Challenging Assumptions
Looking In, Looking Out

CHALLENGING
LOOKING IN
LOOKING OUT
ASSUMPTIONS

Mentoring Vietnamese preservice teachers in EFL writing

Peter Hudson
Queensland University of Technology
Thi Mai Hoa Nguyen
University of Queensland
Sue Hudson
Queensland University of Technology

Mentors have individual beliefs on what is and what is not important for developing preservice EFL teachers. Five factors for mentoring have been previously identified by the author, namely, personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge, modelling, and feedback. A literature-based survey instrument gathered 100 Vietnamese preservice primary school teachers' perceptions of their mentoring for EFL teaching. Results indicated acceptable Cronbach alpha scores for four of the five factors, that is, personal attributes (.74), pedagogical knowledge (.89), modelling (.81), and feedback (.75); however, system requirements was .08 below the accepted .70 level. More than 50% of mentees perceived they had not received mentoring for developing their teaching of English writing on 29 of the 34 survey items, particularly with system requirements and modelling of EFL practices. Tertiary institutions may employ the survey instrument to gauge the degree and quality of mentoring in subject-specific areas such as EFL writing in order to benchmark and enhance mentoring practices.

英語教員を目指すものにとってその育成を担当する指導者の価値観は大きな影響をもたらすものである。指導するにあたって人格的特性、教育に対しての知識、観察学習能力、管理能力、そしてフィードバックという5項目は以前、著者によって述べられている。今回100名の英語教師を目指すベトナム人学生に対して教員育成に対するアンケートを実施した結果、5項目中4項目でクロンバック・アルファ・スコアにおいて十分な成果を得ることができた：人格的特性=.74、教育に対しての知識=.89、観察学習能力=.81、フィードバック=.75。しかし認知されている.70レベルに.08届かなかったのが管理能力であった。また、半分以上の学生が34項目中、29項目にライティング教授法に対する指導不足を観察学習能力と管理能力の側面から表した。高等教育における教員育成指導がどの程度の品質で行われているかを測定するためにこのアンケートを使用し、さらなる向上に結び付けることが期待される。

Mentoring and English as a second language

Preservice teachers must be prepared to meet the challenges and standards for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching (Wertheimer & Honigsfeld, 2000), with many educators (Haley & Rentz, 2002; Larsen-Freeman, 2000) calling for effective EFL teaching approaches to raise the standard of learning. Implementing EFL teaching approaches in schools needs to begin with preservice teacher education, for which universities and schools have significant roles in shaping effective practices. The in-school context of preservice EFL teacher education is pivotal for developing knowledge and skills (Chow, Tang, & So, 2004). Indeed, there is extensive research on preservice teachers' field experiences, as it is recognised as a key for enhancing the practicalities of teaching (e.g., Catapano, 2006; Goodfellow & Sumsion, 2000; Mule, 2005; Power, Clarke, & Hine, 2002).

Generally, preservice teacher education has become more school-based, which has increased the responsibilities assigned to mentors (Sinclair, 1997). Even though mentors have individual beliefs on what is and what is not important for developing preservice teachers, the general result of effective mentoring is "improvement in what happens in the classroom and school, and better articulation and justification of the quality of educational practices" (Van Thielen, 1992, p. 16). Prior to 1990, there had been very few in-depth studies of generic mentoring (Little, 1990), despite the last decade and a half producing significantly more literature on generic mentoring (e.g., Edwards & Collison, 1996; Tomlinson, 1995), which appears not to be subject specific. There is very little literature for subject-specific mentoring (Hodge, 1997 [physical education]; Hudson, 2005 [science]; Jarvis, McKeon, Coates, & Vause, 2001 [science]; Jarworski & Watson, 1994; [mathematics]), and it is virtually non-existent for mentoring EFL preservice teachers.

