamics of the mentor / trainee relationship**

This study has explored and captured the dynamic nature of the mentor / trainee relationships over time, in relation to trainees’ development, mentors’ styles and relationship dimensions as exemplified in Chapter Six, Figure 18. As such, it uniquely contributes to greater understanding in the PE ITT context.

The journey of learning to teach starts as trainees enter the course and continue into their NQT year and beyond. This takes the trainee through combinations of university experience and school placements until they qualify as NQTs and settle to work in one school for what is likely to be a an extended period. During the university course placements, trainees and mentors have only 15 weeks to develop interpersonal and developmental relationships with their mentors — a relatively short period of time especially if they do not initially get on. Although these mentor / trainee relationships are seven weeks longer than the relationships in Walker and Stott’s (1993) study, they are significantly shorter than the two- to five-year corporate relationships that Kram (1983) and Clutterbuck (2001)
investigated. Whilst PE ITT mentor/trainee relationships are relatively short as are those in the Walker and Stott (1993) study, it is important to note that the relationships in Walker and Stott’s (1993) study were between experienced teachers aspiring to be school principals and school principals already in post. As a contrast, in the context of this study, year 3 trainees have no experience of a school placement and little, if any, experience of mentoring relationships; and they can lack significantly in activity subject knowledge\(^{42}\). At the start of the final placement, year 4 trainees have only the year 3 experience of school placement and one mentoring relationship to draw on. Although, in the interim between placements, year 4 trainees will have gained in subject knowledge and understanding during two university semesters.

In addition to limited experience, PE ITT Southern University trainees, as the dependent member of a figuration (Elias, 1978), have to deal with an imbalance of power in favour of the mentor and differences in the values between University tutors and mentors. Additionally, busy mentors, with limited protected time for mentoring, have to manage the conflicts created by the combination of the caring, nurturing and assessment components of their role while also ensuring the trainees achieve the prescribed outcomes within a very short period of time.

I maintain that while broad stages of trainees’ development, as identified by Fuller and Brown (1975), Maynard and Furlong (1995), Tomlinson (1995) and Leask (2001b), can be identified and are helpful as a guide, ultimately each relationship needs to be ‘personalised’ to accommodate the purpose of the mentoring journey and the personalities and needs of the individuals engaging in the relationship. Indeed, this study indicated that there was no clear line of development from novice trainee to the fully trained teacher and while there was evidence of trainees’ progress, the rate and type of progress was not the same for all trainees. For example, Tess, Chloe and Di, all year 3 trainees were very different characters.

\(^{42}\) Activity subject knowledge: subject knowledge of activity areas in PE (athletics, dance, gymnastics, games, outdoor adventurous activities, swimming).
with entirely different interpersonal and developmental needs. They progressed at
different rates and required different levels of support and combinations of
mentoring styles. They could all be placed at different points on the continuum of
development from a novice teacher with limited experience and idealistic
perceptions, through to a more experienced teacher who is able to read classroom
situations, reflect on practice, solve problems and cater for pupils’ individual
learning needs. The same would be true for the year 4 trainees. Whilst I concur
with Leask (2001b) that this developmental process is slow, I also argue that the
process is slowed down further for trainees by the break between placements and
the need for year 4 trainees to re-adjust to a new school, new pupil groups, some
new activities, and to establish new relationships with new mentors (Figure 20).
To compound this further, mentors and trainees are not educated in preparation
for the mentor/trainee experience, do not receive training in the skills of reflective
dialogue, and demonstrate little awareness of the development of an interpersonal
relationship.
YEAR 4 TRAINEE:
15 week final placement
New school, new mentor / trainee relationship, new pupil groups, some different activity areas

Adjustment

2 semesters university experience to increase knowledge and understanding in preparation for the final 15 week placement

YEAR 3 TRAINEE:
15 week intermediate placement
Totally new experience

Figure 20  The journey of the trainee, year 3 – end of course
Key:  
\[\text{double ended arrow demonstrates the possibility of progression and regression throughout the placement}\]
\[\text{single-ended arrow demonstrates the increase in subject knowledge and understanding}\]
\[\text{the ladder demonstrates the progressive steps in preparation for the final placement}\]
7.3.4 Interpersonal and developmental components of the PE ITT mentor/trainee relationship

Walker and Stott (1993) claim that successful mentoring relationships are composed of developmental and interpersonal components, which are interrelated and of equal importance. This study explored more fully over time the development of these components in the Southern University partnership context. Whilst the research indicates that mentors and trainees acknowledge the importance of the inter-relationship between the developmental and interpersonal components of their relationships, they were nevertheless unable to articulate this in any depth.

a. The interpersonal component

Numerous authors (Bruner, 1977; Hill, Jennings and Madgwick, 1992; Walker and Stott, 1993; Field, 1994d; Tomlinson, 1995; Brooks, 1996; Hawkey, 1997) have acknowledged that the quality of the personal relationship impacts on the outcome of the learning experience. Mentors and trainees in this study indicated that this was the case. During interviews, mentors claimed that trainees found it easier to learn and make progress when they were at ease, got on with their mentors and relaxed. Additionally, trainees claimed it was difficult to seek advice and to risk using new methods, styles and activities in their teaching if the interpersonal relationship remained distant and mentors were not friendly, approachable and trustworthy. For example Ruth ‘hated’ the closed and distant relationship she had with her mentor on the intermediate placement and claimed this had hindered her progress.

Mentors and trainees in this study supported the claims made by Dagenais (1990), Tomlinson (1995) and Cranwell-Ward et al. (2004) that empathy, respect and genuineness were important for the maintenance of a successful relationship. Yet, the study has established that they neither recognised these attributes as core conditions (Rogers, 1957) nor had they received any training in how to use them to enhance communication and to build and maintain relationships. Based upon my observations and the evidence provided in Chapter Six, Text Boxes 4 and 5, there is no reason to doubt that mentors and trainees are empathetic and appreciate
each other’s reality, and acknowledge the need to be respectful of others. Conversely, whilst mentors and trainees claimed it was important that they were genuine and honest with each other in order to build trust, the evidence suggests that they were not always completely ‘authentic’. For example, observation data showed that mentors rarely confronted the limitations of trainees; and interview data indicated that Jane and Philippa failed to share their concerns about how close Tess and Chloe were to failing the placement. Similarly, trainees did not share feelings or concerns with mentors which they thought might impact negatively on either their relationships in the department or their prospect of passing the placement. For example, Di explained that with Anetta she was only honest up to a point. Based upon Egan’s (1998) claim that genuineness is important for authentic dialogue and comfortable interactions, I argue that in this context, authentic dialogue during interactions is unlikely to occur and the level of trust is likely to be restricted.

