

Factors Affecting the Implementation of School-based mentoring in pre-service teacher education: The case of students of the language stream at Kotebe College of Teacher Education and St. Mary's University Colleges' Practicum

Hailu Woubshet

Abstract

This study investigates factors affecting the implementation of mentoring student teachers of the language stream in pre-service teacher education.

Questionnaire and interview were used as primary data collection instruments.

The results of the study revealed that the majority of the school based mentors under study have no training on mentoring skills, no workshop, no seminar etc. They also have no reading materials related to mentoring. These, in turn, made the school-based mentors unable to carryout their mentoring roles effectively.

Further more, the two teacher education colleges have loose relationship with their partner schools. As a result, they (the colleges) failed to establish an accountability system for the whole of practicum, activities in general and for school-based mentoring in particular.

It was found that several factors hinder the implementation of mentoring in practicum.

These include:

- *Considering mentoring as an extra responsibility on the part of school-based mentors,*
- *Inappropriacy of the practicum,*
- *lack of assistance from school administrators, the number of student teachers working with a mentor, etc.*

Based on the results of the findings conclusions were drawn and recommendations were made.

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

In an attempt to solve the long existing problems of teacher education in Ethiopia, the Ministry of Education has made a paradigm shift in the previous few years. According to MOE (2003), the paradigm shift involves:

- Teaching which makes changes in ideas and peoples lives.
- Taking the real world into the classroom and taking teachers into the real world.
- Demonstrating teacher education-giving teachers, students and citizens confidence to make decisions and initiatives, to take control of the in worlds.

Due to this shift, the traditional teaching practice is substituted by the new practice called practicum. This new practice, unlike the old one, gives chance to student teachers to have the knowledge of school organization starting from the very beginning of their training. In addition to this, they have as much supported experience as possible before they begin their career as professional teachers. As stipulated by MOE (2003:12),

The new practicum allows student teachers to practice teaching in their respective areas, try out ideas, have confidence to make mistakes and reflect and learn from them in order to develop new strategies.

As practicum is full of active experiences like observation, reflection, analysis and evaluation, student teachers need much professional support at all levels. According to MOE (2003:12) “An essential element of practicum is the continual support and guidance offered to each student teacher by a tutor from TEI (Teacher Education Institute) and from a teacher at a partner school.” A tutor is a lecturer in the TEIs and a teacher is a school based mentor who is the focus of this study.

This study attempts to investigate factors affecting the implementation of mentoring in pre-service teacher education.

What initiated the idea of conducting a study on this area is that it seems no special attempt has been made in most teacher education colleges in Ethiopia that may help the school-based mentors to clearly know their roles and act accordingly. Furthermore, according to the researcher's personal experience many teacher education colleges seem reluctant to create link with their partner schools in general and with the school-based mentors in particular. It is believed by the researcher that a strong liaison between teacher education institutes and their partner schools facilitates the whole of the practicum activity in general and mentorship in particular.

It would, therefore, be very important to study the nature of practicum in general and the mentoring duties of the school practicing language teachers in particular in the sample college training of professional pre-service teachers of languages. This may indicate the extent to which the current trend in teacher education is making its way to the colleges.

Objectives of the Study

A. General objective

The study aims at investigating factors affecting the implementation of Mentoring in pre-service teacher education in the sample colleges.

B. Specific objectives

This study will try to:

- 1) Investigate the school-based mentors teaching and mentoring experience which in turn affects their mentoring duties,
- 2) See the school-based mentors perception of their mentoring role,
- 3) Observe the mentors readiness to work as mentors,
- 4) Search the extent to which the school-based mentors discharge their mentoring duties, and
- 5) Indicate factors that hinder the school-based mentors effective discharging of their roles.

Methodology of the Study

Selection of the sample colleges, the description of the subjects of the study, justification for the selection of the institutions and the subjects, the data collecting tools employed and the procedures followed to analyze the data are the components of this chapter.

Selection of the Sample Colleges

The two sample colleges of the study were St. Mary's University College and Kotebe College of Teacher Education. The writer of this paper selected these colleges due to some valid reasons.

St. Mary's University College was selected among private teacher education colleges because of their longer experience than other similar private institutes in the region (Addis Ababa).

In addition, the researcher was teaching in this college when the study was conducted and was participating in the practicum of the college as a college-based tutor. So, this experience and the problems observed on the implementation of mentoring in the practicum activities of the college urged the researcher to conduct this study.

Regarding the selection of Kotebe College of Teacher Education, its vast experience in teacher education was the major criteria used.

Furthermore, these colleges were selected due to their convenience for a careful, closer study as they are situated in Addis Ababa.

Subjects of the Study

School-based mentors, student teachers, college tutors, college practicum unit coordinators, principals of the partner schools and language department heads of the partner schools were the subjects of the study.

The partner schools

The study was conducted in six partner schools of the two colleges under study (i.e. three partner schools of Kotebe College of Teachers Education and three partner schools of St. Mary's University College). These schools were selected among many other partner schools due to the suitability of their location for the researcher and due to the fact that the third year students of the language stream were conducting their block teaching in these schools. These sample schools were Meskerem primary school, Balcha Aba Nefso primary school and St. Giorgis primary school from St. Mary's partner schools and Dej. Belay-Zeleke, Misrak Goh and Menilik I primary schools from Kotebe College's partner schools. All these schools are found in Addis Ababa.