Mentoring is typically noted as a way to develop teaching practices and involves a close relationship between a less experienced person and a more experienced person who provides guidance, advice, support, and feedback (Haney, 1997). The two key players at the centre of the mentoring process are the mentee (preservice teacher) and the mentor (i.e., supervising or cooperating teacher). A competent mentor can be considered as "more knowledgeable on teaching practices and through explicit mentoring processes develops pedagogical self-efficacy in the mentee towards autonomous teaching practices" (Hudson, 2004, p. 216). Thoughtful mentors organise their preservice teachers' professional development by "advising on effective practices, making the theory-practice link overt, and evaluating and reporting upon their practicum performance" (Sinclair, 1997, p. 309). This implies that such mentors have proficient knowledge and skills on effective mentoring practices; however, there may be inadequately-skilled EFL teachers to fill the role of effective mentors in this field.

Five-factor model for mentoring

A five-factor model for mentoring has previously been identified by Hudson (2003), namely, personal attributes, system requirements (e.g., aims, policies, curriculum), pedagogical knowledge, modelling, and feedback. Personal attributes, including interpersonal skills, are essential for facilitating the mentoring of preservice teachers (Ganser,

1996), particularly the mentor's personal attributes of trust and emotional support that foster a learning environment conducive for developing the mentee's skills (Halai, 1998). System requirements provide a systematic direction for teaching and present a framework for regulating the quality of teaching practices (Smith, 2000). Pedagogical knowledge, which is developed pragmatically within the school setting and encompasses knowledge for teaching, is crucial for preservice teacher development (Jonson, 2002). As mentors are purported to be experts who model practice (Barab & Hay, 2001), it is argued strongly that teaching practices are learned more effectively through modelling (Carlson & Gooden, 1999). Finally, numerous researchers (e.g., Bishop, 2001; Little, 1990; Schon, 1987) have reported that a mentor's constructive feedback allows opportunities for the preservice teacher to reflect and improve teaching practice.

The five factors and items associated with each factor have been justified statistically with the literature (see Hudson, Skamp, & Brooks, 2005). For example, statistical analysis of 331 preservice teachers' responses from nine Australian universities on the five-factor model indicated acceptable Cronbach alphas, which is a measure of internal consistency, for each key factor, namely, personal attributes (mean scale score=2.86, *SD*=1.08), system requirements (mean scale score=3.44, *SD*=.93), pedagogical knowledge (mean scale score=3.24, *SD*=1.01), modelling (mean scale score=2.91, *SD*=1.07), and feedback (mean scale score=2.86, *SD*=1.11) were .93, .76, .94, .95, and .92, respectively. Correlations and covariances of the five factors were statistically significant ($p<.001$). Standardised regression weights ranged from .67 to .89 ($p<.001$), and all standard errors, which are a

measure of how much the value of a test statistic varies from sample to sample, were minimal for all items ($\leq.01$; see Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). The five factors, associated variables, and the development of a mentoring instrument are well articulated in the literature (see Hudson et al., 2005) for which this survey (Appendix 1) provides a direct link.

This study explores and describes Vietnamese preservice teachers' perceptions of their mentors' practices for developing their teaching of writing in English within the abovementioned five factors that are linked to a literature-based instrument (Appendix 1). This study aims to determine the transferability of the science mentoring instrument (i.e., Hudson et al., 2005) to the development of an instrument for mentoring preservice EFL teachers in teaching English writing in the primary school. This study also aims to articulate existing mentoring practices linked to this instrument on Vietnamese preservice EFL teachers' mentoring in the area of teaching English writing.

The preservice EFL teachers in this study were completing a 4-year undergraduate course for TESOL and commenced their 6-week practicum in Hanoi. Most were in their final year of study. Before entering practicum, the university course provided them with pedagogical knowledge of EFL teaching methods, as well as opportunities to present EFL teaching to their peers. As a result of this university education, assessments revealed they had at least met the minimum requirements for EFL teaching before entering practicum within primary and secondary schools. The participants completed this survey (Appendix 1) immediately after they had finished their practicum.