Although Barnes and Stiasny (1995) and Hall and Kinchington (1995) suggest that mentor / trainee relationships can benefit from being more open than closed, this study indicates that development of open relationships is arrested because of the mentors’ assessment role and the power imbalance. In questionnaires, mentors and trainees indicated that their relationships became more open as the placement progressed. However, based upon Garvey’s (1994b) definition of an open relationship, analysis of interview data showed that whilst trainees became more open and mentors more friendly, the ITT mentor / trainee relationship was still more closed than open. For example Tess, Ruth and Chloe agreed that, although they became more open with mentors, they talked only very superficially about their personal lives. On the other hand, Philippa and Michael claimed that by the end of the placement, they had established ‘a friendship’. Even so, the nature of this friendship was difficult to establish because, like other mentors, Philippa

43 Open relationship: all topics are discussed freely (Garvey, 1994b). Closed relationship: only work topics are discussed (Garvey, 1994b).
claimed it was inappropriate to talk to Michael about her own personal issues and their discussion focused primarily on work.

I argue that hierarchical, controlling and unequal relationships such as these curtail the extent to which mentors and trainees can engage in authentic dialogue, trust each other and become open with one another. I argue also that mentoring in this context is not underpinned by the ‘person-centred, voluntaristic principle’ (Colley, 2003, p.164) and cannot be classified as a ‘dyadic helping intervention’ (Colley, 2003, p.164) that works ‘through individuals rather than on them’ (Watts, 2000, p.303). These mentoring relationships are not open enough to facilitate the deeper levels of reflection required to take the trainees from a single loop to a double loop learning process, and it is unlikely that they will be encouraged to think ‘outside of the box’ or to challenge status quo (Brockbank and McGill, 2006, p.34). I question whether this will be possible at all, if the nature of the context and the structure of courses continue as at present. But even if the context changed to allow for deeply reflective, ‘dyadic helping relationships’ (Colley, 2003, p.164), the limited time on placement would still make it unlikely that there could be time for relationships to become truly open and for mentors and trainees to become equals.

b. The developmental component

Mentors and trainees perceive that mentors use a combination of Clutterbuck’s (2001) coaching (directive and challenging), guiding (directive and nurturing), networking (non-directive and challenging) and counselling (non-directive and nurturing) styles. Based on these perceptions, PE ITT mentoring in this context could be classified as a form of ‘developmental mentoring’ (Clutterbuck, 2001, p.21).

Mentors and trainees concurred with the work of Elliott and Calderhead (1994) that learning progresses if there are appropriate levels of challenge, support and nurturing. Mentors claimed that an appropriate balance of challenge and support gave trainees the confidence they needed as they attempted new teaching methods, styles and activities and made mistakes and learnt from these. Yet, this
study found that mentors were unable to articulate in any detail the nature of the challenge they provided at different stages in the placement.

Although mentors and trainees claimed that combinations of styles were used throughout, they also perceived that some were more predominant than others at different stages in the placement (Chapter Six, Figures 14–17). At the beginning of a placement and the relationship, all mentors and trainees were very active as they worked together and identified expectations, made decisions about timetables, organised mentor/trainee meetings and other weekly procedures and prepared for teaching. In five out of six relationships, mentors claimed they drove the relationship. Mentors nurtured trainees through the challenges they faced, especially when they worked with less able trainees who lacked confidence and needed reassurance. On the other hand, whilst mentors who worked with more confident and proactive trainees still drove the relationship, they provided less nurturing and more challenge.

Mentors took a step back as trainees became more pro-active and confident, and planned and delivered more effectively for pupils’ learning needs, as Philippa did with Michael. Mentors became less active as they allowed trainees greater freedom and checked their work less frequently. For example, Philippa and Anetta acknowledged how they themselves became passive as the relationship became increasingly non-directive and more challenging as they worked with confident and able trainees such as Michael and Di. Indeed, with year 4 trainees, mentors emphasised the need for non-directive and challenging relationships as these trainees would soon be taking up their first teaching posts and would have to rely on themselves. Conversely, throughout the placement, relationships remained active and driven by mentors in instances where trainees’ progress caused concern, as in the relationships between Jane and Tess and Philippa and Chloe. When trainees continued to struggle, the challenge remained at a low level and was accompanied by high levels of nurturing. Analysis of questionnaire data showed that in such cases trainees’ perceptions of mentors’ styles were noticeably different, especially with regard to both the level of challenge and the extent to which the relationship was directive or non-directive. There was no evidence to
suggest that mentors and trainees discussed these differences in their perceptions. Consequently, I argue, this may have led to misinterpretations of situations, inappropriate responses and uncomfortable relationships, as in the case of Jane and Tess. I maintain this lack of awareness and absence of reflection on relationship development are significant aspects of PE ITT mentoring that need to be addressed.

Observation data from both middle and end of placement meetings provided a significant contrast to what mentors and trainees perceived as the shift in mentoring styles from directive to non-directive and nurturing to challenging. Mentor / trainee dialogue in fact provided no evidence that developmental relationships had moved towards the non-directive end of the continuum, although mentors and trainees perceived this to be the case. For example, mentors were in charge and trainees remained passive as they received corrective feedback, advice, guidance and support. Analysis of the interactions observed in weekly meetings overwhelmingly revealed that relationships remained directive and nurturing, with limited challenge. Even so, it was apparent that trainees drove some aspects of the relationships. For example, mentors encouraged trainees to find resources that would help them to improve their practice and expected trainees to manage their ITDPs. In addition, Philippa encouraged Michael and Chloe to complete the SSL1 forms prior to the weekly meeting.

The discrepancy between mentors’ and trainees’ perceptions and observation data raises important questions. Mentors and trainees alike told me that mentors use different styles of mentoring. However, in light of my observations of weekly meetings, I question firstly, whether mentors and trainees in this context vary their styles of mentoring as much as they claim; secondly, whether mentors and trainees become what Maynard and Furlong (1995) refer to as co-enquirers, who engage in a reflective model of mentoring that enables trainees to break through a learning plateau; and thirdly, whether the mentors’ and trainees’ perceived shift from directive to non-directive styles was able to challenge trainees to achieve their highest attainment levels while allowing trainees ‘to become more autonomous’ learners (Heron, 1990, p.6). Indeed, I wonder whether the perceived
shift actually meant that once trainees became more settled, confident and were able to deliver material that facilitated whole group learning, they were left to get on, on their own. Subsequently, whilst trainees were given greater freedom and managed aspects of their own learning, the challenge to reflect deeply, to raise levels of attainment further and to think about new approaches was limited, especially in the last month of the placement.

Figure 19 (Chapter Six) demonstrates my conceptualisation of an interrelationship between the interpersonal and developmental components of the PE ITT mentor / trainee relationships examined. This study suggests that there are some relationships, for example like that between Philippa and Michael, which move closer towards the open, equal and reciprocal relationship and allow trainees’ independence in their final stage, as suggested in the Walker and Stott (1993) study. However, I found that most relationships remained unequal with few reciprocal benefits and were more closed than open with no deeply reflective dialogue and varying degrees of independence given to trainees. The discrepancies which existed between what mentors and trainees said and what took place in mentor/trainee meetings cause me to speculate that trainees are given degrees of freedom and independence to get on, on their own, in relationships which are unequal, more closed than open and characterised by superficial reflection and limited challenge to facilitate continuously higher levels of attainment. None of the relationships, in my view, demonstrated the emotional bond required for deeply reflective dialogue, double loop learning and transformation.