A classroom teacher served as a mentor during the preservice teachers' field experiences (practicum). These mentors received a nominal fee for their service. In some rural areas, such a small amount of money would be an incentive for mentors; however this is not the case in most areas. Over the past years, foreign language education at secondary level in Vietnam has been criticised for over-emphasising grammar and reading. Recently, a new English course book with a focus on four skills has been introduced. Among the four skills, teaching writing continues to be a challenge within secondary education. Therefore, understanding how to help preservice EFL teachers learn to teach writing in Vietnam may facilitate their development. However, it is important to understand mentoring practices at all levels of education (both primary and secondary).

Developing the MEFLT instrument

The Mentoring for English as a Foreign Language Teaching (MEFLT) survey instrument (Appendix 1) evolved through a series of preliminary investigations on Mentoring for Effective Primary Science Teaching (MEPST) (Hudson, 2003; Hudson, 2004; Hudson et al., 2005), which also identified the link between the literature on mentoring and the items on the survey instrument. The items on the instrument focus on the key mentoring attributes and practices for developing a preservice teacher's competency in a given subject area. The MEPST survey instrument, which focused on the five factors (i.e., personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge, modelling, and feedback), was altered to reflect mentoring for developing EFL teaching of writing. In addition, the

word "science" was replaced by the word "writing". For this study, 100 Vietnamese preservice teachers' perceptions of their mentoring were obtained from the five-part Likert scale (i.e., strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, uncertain=3, agree=4, strongly agree=5) MEFLT instrument. SPSS was used to produce mean scale scores, Cronbach alpha scores, and descriptive statistics for each variable, which also indicated the statistical relationship between variables within each factor.

Results and discussions

Data were gathered from 106 preservice EFL teachers at the conclusion of their last primary or secondary field experience (i.e., practicum, professional experience). Six incomplete responses were deleted (see Hittleman & Simon, 2002). The completed Vietnamese preservice teacher responses (95 female; 5 male) provided descriptors of the participants (mentors and mentees) and data on each of the aforementioned five factors and associated attributes and practices. Twenty percent of these mentees (n=100) were under 22 years of age and the rest were between 22 and 29 years of age. Seventy-two percent of mentees had not completed English units in their last 2 years of high school, yet all students completed at least one English curriculum unit at university (1% completed 1 English unit, 16% completed 2 units, 51% completed 3 units, and 32% completed 4 or more units). Eighty-nine percent were in their 4th year of university (7 were in their 3rd year, 3 were in 2nd year, and 1 was in 1st year), with 94% of the cohort as undergraduates. Thirty percent had completed one field experience (professional experience or practicum), with

54% completing 3 or more field experiences. There were no professional experiences less than 3 weeks. Their field experiences were located in a variety of contexts, that is, 44% were in a metropolitan city, 19% in the city suburbs, 16% were located in regional cities, 20% in rural towns and villages, and only 1 preservice teacher was located in a rural isolated area. Class allocations for their field experiences were also quite varied (i.e., 32% were allocated to classes between Year 1 and Year 6, 37% between Years 7-10, and the rest in Years 11). The heaviest allocations were in Years 10 and 11 (60%). Although 79% of the preservice teachers in this study taught one or more writing lessons, which included 34% who taught 4 or more lessons, there were 21% who did not teach a writing lesson during this last field experience.

Mentees estimated their mentors' (male=17, female=83) ages were as follows: 37% between 22-29 years, 33% between 30-39 years, and 30% were 40 years and over. Thirty three percent of mentees claimed they had observed their mentors model four or more EFL writing lessons during their last primary or secondary field experience. Although 38% of mentees were unsure that teaching English writing was a strong subject area for their mentor, 50% of mentees perceived that English writing was their mentors' area of strength.

Five factors for effective EFL mentoring

Four of the five factors had acceptable Cronbach alpha scores greater than .70 (see Kline, 1998), that is, personal attributes (mean scale score=3.25, SD=0.74), pedagogical knowledge (mean scale score=3.18, SD=0.73), modelling (mean scale score=3.09, SD=0.68), and feedback (mean scale score=3.19, SD=0.71) were .74, .89, .81, and .75, respectively (Table 1). System requirements had a Cronbach alpha score of .62 (mean scale score=3.09, SD=0.81), which is .08 below the accepted level. Indeed, a previous study on mentoring science education (Hudson et al., 2005) indicated system requirements would have the lowest Cronbach alpha score of the five factors.

Table 1. Confirmatory factor analysis for each of the five factors (n=100)

Factor	Mean scale score	SD	Cronbach alpha
Personal attributes	3.25	0.69	.74
System requirements	3.09	0.81	.62
Pedagogical knowledge	3.18	0.73	.89
Modelling	3.09	0.68	.81
Feedback	3.19	0.71	.75

The following provides a fine-grained analysis on the attributes and practices associated with each factor.

Personal attributes

When analysing the mentees' responses on their mentors' personal attributes, the majority of mentors were perceived to be comfortable in talking about teaching English writing (53%); however, other than perceiving their mentors instilled confidence for them to teach writing (50%), all other personal attributes were less than 50% (Table 2). Table

2 also provides mean item scores (range: 3.07 to 3.36; *SD* range: 0.93 to 1.21) and rank-order percentages on mentees' perceptions of their mentors' personal attributes.

Table 2. Personal attributes for mentoring the teaching of EFL writing (n=100)

Mentoring Practices	%*	M	SD
Comfortable in talking	53	3.30	1.01
Instilled confidence	50	3.27	1.12
Supportive	46	3.36	1.21
Assisted in reflecting	45	3.28	0.93
Listened attentively	44	3.20	1.08
Instilled positive attitudes	42	3.07	1.08

* % = Percentage of mentees who either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" their mentors provided that specific mentoring practice.

System requirements

The percentages of mentees' perceptions of their EFL mentoring practices associated with system requirements were all below 50%, that is, 46% of mentors discussed with their mentees the aims of teaching writing in English, 44% of mentors discussed the school's English language writing policies with their mentees, and 34% outlined English writing curriculum documents (mean item scores range: 2.95 to 3.16; *SD* range: 1.06 to 1.10; Table 3).

Table 3. System requirements for mentoring the teaching of EFL writing (n=100)

Mentoring practices	%*	M	SD
Discussed aims	46	3.16	1.07
Discussed policies	44	3.16	1.10
Outlined curriculum	34	2.95	1.06

* % = Percentage of mentees who either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" their mentors provided that specific mentoring practice.

Pedagogical knowledge

Mean item scores (3.06 to 3.32; *SD* range: 1.00 to 1.14; Table 4) indicated that the majority of mentees did not "agree" or "strongly agree" their mentor displayed pedagogical knowledge for teaching writing in English. More than 45% of mentors may not have mentored pedagogical knowledge practices (see Table 4 for rank-order percentages). For example, in the planning stages before teaching writing, only 37% of mentors assisted in planning, 48% discussed the timetabling of the mentee's teaching, and at the top end of the rank order 52% guided their mentees' English writing preparation. Even though strategies for teaching needed to be associated with the assessment of students' prior knowledge, more than 60% of mentors were perceived not to have discussed assessment or questioning techniques for teaching EFL writing. Many mentors also appeared not to consider content knowledge and problem-solving strategies for teaching EFL writing (44%), and providing their personal viewpoints on how to teach writing was not considered a high priority (41%). This implies that many preservice teachers may not be provided with adequate

pedagogical knowledge to develop successful EFL teaching practices.