I find that the PE ITT context militates against mentor / trainee relationships being authentic, open (Garvey, 1994b) and deeply reflective between equals (Walker and Stott, 1993). Additionally, I argue that the nature of the PE ITT context, the patterns of school placements within the course structure, the length of relationships and the knowledge and experience of the participants means that the timing and characteristics of the broad stages of development will vary significantly from one relationship to another.
7.3.5 Ending or re-defining the relationship

At the end of the placement, mentors shared final reports with trainees and to that extent trainees knew what mentors thought of their attainment and progress. In addition, based upon what was recorded on ITDPs, trainees identified their achievements in relation to the standards (DfES, 2002). Yet, this study found that mentors and trainees did not discuss the impact of the relationship on achievements, as for example, the learning climate, the degree of rapport and trust and the frequency and effectiveness of mentor meetings, which Cranwell-Ward et al. (2004) suggest is important. Similarly they did not discuss expectations of any future relationship, as Clutterbuck (2001) advocated would occur in the longer corporate relationships.

In reality, the way in which relationships continued after the placement varied. All mentors and most trainees expected the relationship would continue in the form of mentors as advisors if required and trainees who would contact mentors to let them know how they are doing. Tess was the exception, as she had no interest in continuing the relationship with Jane on any level. Some mentors and trainees wanted the social relationship to continue, as for example, Philippa and Michael both thought Michael would return to the school for P.E. department social gatherings.

7.4 The picture of mentoring in PE ITT from my perspective

The mentor / trainee relationships identified in this study reveal a model of mentoring that is narrowly conceived (Little, 1990) and has a (merely) functional purpose (Brockbank and McGill, 2006). This model comes closer to training to improve performance than to a more holistic model of mentoring that facilitates professional and personal development and transformation of the trainee.

If, as Fletcher (2000, p.xii) maintains,

Mentoring is concerned with easing transitions and enabling change and growth … a process of active, creative engagement in education and not just finding evidence to support externally imposed standards [a process which] lies at the heart of effective learning …
then mentors need to go further than:

…being a support system for trainee teachers through which they were given many opportunities, help and advice … to guide them and to progress subject material. (Jane, Q1M, Itv1)

In this study, mentors did not build relationships that facilitated trainees’ holistic growth through effective reflective dialogue. If mentors had achieved this they may have moved mentoring in PE ITT closer to Brockbank and McGill’s (2006) evolutionary approach and nearer to the achievement of Fletcher’s (2000) expectations.

It seems clear to me that the PE ITT context reflects a culture of ‘proformativity and managerialism’ (Ball 2005, p.5) and ‘depthlessness’ (Ball 2005, p.12), in which mentors and trainees tick boxes to show standards are met—a characteristic of the audit society described by Power (1997). Mentors and trainees work towards achieving ‘hard’ outcomes (Colley, 2003, p.163) set by the Government and their relationships are hierarchical, controlling and unequal. As Gay and Stephenson (1998) and Colley (2003) point out, this type of relationship restricts reciprocity, empowerment and autonomy. Consequently, the emotional and social connections between the mentor and the trainee inhibit ‘a more learner-centered approach’ (McNess et al., 2003, p.246). Furthermore, as Colley (2003, p.163) suggests, the nature of this context undermines ‘… the benefits of soft outcomes such as increased confidence, better health and higher aspirations’. In all likelihood, mentors are vehicles ‘… for external interests rather than … [facilitators] for the mentee’ and relationships are ‘triadic’ (Colley, 2003, p.37).

There seems little doubt that the lack of a clear concept, the discrepancy in ideologies and lack of mentor education and training, created the confusion I witnessed in my early years as a subject and link tutor. In the light of my findings, I now see clearly how an ‘authentic professional’ (Ball, 2005, p.4), such as a mentor in PE ITT who demonstrates a deeply reflective holistic approach to mentoring and a genuine enthusiasm for grounding their practice in theory, could become both disillusioned and emotionally drained. In reality, such mentors are likely to find mentoring demanding and hugely problematic. I am able also, to
understand and appreciate why mentors in this study chose to follow procedures, addressed issues superficially and ticked boxes so that they could show that outcomes were achieved at some level. Additionally, it became very clear to me that no one has attempted either to alleviate the discrepancies or to improve clarity and understanding.

The message from these findings is clear. If the expectation is for PE ITT mentoring to be wholly educational and deeply reflective in order to achieve transformation and a change of status quo in teaching, then there must be changes in Government policy, University regulations and procedures and mentoring practice. Changes will be needed to alter the language used in documentation, promote status and time for mentors in schools, emphasise the need for equal partnerships between teacher preparation institutions and schools, establish programmes for mentor education and training and provide accreditation for mentors and adequate funding. If policy and mentoring practice go unchanged, the process will remain a functional pursuit that aspires only to achieve enforced outcomes and retain the status quo. I also argue however, that if the status quo is maintained the least the University and schools can do is to provide mentor education and training. This would better inform those concerned about the context and give them the skills and competencies required to develop mentor / trainee relationships and facilitate trainees’ learning to teach under the existing constraints. To this end, those at the forefront of PE ITT must go much further, both to inform and influence Government policy and provide mentor and trainee education. Additionally, it is my expressed aspiration that this study will initiate the dialogue and debate required at Government level and within the profession to initiate further research and change.

7.5 Reflections on the research process

The multidimensional nature of this work challenged me considerably and stretched my existing research skills and competency levels. The time demands were extreme and only just manageable. After this long journey the following succinct points identify my thoughts on the research process.
I can appreciate why critical researchers might claim that this study did not go far enough in its examination of the ‘… specific, oppressive and social structures’ (Harvey, 1990, p.1) required to initiate change. However, as identified in Chapter Five, I believe strongly that an enhanced up-to-date understanding of PE ITT mentoring and mentor / trainee relationships was required in order to identify if change was required and what needed to change.

Alternatively, an ethnographic study might have allowed for a more seamless and complete understanding of mentors’ and trainees’ behaviour, and trainees’ development, as well as changes within relationships. Even so, if ethnography had been attempted within the time restrictions, the number of relationships within the case would have been reduced further. This would have impacted on variety within the sample and not allowed adequately for the drop-out that took place in the second phase.

In line with De Vaus’s (2001, p.227) position, multiple cases that comprised two or three providers of PE ITT nationally may have been more ‘convincing and provided more insight’, increased diversity and allowed for comparison. However, time limitations on travel plus the demands of the multi-method approach made it impractical to work with multiple providers. Instead, the selection of relationships from within an institution with a nationally recognised large four year undergraduate PE ITT course can be seen in many ways as being similar to other such courses. In turn, there is a strong likelihood of qualitative (Tripp, 1985), fuzzy (Bassey, 1999) and naturalistic (Stake, 1995) generalisations as argued in Chapter Five. I was reassured of these possibilities following my research presentations in 2006, at the National PE ITT Network conferences and the Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) new researchers conference and in 2007, at the National PE ITT Network Conference, the Regional PE ITT mentors’ workshop and Southern University Professional Tutors conference. The depth of discussion that followed these presentations indicated to me that fellow professionals identified with the findings and considered them to be important.
When I pondered on the techniques implemented, I knew the reflective questionnaires were long and could have been shortened further. I argue, however, that mentors and trainees needed to consider the range of themes included in the questionnaires to reflect more deeply on their relationships. On the other hand, as mentors and trainees enjoyed the interaction of interviews, this made it difficult for me to remain under the allocated one-hour time frame and some discussions had to be cut short. Whilst I wonder whether longer interviews could have replaced questionnaires, I maintain it was important for mentors to record in questionnaires what was fresh in their minds at different stages in the placement. On reflection, I have to accept that, in both questionnaires and interviews, mentors and trainees may have written and said things that they thought I wanted to read and hear (Adler and Adler, 1994; Denscombe, 1998; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000).