Table 4. Pedagogical knowledge for mentoring the teaching of EFL writing (n=100)

Mentoring Practices	%*	M	SD
Guided preparation	52	3.20	1.05
Assisted with classroom management	52	3.32	1.14
Discussed implementation	48	3.27	1.05
Assisted with timetabling	48	3.32	1.09
Discussed problem solving	44	3.24	1.08
Discussed content knowledge	44	3.21	1.05
Provided viewpoints	41	3.14	1.10
Discussed questioning techniques	38	3.10	1.00
Assisted in planning	37	3.10	1.08
Assisted with teaching strategies	37	3.06	1.03
Discussed assessment	32	3.07	1.12

* % = Percentage of mentees who either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" their mentors provided that specific mentoring practice.

Modelling

Modelling teaching provides mentees with visual and aural demonstrations of how to teach writing in English, yet mean item scores in this study (2.75 to 3.24; *SD* range: 0.96 to 1.12; Table 5) indicated the majority of mentors were perceived not to have modelled EFL writing teaching

practices. It appeared that more than 50% were not enthusiastic about teaching writing in English. In addition, more than 60% did not model a hands-on lesson, a well-designed lesson, or classroom management practices for teaching writing (see Table 5 for rank-order percentages). Out of the 46% who modelled the teaching of writing, 20% of mentors were considered by their mentees as not effective in their EFL teaching of writing.

Table 5. Modelling for mentoring the teaching of EFL writing (n=100)

Mentoring Practices	%*	M	SD
Modelled teaching	46	3.24	1.04
Modelled rapport with students	44	3.16	1.04
Displayed enthusiasm	43	3.14	1.12
Used syllabus language	41	3.22	0.96
Modelled classroom management	37	3.02	1.05
Modelled a well-designed lesson	35	3.15	1.07
Demonstrated hands-on	34	3.05	0.96
Modelled effective teaching	26	2.75	1.09

* % = Percentage of mentees who either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" their mentors provided that specific mentoring practice.

Feedback

Mean item scores (3.07 to 3.27; *SD* range: 0.99 to 1.10; Table 6) indicated that 50% or more of mentees did not "agree" or "strongly agree" their mentors provided feedback as part of their mentoring practices for teaching writing in English.

Surprisingly, mentees perceived that only half the mentors observed their teaching of writing, with 41% articulating their expectations for the mentees' teaching of writing. More surprising is that 60% of mentors did not provide written feedback. In addition, only 47% of mentors reviewed their mentees' lesson plans, which can enhance teaching performance and possibly learning outcomes (Table 6).

Table 6. Providing feedback for mentoring the teaching of EFL writing (n=100)

Mentoring Practices	%*	M	SD
Observed teaching for feedback	50	3.27	1.10
Provided oral feedback	49	3.26	0.99
Reviewed lesson plans	47	3.22	1.07
Provided evaluation on teaching	45	3.17	1.04
Articulated expectations	41	3.12	1.09
Provided written feedback	40	3.07	1.06

* % = Percentage of mentees who either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" their mentors provided that specific mentoring practice.

Further discussion and conclusions

A literature-based instrument (Appendix 1) gathered 100 Vietnamese preservice teachers' perceptions of their mentors' practices for developing their teaching of EFL writing. Data were analysed within five factors, namely, personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge, modelling, and feedback. Apart from the system requirements factor, there appeared to be transferability of the MEPST survey instrument (Hudson et al., 2005) to the MEFLT instrument, which was generally supported by acceptable Cronbach alpha scores and descriptive statistics (Table 1). Cronbach alpha scores determined the internal consistency of the instrument, which appeared not unlike the scores from the MEPST instrument. However, further sampling may present additional information on the internal consistency of the factor system requirements. Nevertheless, this specific MEFLT instrument provided a way to collect data about mentees' perceptions of their mentors' practices for learning how to teach EFL writing. Even though the Likert scale differentiated the degree of mentoring (e.g., strongly disagree to strongly agree), the quality of these mentoring practices needs to be investigated further. Anecdotal evidence suggests mentors vary their mentoring considerably, and so a set of standards for mentoring practices on learning how to teach writing in English appears logical. Such standards should only be served as minimum requirements and not inhibit the approach of effective mentors who articulate unique, individual mentoring styles about teaching philosophies.