The observations of mentor / trainee interactions was invaluable. These provided an opportunity to view how pairs worked together and supplemented what they said they did. On the other hand, observation of only three meetings (beginning, middle and end) may have limited understanding of how mentors sequentially developed trainees’ learning throughout the placement. Additionally, it was possible that recorded meetings were staged and as such mentors might have engaged with trainees differently. But on the contrary, I also doubt that mentors and trainees could have had the time to stage meetings.

My ability to reflect on mentoring in PE ITT from the different perspectives of link tutor, subject tutor, senior lecturer and researcher was an advantage to the study as it facilitated an informed analysis and deepened my understanding of mentoring in PE ITT. However, at times it was difficult for me to silence the internal judgemental voices of the subject and link tutor and listen carefully to those voices of mentors and trainees. I acknowledged throughout that my values, beliefs and behaviour coloured analysis, impressions and interpretations of data. I accept also that reactivity may have resulted from my previously established relationships with mentors and trainees, together with their need to retain good reputations with the University. Even so, some mentors and trainees claimed that
knowing me made it easier for them to share opinions and speak freely and frankly.

Finally, I often worried that the research process demanded time and discipline from mentors and trainees, added pressure to their already busy schedules and at times may have been burdensome. However, mentors and trainees reassured me that they found the research process both a challenging and valuable learning experience.

Despite the possible shortcomings of this study, it was always my expressed determination to enhance learning and understanding by painting an informed and well-balanced picture of what went on in the natural context. I believe I have achieved that goal.

7.6 Future recommendations

This section presents recommendations in the light of findings from this study. As a professional in PE ITT, I found that the lack of understanding of the mentoring context, process and relationships in PE ITT within the Southern University partnership indicated that much needed to be done, firstly, to improve the clarity of the concept of PE ITT mentoring; and secondly, to provide mentor and trainee education and training in order to enhance the depth of trainees’ learning experience.

7.6.1 Presentation of recommendations

The recommendations are divided into four main areas that start with recommendations for further research and then lead deliberately from the macro to the micro level. Policy recommendations precede university / professional area recommendations and in turn these pave the way for school-specific recommendations. Each recommendation under the main headings follows a common format: the recommendation area is introduced and recommendations are stated.
7.6.2 Recommendations for further research

Due to the limitations on the size of the sample in this study, additional research is necessary across populations of mentors and trainees, providers and ITT courses. In particular, specific aspects of the mentoring process require further study to inform effective practice within PE ITT partnerships. For example, further attention needs to be given to the nature, content, and dialogue of mentor / trainee meetings over the whole placement.

**Recommendation 1**

There is a need for collaborative cross-institution research focused on the nature of ITT mentoring relationships.

**Recommendation 2**

Mentoring research within PE ITT partnerships and across subjects is required to raise awareness, to increase understanding and to inform practice. This could include:

i. university staff working towards higher degrees;

ii. university staff supervising mentors working towards higher degrees;

iii. university staff working on collaborative research projects with school mentors and professional tutors;

iv. mentors’ own action research.

7.6.3 Recommendations at Government level

If teacher preparation is supposed to be a deep educational experience that addresses trainees’ holistic development and effects deeper levels of reflection leading to transformation, then, firstly, Government policy needs to change to accommodate this; and, secondly, adequate funding needs to follow. Currently, there is no obligation on schools to allocate funds for mentor education to staff who embark on mentoring in ITT. Consequently, the focus at Government level needs to be on providing funding for schools to facilitate mentor education and
training, or placing pressure on schools to use existing funding for mentor education and training.

**Recommendation 3**

Government ITT policy should be developed to provide funds for mentor education and training and place obligations on schools to fund CPD for staff who already mentor in ITT and those who aspire to become involved in ITT mentoring.

**Recommendation 4**

Government should include provision for ITT in school Ofsted inspections and examine the mentoring practice.

While there is no direct basis in this study for Recommendation 4, it follows on from Recommendation 3. If future policy states that schools must facilitate CPD in mentor education, inspection could at least check that this happens.

**7.6.4 Recommendations at University level**

Recommendations are required at University level if, firstly, mentors within a university partnership are mentoring trainees without appropriate mentor education and training and, secondly, if trainees are not skilled adequately to deal with the mentor / trainee relationship. Such recommendations need to address the provision of a clear concept of ITT mentoring and education, which is focused on the processes and skills required for ITT mentoring through an accreditation programme for mentors and lectures for trainees.

**Recommendation 5**

The University should take the lead to enhance knowledge and understanding of mentoring in PE ITT and the competency of mentors by defining what mentoring is within this specific context, clarifying the processes involved, identifying the required skill sets and training mentors in the use of these skills.
Recommendation 6

The University should provide a framework for mentor accreditation with qualifications that range from a certificate in mentoring to doctorate level.

If the University provided such a framework, partnership schools could make available opportunities for teachers to engage in this form of CPD. Such qualifications would enable teachers to follow a CPD route towards becoming an advanced skilled mentor. The process would have to be teacher-friendly and relate intimately to the work teachers do as mentors in schools. This could involve action research at Master of Arts [MA] and Doctor of Philosophy [PhD] level and could, in turn, inform and enhance local practice and contribute to a wider national debate.

Trainees within the University should be prepared specifically for the mentor / trainee relationship.

Recommendation 7

Education studies could provide the vehicle through which a focus is placed on the nature of the mentor / trainee relationship, the processes involved and the essential communication skills required for success. A permeation of such skills through education studies’ modules prior to the third and fourth year placements could deepen trainees’ understanding of the issues involved and lead to richer dialogues with mentors.

Recommendation 8

The allocation of time for mentors working with trainees in schools, as stated in the Partnership in Education handbook, needs to be increased. Based on the findings in this study, at least three hours of protected time per week would seem more realistic and reinforce the importance of time required for mentoring.
7.6.5 Recommendations at school level

Mentors need to be educated for the role of mentor and require time to do the job effectively. This study highlighted a lack of mentor education, mentors’ and trainees’ limited communication skills and a significant lack of protected time for mentors to do the job. This made the role challenging for mentors, especially when they dealt with difficult or weak trainees. Hence, it seems crucial that ITT mentoring is given both status and time in schools and that mentors are given the opportunity to access appropriate education and training. It is imperative that the TDA, providers and partnership schools engage in dialogue and come to an agreed understanding of the appropriate protected time mentors require to do the job effectively.

As mentors are neither educated specifically to mentor in ITT nor have the protected time to do the role effectively, recommendations have to focus on schools raising the status of mentors, giving them additional protected time and facilitating CPD opportunities for staff.

**Recommendation 9**

Schools should facilitate CPD so that all staff who mentor in ITT, as well as those who aspire to become mentors, can be educated and trained appropriately and accredited.

**Recommendation 10**

Schools should provide much greater recognition and status for mentors.

**Recommendation 11**

Schools should protect at least three hours per week for mentors to do the job of mentoring.
7.7  **In closing: as one journey ends another one begins**

My work to raise the awareness, knowledge, understanding and the skills of mentors has begun. In conjunction with colleagues at Southern University the following has been initiated:

i.   in September 2008, aspects of mentor education were placed as a standing item on the University PE ITT mentor conference agenda;

ii.  in the academic year 2008 – 2009, I created and delivered an MA module on learning relationships, with a particular focus on mentoring. Many of the students registered on the module were partnership mentors. Based on their reflections, the learning experience was very useful in many ways as it enabled them to reflect on their own practice and consider different approaches to mentoring trainees;

iii. from the start of the 2009 – 2010 academic year, keynote lectures and seminars on mentoring practice, processes and skills are to be included in trainees’ PE ITT education studies modules.

I am inspired by the response to my work and make the determination to extend it. In the short term, Government policy may not change and schools may not provide CPD funding and time for mentors to do the job. Regardless of this, the least the profession can do is to provide opportunities for mentors and trainees to gain knowledge and understanding of the context, the processes and the skills required, to enable them to create both the best possible relationships and maximise learning outcomes.
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

BAC    British Association for Counselling
BA (Hons)  Bachelor of Arts Honours degree
BA QTS  Bachelor of Arts with Qualified Teacher Status
BEd    Bachelor of Education
BTEC   Business and Technician Education Council
CATE   Campaign for the Advancement of Teacher Education
CEDP   Career Entry and Development Profile
CEP    Career Entry Profile
CNAA   Council for National Academic Awards
CPD    Continuing Professional Development
CUREE  Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education
DCSF   Department for Children, Schools and Families
DES    Department of Education and Science
DfE    Department for Education
DfEE   Department for Education and Employment
DfES   Department for Education and Skills
DRS    Dyadic Reflective Space
EAL    English as an Additional Language
GCSE   General Certificate of Secondary Education
GTC    General Teaching Council
HE     Higher Education
HEFC   Higher Education Funding Council
HEI    Higher Education Institutions
HMI    Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Schools
ICT    Information and communication technology
ITDP   Individual Training and Development Programme
ITT    Initial Teacher Training
LEA    Local Education Authority
MA     Master of Arts
MBA    Master of Business Administration
NHS    National Health Service
NQT    Newly Qualified Teacher
Ofsted Office for Standards in Education
PDP    Professional Development Profile
PE     Physical Education
PE ITT Physical Education Initial Teacher Training
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PENC</td>
<td>Physical Education National Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>Post Graduate Certificate in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PiE</td>
<td>Partnership in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Personal Reflective Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSHE</td>
<td>Personal, Social and Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Professional Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTS</td>
<td>Qualified Teacher Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCITI</td>
<td>School Centred Initial Teacher Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENCO</td>
<td>Special Education Needs Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLER</td>
<td>Seating, Open posture, Trunk Lean, Eye contact, Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRHE</td>
<td>Society for Research into Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSL</td>
<td>Secondary School Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Teacher Training and Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA</td>
<td>Teacher Training Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDE</td>
<td>University Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 1 (A – J)
Examples of questions from questionnaires
given to mentors and trainees

Questionnaire 1 (Q1) was administered at the beginning of the placement,
Questionnaire 2 (Q2) at mid-placement and Questionnaire 3 (Q3) at the end of the placement
A. **Example of an introduction to a questionnaire**

Dear _________________,

It is now week 7 of the placement and I hope everything is progressing well. This questionnaire asks you to identify any changes which have taken place since the start of the placement, and to delve more deeply into the processes and skills involved in your mentor / trainee relationship. Once again, I hope that you find the exercise professionally and personally beneficial. Your time and support is appreciated.

I suggest that you take time to reflect on the questions and answer them honestly in relation to the stage you and your trainee are at in the placement.

Before starting to write your answers, I suggest that you read through all of the questions to get a feel for the process. There is no need to answer all of the questions at once, answer a few every day during personal quiet time.

If you have difficulty with any of the questions please feel free to contact me.

All information you provide will be kept strictly confidential.

Completed questionnaire 2 and tape two will be collected on _________________. I will send a very gentle reminder via e-mail.

Thank you.

Joan Williams
The following sequence of questions came at the start of questionnaire 1 to mentors. Questions invited mentors to give some personal details, background and information related to their job and mentoring role.

1. Tick the box to indicate if you are male or female:

   | MALE | FEMALE |

2. State your age:

   __________________________________________

3. What is your position in the Physical Education Department (e.g. head of Department)?

   __________________________________________

4. How would you define mentoring in Initial Teacher Education?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

5. Were you given the option of becoming a mentor; appointed; or told that mentoring would become a part of your job description?

   | OPTIONAL | APPOINTED | TOLD |

6. Describe how this impacts upon your attitude towards mentoring?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

7. How many years have you been mentoring?

   __________________________________________

8. How many years have you been mentoring for Southern University (if different from your answer to question 5c)?

   __________________________________________

9. How much time per week are you given to perform the role of mentor?

   __________________________________________
C. The following sequence of questions came at the start of questionnaire 1 for year 4 trainees. The sequence of questions asked trainees to provide some background information and some indication of their feelings at the start of their final placement. The first two questions of questionnaire 1 for mentors and trainees related to sex and age. These questions are not shown here.

1. Have you had access to the Southern University Trainee Placement information booklet?
   Yes    No

2. Are you aware of the University’s expectations of the trainee while on school placement?
   Yes    No

3. Did you have a successful mentor / trainee relationship on your year 3 School Placement?
   Yes    No

4. Give reasons for your answer.

5. Has your Year 3 mentor / trainee relationship impacted upon your attitude towards your year 4 mentor / trainee relationship?
   Yes    No

6. Give reasons for your answer.

7. Do you feel prepared for the year 4 mentor / trainee relationship?
   Yes    No

8. Describe how you feel about your mentor / trainee relationship so far:

9. Do you feel prepared for your placement workload?
   Yes    No
D. Questionnaires 2 and 3 to mentors and trainees begin by asking them to consider any significant developments in their relationship.

1. Explain if there have been any significant developments in your mentor / trainee relationship since completing the first questionnaire.
E. The following sequence of questions occurred in all three questionnaires to mentors and trainees. These questions use Clutterbuck’s (2003) behavioural matrix as a starting point to investigate the mentor and trainee behaviour and to give an indication of the nature of the relationship.