The education of preservice EFL teachers is a place to focus attention in an effort to obtain quality EFL teaching (Haley & Rentz, 2002; Larsen-Freeman, 2000). EFL teachers in their roles as mentors are essential in assisting preservice teachers to develop competent knowledge and skills (Chow, Tang, & So, 2004; Mule, 2005). These teachers (mentors) are well positioned and located to educate preservice teachers on the pedagogical knowledge and content knowledge necessary for effective EFL education practices. The quality and degree of collaboration within field experience programs can aid the preservice EFL teachers' development as future

practitioners, and more efforts need to be made to produce quality EFL teachers (Lu, 2002). Currently, there is little or no literature recording the amount of field experiences sufficient to produce competent EFL teachers or on specific mentoring that may be required for developing preservice EFL teachers during their field experiences.

Mentees' in-school context is pivotal for their development as teachers (Jasman, 2002), yet the results in this current study indicated perceptions of inadequate mentoring for learning how to teach EFL writing. This implies that many Vietnamese preservice primary teachers may not receive equitable mentoring. Many of these mentors may require further professional development and scaffolding on subject-specific mentoring skills. The inadequate mentoring perceived by mentees in this study may be initially addressed through specific mentoring practices that focus on each of the items associated with the survey instrument (Appendix 1). For example, if a system requirement is discussing aims for teaching of EFL writing, then this practice could be built into a mentoring program to guide mentors' practices. Additionally, tertiary institutions may employ the instrument to gauge the degree and quality of mentoring in subject-specific areas (such as EFL writing) and, as a result of diagnostic analysis, plan and implement mentoring programs that aim to address specific needs of mentors to enhance the mentoring process. Furthermore, benchmarking mentoring practices may aid in determining ways for improving such practices. The MEFLT survey instrument (Appendix 1) may also assist mentors in their education on subject-specific mentoring as a self-reflective way to assess their own mentoring practices. As the mentoring

attributes and practices in this study were derived from the generic literature on mentoring, this survey instrument can be amended to reflect other EFL areas, for example, by changing the word "writing" to "reading", "speaking", or "listening". The instrument may also be altered to gather information on the general area of English mentoring (i.e., substituting "writing" for "English"). However, tests for internal consistency, such as Cronbach alpha scores, will need to be determined for validating the data.

This study only focused on the mentees' perceptions of their mentors' practices and did not consider mentees' practices or performances in the mentoring process. Even so, if the mentees perceived they had not received adequate mentoring in particular areas, then either the mentors had not provided that practice or it was not explicit enough for the mentees to recognise it. Either way, gathering mentees' perceptions on their mentoring can present useful information for devising quality programs. As mentoring needs to be a two-way dialogue, investigating mentees' practices and roles in quantitative and qualitative terms can provide a deeper understanding on learning how to teach EFL.

In conclusion, the mentor's involvement in facilitating the mentee's learning for more effective teaching of English-language writing cannot be without purpose or direction; instead it must be organised with specific and clear objectives for mentors. Effective mentoring aims at elevating preservice teachers' real-life learning experiences with opportunities for developing effective teaching practices within school settings. Hence, educating mentors on subject-specific mentoring practices may enhance this process.

Peter Hudson has taught in British Columbia (1987), Ottawa (2001), and lectured at Southern Cross University and is currently at Queensland University of Technology.

Nguyen Thi Mai Hoa is a PhD candidate at The University of Queensland. Her research activities focus on English language teaching and EFL teacher education.

Sue Hudson is the Academic Coordinator for the Caboolture campus at Queensland University of Technology (QUT) and has 28 years in education.

References

Barab, S. A., & Hay, K. E. (2001). Doing science at the elbows of experts: Issues related to the science apprenticeship camp. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38*(1), 70-102.

Bishop, C. (2001). *Case-based learning and the construction of professional practical knowledge in teacher education*. Ed. D dissertation, Sydney, Faculty of Education, University of Sydney.

Carlson, R. D., & Gooden, J. S. (1999, February). *Mentoring pre-service teachers for technology skills acquisition*. Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Catapano, S. (2006). Teaching in urban schools: Mentoring pre-service teachers to apply advocacy strategies. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 14*(1), 81-96.

Chow, A. W. K., Tang, S. Y. F., & So, K. S. (2004). Mentoring others and developing self: Teacher learning and development. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 13*(1), 57-85.

Edwards, A., & Collison, J. (1996). *Mentoring and developing practice in primary schools: Supporting student teacher learning in schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ganser, T. (1996). What do mentors say about mentoring? *Journal of Staff Development, 17*(3), 36-39.

Goodfellow, J., & Sumsion, J. (2000). Transformative pathways: Field-based teacher educators' perceptions. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 26*(3), 245-258.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis with readings* (4th ed.). New York: Prentice-Hall.

Halai, A. (1998). Mentor, mentee, and mathematics: A story of professional development. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 1*(3), 295-315.

Haley, M. H., & Rentz, P. (2002). Applying SLA research and theory to practice: What can a teacher do? *TESL-EJ, 5*(4).

Haney, A. (1997). The role of mentorship in the workplace. In M. C. Taylor. (Ed.), *Workplace education* (pp. 211-228). Toronto, Ontario: Culture Concepts.

Hittleman, D. R., & Simon, A. J. (2002). *Interpreting educational research: An introduction for consumers of research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hodge, S. R. (1997). Mentoring: Perspectives of physical education graduate students from diverse cultural backgrounds. *Physical Educator, 54*(4), 181-195.

Hudson, P. (2003). Mentoring first-year preservice teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*: *The Journal of the Association of Teacher Educators, 15*(3), 91-99.

Hudson, P. (2004). Toward identifying pedagogical knowledge for mentoring in primary science teaching. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 13*(2), 215-225.

Hudson, P. (2005). Identifying mentoring practices for developing effective primary science teaching. *International Journal of Science Education, 27*(14), 1723-1739.

Hudson, P., Skamp, K., & Brooks, L. (2005). Development of an instrument: Mentoring for effective primary science teaching. *Science Education, 89*(4), 657-674.

Jarvis, T., McKeon, F., Coates, D., & Vause J. (2001). Beyond generic mentoring: Helping trainee teachers to teach primary science. *Research in Science and Technological Education, 19*(1), 5-23.

Jarworski, B., & Watson, A. (Eds). (1994). *Mentoring in mathematics teaching*. London: Falmer Press.

Jasman, A. (2002, October). *Initial teacher education: Changing curriculum, pedagogies and assessment*. Paper presented at Challenging Futures Conference, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.

Jonson, K. F. (2002). *Being an effective mentor: How to help beginning teachers succeed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching (2nd ed.)*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organisation of teaching. *Review of Educational Research, 16,* 297-351.

Lu, D. (2002). English medium teaching at crisis: Towards bilingual education in Hong Kong. Gema: *Online Journal of Language Studies, 2*(1). Retrieved 2 July, 2006, from http://www.fpbahasa.ukm.my/PPBL/GemaVol2.1.2002No5.pdf

Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practices of structural equation modeling*. New York: The Guildford Press.

Mule, L. (2005). Preservice teachers' inquiry in a professional development school context: Implications for the practicum. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(2), 205-218.

Power, A., Clarke, M., & Hine, A. (2002, October). The internship: A journey of professional learning through reflection. Paper presented at Challenging Futures Conference, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. California: Jossey Bass.

Sinclair, C. (1997). Redefining the role of the university lecturer in school-based teacher education. Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 25(3), 309-324.

Smith, D. C. (2000). Content and pedagogical content knowledge for elementary science teacher educators: Knowing our students. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 11*(1), 27-46.