1. **Directive**

   - By placing an X on the line between 1 & 5 at the directive end of the vertical axis of the graph above indicate how much you are responsible for managing the relationship with your trainee at this stage in the placement (1 take no responsibility for managing the relationship — 5 take full responsibility for managing the relationship).
   - By placing an X on the line between 1 & 5 at the non-directive end of the vertical axis of the graph above indicate how much you allow your trainee to take responsibility for managing the relationship at this stage in the placement (1 you allow her / him little responsibility for managing the relationship — 5 you allow her / him full responsibility for managing the relationship).
   - By placing an X on the line between 1 & 5 at the challenging end of the horizontal axis of the graph above indicate the degree of challenge you set your trainee at this stage in the placement (1 low level of challenge — 5 high level of challenge).
   - By placing an X on the line between 1 & 5 at the nurturing end of the horizontal axis of the graph above indicate how much you support and nurture your trainee at this stage in the placement (1 low level of support & nurturing — 5 high level of support and nurturing).
   - Join up the Xs with lines and reflect on the dimensions of your mentor / trainee relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Challenging</th>
<th>Nurturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-directive**
2. Since starting the placement if you have noticed a shift in the dimensions of the relationship either way along each of the continua please explain.

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

3. At this stage in the placement is it important who drives and manages the mentor / trainee relationship? Give reasons.

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

4. At this stage in the placement how important is it to use appropriate combinations of challenge (stretch) and nurturing (support and encouragement) to facilitate your trainee’s learning? Give reasons.

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

5. At this stage in the placement what do you consider to be appropriate combinations of challenge and nurturing for your trainee’s learning needs? Explain.

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
F. The sequence of questions below shows an example of how mentors and trainees were asked to explore the dimensions (open – closed; active – passive; stable – unstable; public – private; formal – informal) of their relationship (Garvey, 1994b). These appear in questionnaires 2 and 3 to mentors and trainees.

1. At this stage in the placement is the relationship with your trainee open or closed? If the relationship is open all topics (professional & personal) are discussed. If it is closed discussion will only include specific topics (e.g. issues related to teaching). Place your relationship somewhere along the continuum below by circling the appropriate number.

   OPEN 5 4 3 2 1 CLOSED

2. Give reasons why this is appropriate or inappropriate for your relationship at this stage in the placement.

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

3. Explain any shifts which have occurred along the open – closed continuum since starting the placement.

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________
G. The sequence of questions below appeared in questionnaires 1 – 3 to mentors. The example given asked mentors to explore trainees’ development through broad stages (Maynard and Furlong, 1995). Similar sequences of questions that followed asked mentors to reflect on trainees broad stages of development in relation to reflection and problem solving abilities. These questions were mirrored in trainees’ questionnaires (1 – 3) with slight variation in the wording to accommodate the change from mentor to trainee.

1. Place your trainee in one or more of the developmental stages of learning to teach identified below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views and approach are very idealistic</th>
<th>Surviving the experience</th>
<th>Dealing with difference</th>
<th>Hitting a plateau no real visible progress</th>
<th>Progressing and moving on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Since starting the placement has your trainee’s development fluctuated between the stages depending upon what aspect of teaching s/he is learning or practising?

Yes  No

3. Explain.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. What do you and your trainee do to facilitate development through these stages?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Examples are included below of questions from questionnaires 2 and 3 to mentors and trainees which asked them to explore the following themes: the imbalance of power in the relationship, the core conditions, emotional competence, verbal and non-verbal communication skills, active listening skills, questioning skills, giving and receiving feedback, and goal setting. Each sequence of questions on each theme started with a closed question and then opened up to ask for explanations and reasons. The following questions are from a questionnaire to mentors. The wording in trainees’ questionnaires varied to accommodate the change from mentor to trainee.

(Example — imbalance of power)
1a. As a mentor is expected to make formative and summative assessments of the trainee this creates an imbalanced power relationship in favour of the mentor. Has this impacted in any way (positively or negatively) on the relationship with your trainee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1b. If the answer is yes explain the impact it has had and how you have dealt with it.

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

(Example — empathy)
1a. If empathy is “…our effort to experience someone else’s reality no matter how different from ours, as if it were our own” (Frankland and Sanders, 1996, p.41), is it important for you and your trainee to be empathetic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1b. Give reasons to support your answer.

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

__________________________
(H. continued)

(Example — emotional content)
1a. Are you able to recognise how the intellectual and emotional content of the trainee’s issues interact and assist her / him in gaining greater control of her / his feelings and the situation?

| Yes | Sometimes | No |

1b. Explain

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Example — communication)
1a. Is it important for you to pay close attention to your own verbal and non-verbal communication during your mentor / trainee interactions?

| Yes | No |

1b. Give reasons for your answer.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Example — communication)
1a. If reflecting-back means picking up and verbalising the emotional content of what is said and done to demonstrate that we are trying to understand, is it important for you and your mentor to reflect-back during interactions?

| Yes | No |

1b. How often do you and your trainee reflect back? Give examples.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
I. The following questions are examples of those used in questionnaire 3 to mentors which asked them to reflect on aspects of their experience over the course of the placement. Similar questions were included in questionnaire 3 to trainees with a slight variation in wording to accommodate the change from mentor to trainee.

1a. Using the box below, attempt to identify the pattern of your trainee’s development through the stages of learning to teach from the beginning to the end of the placement. Draw a diagram if it’s easier.

1b. Has the nature of your interpersonal relationship impacted upon the trainee’s progress through the developmental stages?

   Yes  No

1c. If it has, explain how it has impacted. If it has not, explain.

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________

2. Explain the impact of the core conditions (empathy, respect and honesty) on the effectiveness of your interpersonal and developmental relationship.

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
3. Communication skills include: paying attention to your own and the trainee’s verbal and non-verbal communication; paying attention to what you sense the trainee is feeling; letting the trainee know that they are heard and understood through reflecting back words and feelings; paraphrasing and summarising.

Reflect on and explain the impact that your communication skills have had on your ability to maintain an effective mentor / trainee relationship.

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

4. Explain any re-occurring patterns you have noticed in the way goal setting has been used when working with your trainee throughout the placement and especially in this final stage.

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

(I. continued)
J. The following sequence of questions, which came at the end of questionnaire 3 to mentors and trainees, asked them to reflect on the ending of the mentor / trainee relationship. The example below came from the mentors’ questionnaire. Similar questions were included in questionnaire 3 to trainees with a slight variation in wording to accommodate the change from mentor to trainee.

1a. Have you given any thought to how you will deal with the relationship with your trainee when the placement comes to an end?

Yes  No

1b. Will you want the relationship to continue?

Yes  No

1c. If you want the relationship to continue, explain what you and your trainee will do to enable this to happen and what form the relationship will take (friendship, advisor etc).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

1d. Is this similar to or the same as what happened with your relationship with other year 4 trainees?

Yes  No

1e. Explain.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 2

JOINT QUESTIONNAIRE 3

TASKS 1(a), 1(b) and 2
FOR MENTORS AND TRAINEES
EDUCATIONAL MENTORING — STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MENTOR / TRAINEE RELATIONSHIP

Task 1(a) Read Walker and Stott’s (1993) stages of development in the mentor / trainee relationship in educational mentoring [below].