Tomlinson, P. (1995). *Understanding mentoring: Reflective strategies for school-based teacher preparation.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Van Thielen, B. (1992). *Tutoring beginning teachers through a mentor teacher program.* Monograph No. 16. Saskatchewan, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED354222)

Wertheimer, C., & Honigsfeld, A. (2000). Preparing ESL students to meet the new standards. *TESOL Journal, 9*(1), 7-11.

Appendix 1

Mentoring for English as a Foreign Language Teaching (MEFLT)

Writing

SECTION 1

This section aims to find out some information about you. To preserve your anonymity, do not write your name. Please *circle* the responses that apply to you.

a) What is your gender? Male   Female

b) What is your age?

<22 yrs   22 - 29 yrs   30 - 39 yrs   >40 yrs

c) What English units did you complete in Years 11 and 12 at high school (if any)?

d) How many English curriculum/methodology units have you completed at university?

0   1   2   3   4 or more

e) How many English writing lessons did you teach during your last field experience (practicum)?

0   1   2   3   4   5   6 or more

f) How many field experiences (block practicums) have you now completed during your tertiary teacher education?

(including this one).   1   2   3   4 or more

g) Please circle the class(es) on which you completed your last field experience (practicum).

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10   11   12

h) Where was your last field experience located?

metropolitan city   city suburbs   regional city   rural town or village   rural/isolated

i) Please circle the university year in which you are currently enrolled.

first year   second year   third year   fourth year

j) I am:
an undergraduate   (without a degree)
a graduate (with a degree)

SECTION 2

This section aims to find out some information about your mentor during your last field experience (practicum). Please *circle* the response you feel is most accurate.

a) What is your mentor's gender?   Male   Female

b) What was your mentor's approximate age during this last field experience?

<22 yrs   22 - 29 yrs   30 - 39 yrs   >40 yrs

c) Would writing in English be a strong area for your mentor?

strongly disagree   disagree   uncertain   agree   strongly agree

SECTION 3

The following statements are concerned with your mentoring experiences for teaching writing in English during your last field experience (practicum). Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each statement below by *circling only one response* to the right of each statement.

Key

SD = strongly disagree

D = disagree

U = uncertain

A = agree

SA = strongly agree

During my last field experience (i.e., practicum) for teaching writing in English my <u>mentor</u>:

1. was supportive of me for teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

2. used writing language from the current writing syllabus.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

3. guided me with writing lesson preparation.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

4. discussed with me the school policies used for teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

5. modelled the teaching of writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

6. assisted me with classroom management strategies for teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

7. had a good rapport with the students when teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

8. assisted me towards implementing teaching strategies for writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

9. displayed enthusiasm when teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

10. assisted me with timetabling my writing lessons.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

11. outlined national writing curriculum documents to me.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

12. modelled effective classroom management when teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

13. discussed evaluation of my teaching of writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

14. developed my strategies for teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

15. was effective in teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

16. provided oral feedback on my teaching of writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

17. seemed comfortable in talking with me about teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

18. discussed with me questioning skills for effective teaching of writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

19. used hands-on materials for teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

During my last field experience (i.e., practicum) for teaching writing in English my <u>mentor</u>:

20. provided me with written feedback on my teaching of writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

21. discussed with me the knowledge I needed for teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

22. instilled positive attitudes in me towards teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

23. assisted me to reflect on improving my writing teaching practices.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

24. gave me clear guidance for planning to teach writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

25. discussed with me the aims of teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

26. made me feel more confident as a teacher of writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

27. provided strategies for me to solve my problems for teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

28. reviewed my writing lesson plans before teaching writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

29. had well-designed writing activities for the students.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

30. gave me new viewpoints on teaching writing to students.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

31. listened to me attentively on teaching of writing matters.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

32. showed me how to assess students' writing.

    SD   D   U   A   SA

33. clearly articulated what I needed to do to improve my teaching of writing.

SD   D   U   A   SA

34. observed me teach writing before providing feedback?

SD   D   U   A   SA