Task 1(b) Reflect on the similarities and differences in the interpersonal and developmental elements of Walker and Stott’s (1993) stages and the stages in your mentor / trainee relationship development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 1</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL relationship stages</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENTAL relationship stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
<td>Performed routine tasks, checked everything with mentor, discussion about school and development matters, looking around school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guest in the school, friendly or distant, cold and very formal, distanced respect, apprehension and uncertainty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 2</th>
<th>Cautious</th>
<th>Some latitude in tasks, mentor asks for opinions, confidence in mentee’s ability, some freedom in carrying out important tasks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal issues discussed, elements of trust, openness about personal fears &amp; difficulties, exploring different expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 3</th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>Frank exchanges about tasks and performance, confidence in mentee’s ability to take charge, opinions respected and shared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual understanding, mutual trust, atmosphere informal, both parties accommodating, confide in each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 4</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Mentee left to complete tasks alone, treat each other as equals, reciprocal benefits of relationship, experiences and problems discussed openly.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of real friendship, relationship about deeper and more personal issues, extremely informal, high degree of trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 5</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
<th>WALKER AND STOTT (1993) Educational Mentoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact and friendship maintained, open discussions after attachment, seeking advice about professional problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 2  In the blank table [below] identify the interpersonal and developmental stages in your mentor / trainee relationship over the 15 week period. If you can identify the stages in the relationship in relation to weeks of the placement that would be useful (e.g. Stage 1 = weeks 1 – 5). I realise that it might not be easy to identify the weeks.

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY ITT MENTORING
STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF YOUR MENTOR / TRAINEE RELATIONSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL relationship stages</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENTAL relationship stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3(a) and 3(b)

OBSERVATION SCHEDULES FOR MENTORS (3a)
AND TRAINEES (3b)

Components included in the observation schedule for a mentor 3(a) and a trainee 3(b) are almost identical. Only components that are unique to the trainees’ observation schedule are included in Appendix 3(b).
OBSERVATION SCHEDULE: Mentor 3(a)
RELATIONSHIP: __________ TAPE: _____ DATE: ________________

[PREPARATION]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENTION TO THE VENUE SETTING, SEATING ARRANGEMENTS, DISTRACTIONS:</th>
<th>ATTENTION TO PREPARING SELF FOR THE MEETING:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CONTENT OF THE SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEGINNING:</th>
<th>Start Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END:</td>
<td>End Time:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORE CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPATHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONESTY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-VERBAL MESSAGES GIVEN OUT BY SEATING POSTURE, TRUNK LEAN, EYE CONTACT, RELAXED POSTURE:</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO THE NON-VERBAL MESSAGES GIVEN BY THE TRAINEE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
USE OF LISTENING SKILLS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Sometimes %</th>
<th>Often %</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the whole message without judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the feelings attached to what is being said</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using silence and tuning in to what the silence is saying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONDING SKILLS: QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Sometimes %</th>
<th>Often %</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Raising Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONDING SKILLS: MENTOR INTERVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTIONS</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Sometimes %</th>
<th>Often %</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathartic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalytic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONDING SKILLS: OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Sometimes %</th>
<th>Often %</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting Words and Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probing Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Silence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBSERVATION SCHEDULE: Trainee 3(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENTION TO PREPARING SELF FOR THE MEETING:</th>
<th>START OF THE SESSION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### NATURE OF TRAINEE’S DIALOGUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee’s dialogue</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Sometimes %</th>
<th>Often %</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 words, acknowledging and agreeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting-back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS WITH PROMPTS FOR MENTOR
(MID-PLACEMENT WITH A YEAR 4 TRAINEE)
Mentor Interview (1) Mid-placement

(year 4 trainees’ final placement)

MENTORING

QUESTION 1: What is mentoring in ITT?
   i. What are some of the key words that you would associate with mentoring?
   ii. What key words would you use to describe the process of mentoring in ITT?

TIME FOR MENTORING

QUESTION 2: How much time (hours per-week) do you spend mentoring your trainee?
   i. (Lesson observation; lesson de-briefs; collating feedback from other staff;
   ii. working collaboratively with the PT; breaks time and after school discussions; mentor hour, notification of targets etc).

QUESTION 3: How much time is protected for you to do the job?

TRAINEE’S STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT

QUESTION 4: Can you identify and describe the stages in the trainee’s development since the start of the placement?

DIMENSIONS OF THE RELATIONSHIP

QUESTION 5: You describe your relationship as open, active, stable and close.
   i. Could it be successful otherwise?
   ii. Are there any limits to how open, active and close your relationship can be?
   iii. Say more?
DEVELOPMENTAL AND INTERPERSONAL COMPONENTS

QUESTION 6:  

i. Do the interpersonal and developmental components of your relationship inter-relate to facilitate an effective mentor / trainee relationship?  

ii. Can you explain how?

MENTORING STYLE

QUESTION 7:  

i. What determines your mentoring style?  

ii. Does your style need to change?  

iii. How frequently does it change?  

iv. Do you have a preferred style of mentoring?  

v. Explain?  

vi. How do you support your trainee?  

vii. How do you challenge your trainee?  

viii. How do you support your trainee?

LEARNING STYLE / WORKING STYLE PREFERENCES

QUESTION 8: 

Explore the possible advantages and disadvantages of the mentor and trainee having:

i. the same or similar learning / working style preferences;  

ii. different / opposing learning / working style preferences.  

iii. In what ways can you use information about the learning / working style preferences of yourself and the trainee to enhance the relationship?
THE IMBALANCE OF POWER

QUESTION 9:  
i. How do you manage the imbalance of power that is in your favour?  

ii. What are the boundaries for an effective mentor / trainee relationship?  

iii. Are these boundaries discussed at the start of the placement?  

iv. Explain?

CORE CONDITIONS AND SKILLS

QUESTION 10: Explore the ways in which you show empathy, respect and genuineness?

QUESTION 11: How often do you reflect on your behaviour with the trainee? Explore further?

QUESTION 12: How often do you reflect on your mentoring practice? Explore further?

QUESTION 13: How do you use paraphrasing and reflecting back when in dialogue with your trainee?  
i. How are these skills useful?

QUESTION 14 How do you use each of the following skills to facilitate development of your trainee:  
i. questioning?  

ii. feedback?  

iii. goal setting?  

iv. silence?  
v. summarising?
THE MENTOR / TRAINEE MEETING

QUESTION 15: Describe a mentor / trainee meeting?
   i. How do you prepare for it?
   ii. Who leads it?
   iii. How do you facilitate learning during the session?

MENTOR’S INTERVENTIONS

QUESTION 16 Reflect on the types of interventions you use during dialogue with your trainee. Which of the six mentor interventions do you use:
   i. Most frequently?
   ii. Sometimes?
   iii. Not at all?

GENERAL

QUESTION 17 Is there anything which I have not addressed in questionnaires and in this interview which impacts on your mentor / trainee relationship?

   Explain.

Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX 5
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS WITH PROMPTS FOR A YEAR 4 TRAINEE (MID-PLACEMENT)
MENTORING

QUESTION 1: What is mentoring in ITT?
   i. What key words would you use to describe mentoring?
   ii. What key words would you use to describe your mentor’s role?

TRAINEE’S STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT

QUESTION 2: Describe the stages through which your development has progressed since the start of the placement?

INTERPERSONAL STAGES OF THE RELATIONSHIP

QUESTION 3: Describe the interpersonal stages in your mentor / trainee relationship since the beginning of the placement?

QUESTION 4: How are these developmental and interpersonal stages similar to or different from what occurred on your year 3 placement?

QUESTION 5: Do the interpersonal and developmental components of your relationship inter-relate?
   i. How?
   ii. What would your ideal mentor / trainee relationship be like?
   iii. Say more?
RELATIONSHIP DIMENSIONS

QUESTION 6: Could your mentor / trainee relationship be successful if it were not stable, open, active and close?

i. Are there any limits to how open, active and close the relationship can be?

ii. Reflect on the relationship with your year 3 intermediate placement mentor. What were the dimensions of that relationship?

iii. How was the developmental and interpersonal relationship with your year 3 mentor similar to or different from your relationship with _______.

QUESTION 7: Can you identify the mentoring styles used by your mentor?

i. Do her styles change?

ii. Is there a predominant style?

iii. If styles change, can you identify when and why?

LEARNING AND WORKING STYLES

QUESTION 8: Consider the possible advantages and disadvantages of yourself and your mentor having:

i. The same or similar learning and working style profiles?

ii. Different or opposing learning / working style preferences?

iii. Would knowing each other’s learning / working styles help both of you to plan better to facilitate a successful relationship?

IMBALANCE POWER RELATIONSHIP

QUESTION 9: How do you deal with the imbalance of power in your mentor / trainee relationship?
SKILLS

QUESTION 10: How do you express empathy, respect and genuineness?

QUESTION 11: How often do you reflect on who you are, what you do and the impact you have on others?

QUESTION 12: What communication skills are important for effective dialogue with your mentor?

QUESTION 13: How do you use paraphrasing and reflecting back in dialogue with your mentor?

QUESTION 14: Which types of interventions does your mentor use most frequently during dialogue (prescriptive, informative, confronting, cathartic, catalytic)?
   i. Are there one or two types of interventions that predominate?

THE MENTOR / TRAINEE MEETING

QUESTION 15: How is the mentor / trainee meeting structured?
   i. How do you prepare for it?
   ii. Who leads it?
   iii. How are you challenged to flesh out issues, problem solve and come up with new ideas?

GENERAL

QUESTION 16: Is there anything which I have not addressed in questionnaires and in this interview which impacts on your mentor / trainee relationship? Explain?

Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX 6
A SCHEMATIC REPRESENTATION
OF THE LAYERS OF ANALYSIS

ANALYSIS THROUGH LAYERS OF REFLECTION ON DATA

This allows an overview of the process of analysis of data.
Layers of reflection on data presented in tabular form are repeated for all schools.

Key: Q: questionnaire,
     M: mentor;
     T4: year 4 trainee

1: beginning of placement,
2: mid-placement;
3 end of placement

Tape 1: recorded meeting at the beginning of the placement
Tape 2: recorded meeting at mid-placement
Tape 3: recorded meeting at the end of the placement

Int: interview

Schools: St. James; Community College and Foundation School
Layer 1  
Data from all sources (questionnaires, observations and interviews) were examined and recorded under thematic headings at the beginning, middle and end of the placement for year 4 (T4) and year 3 (T3) mentor / trainee relationships. For example, Tables A1 – A5 show how data from a year 4 (T4) relationship in one school were collated and examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A1</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Q1M</th>
<th>Q1T4</th>
<th>Tape 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table A2</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Q2M</td>
<td>Q2T4</td>
<td>Tape 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table A3</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Q3M</td>
<td>Q3T4</td>
<td>Tape 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table A4</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Itv1M</td>
<td>Itv1T4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table A5</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Itv2M</td>
<td>Itv2T4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Layer 2  
Data from all sources were recorded in tabular form under thematic headings and examined across stages 1 – 3 (beginning, middle and end of placement) for each participant. For example, Tables B1 – B5 show how data for the year 4 (T4) relationship in one school were collated and examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B1</th>
<th>Q1Mentor (beginning)</th>
<th>Q2Mentor (middle)</th>
<th>Q3Mentor (end)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table B2</td>
<td>Q1Trainee 4</td>
<td>Q2Trainee 4</td>
<td>Q3Trainee 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B3</td>
<td>Tape 1</td>
<td>Tape 2</td>
<td>Tape 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B4</td>
<td>Mentor Interview 1</td>
<td>Mentor Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B5</td>
<td>Trainee 4 Interview 1</td>
<td>Trainee 4 Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Layer 3  Data from each school were examined within stages across year 4 (T4) and year 3 (T3) relationships and recorded under thematic headings. For example, Tables C1 – C13 show how data from T3 and T4 relationships in one school were collated and examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table C1</th>
<th>Q1 Mentor (T4 relationship)</th>
<th>Q1M (T3 relationship)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table C2</td>
<td>Q2M (T4)</td>
<td>Q2M (T3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C3</td>
<td>Q3M (T4)</td>
<td>Q3M (T3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C4</td>
<td>Q1 T4</td>
<td>Q1 T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C5</td>
<td>Q2 T4</td>
<td>Q2 T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C6</td>
<td>Q3 T4</td>
<td>Q3 T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C7</td>
<td>Tape 1 T4</td>
<td>Tape 1 T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C8</td>
<td>Tape 2 T4</td>
<td>Tape 2 T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C9</td>
<td>Tape 3 T4</td>
<td>Tape 3 T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C10</td>
<td>M Interview 1 (T4)</td>
<td>M interview 1 (T3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C11</td>
<td>M Interview 2 (T4)</td>
<td>M interview 2 (T3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C12</td>
<td>T4 Interview 1</td>
<td>T3 interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C13</td>
<td>T4 Interview 2</td>
<td>T3 interview 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data were examined across stages for year 3 (T3) and year 4 (T4) relationships and across schools. For example, Tables D1 – D3 shows how data from the year 4 relationships in three schools were collated and examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee 4 (T4)</th>
<th>St. James School</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Foundation School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 (beginning)</td>
<td>Trainee’s stages of development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Helping to learn’ styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee 4 (T4)</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 4</th>
<th>School 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 (mid-placement)</td>
<td>Trainee’s stages of development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Helping to learn’ styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee 4 (T4)</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 4</th>
<th>School 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (end of placement)</td>
<td>Trainee’s stages of development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Helping to learn’ styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D1 Trainees’ stages of development, ‘helping to learn’ styles Clutterbuck, 2001, p.19) and relationship dimensions
Table D2  Stages in the interpersonal and developmental relationship
Layer 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. James School</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Foundation School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 (beginning of placement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 (mid-placement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (end of placement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D3  Content of meetings with T4 trainees