The Student Teachers

Both sampled colleges had three sections each of third year students of the language stream. From these six sections, thirty (30) student teachers were randomly selected and used for this study (i.e. five students from each section). All of these student teachers were conducting their block teaching practice in the partner schools mentioned above.

The Practicum Unit Coordinators and the College Tutors

The study included two practicum unit coordinators of the two sampled colleges and four college based tutors (instructors). Two tutors each from KCTE and SMUC. The college tutors were selected among tutors of the language stream.

The School Principals and the Department Heads

All the principals of the six partner schools under study along with six department heads of languages were also selected for the study's purpose.

The School-Based Mentors

Thirty school-based mentors, who were the focus of this study, were selected among the aforementioned six partner schools of the two colleges.

All of the school-based mentors were language teachers. Five language teachers were taken from each of the six schools. As the number of the school-based mentors do not exceed the sample in most cases, the sample taken were considered highly representative.

The school-based mentors were selected from the language teachers who were teaching in the second cycle (from 5 to 8) and who were serving as mentors during the time of the study.

Data Collecting Instruments

For this study, questionnaires and interviews were used as data collecting instruments. These questionnaires and interview questions were formerly used by Solomon Geda, (2001) as data gathering tools for his M.A. Thesis. As the current work has some relation with it, the instruments were found highly relevant for this study and used with some modifications to suit the purpose of this study.

Questionnaires

Two sets of questionnaires were distributed among 30 third year student teachers of the language stream and 30 school-based mentors(all of them are language teachers). All of the questionnaires, which were distributed initially, were filled and returned completely (i.e. 100%) because they were filled and returned under close supervision of the researcher. The questionnaires were modified by taking the review of the related literature (i.e. chapter two of this paper) into account.

Both sets of questionnaires were originally written in English. After they were piloted to see the extent of their appropriacy to serve the purpose of the study, they were translated into Amharic by taking into consideration the English language difficulty of the respondents, which was observed during the pilot study, and distributed to the subjects of the main study.

When the pilot study was conducted, fifteen copies of the mentors questionnaires and another fifteen copies of the student teacher's questionnaires were distributed to the

school-based mentors of Tesfa Kokeb, Edget Behibret, and Dej.Bekele Woya primary schools (all these schools were St. Mary's partners).

The student teachers used in the pilot study were conducting their block-teaching in these schools. They were student teachers of the language stream at St. Mary's University College. The subjects of the pilot study were in the same level and in the same condition of the subjects of the main study.

Some changes were made on the questionnaire after the pilot study. These changes include modification of instructions, minimizing the number of open-ended questions and translating the questions into Amharic.

The Questionnaire for the Student Teachers

The student teachers' questionnaire had two parts. Part I was about the student teachers' perception of the practicum program and Part II was about the practical help the student teachers gained from their school-based mentors.

The first part contains items that could be ranked. The scales were ranged from 1 to 5 (1=strongly agree; 2= agree; 3= have no idea; 4=disagree; 5= strongly disagree).

Part two, on the other hand, included three types of items. They were "yes" or "no" response questions, multiple-choice questions and a single free response question.

Questionnaire for the School Based Mentors

As the school-based mentors involved in language teaching were the main focus of the study, the questions for the school-based mentors were more in number and in type than in the student teachers' questionnaire.

It had four parts: Part I, the mentor's background information, part II, the mentors' perception of their mentoring role, part III, factors affecting the school based mentors' effectively discharging their roles, and part IV, on the degree to which the school-based mentors were discharging their mentoring roles.

In line with this, part I incorporated 3 gap filling and 2 multiple choice questions, (i.e. 5 items total) which were expected to give background information about each respondent (school-based mentor).

Part II included a scale ranging from 1-5 (1= strongly agree; 2= agree; 3= have no idea; 4= disagree; and 5= strongly disagree). The total number of questions under this part was 9.

Part III, on the other hand, contained items, which were used to show the magnitude of each of the given statements (possible problems). The magnitude ranged from 1-4 (i.e. 1= not a problem at all; 2= it may cause some problem; 3= it is a serious problem; and 4= it is a very serious problem). 18 items were incorporated in this section. The last question of this part was open-ended whereas the remaining 17 used scaling.

Part IV was a mixture of multiple choice and open-ended questions. From the total number of 12 questions, 6 were multiple-choice items while the other 6 of them were open-ended questions.

Interview

Two sets of interview questions were prepared for two groups. One set for college practicum unit coordinators and college tutors and another one for schools principals and language department heads of the partner schools. The interview questions for college practicum unit coordinators and college-based tutors were in English. But, the interview questions for school principals and department heads were in Amharic for convenience.

Data Analysis and Discussion

As the data gathered were both quantitative and qualitative in nature, percentage and description of interview responses and open-ended question responses were used to analyze the data.

The quantitative data were tabulated and subsequent discussion made after each table (under each table). The discussion of the tabulated data was based on the review of the related literature (i.e., unit two of this paper).

For clarity and suitability of the analysis and discussion, the data were grouped into five sections.

The first section was the analysis of the school-based mentors, background information, the second section was the school-based mentors awareness of their mentoring role, the third section, the analysis and discussion of the school-based mentors readiness to work as mentors, the fourth section was on whether the school-based mentors were effectively discharging their mentoring roles or not and the fifth section was on factors affecting the implementation of mentoring in pre-service teacher education. These parts completely address all the research questions of the study.

In all these sections, the information gathered through mentors' questionnaire, student teachers' questionnaire and all the interviews were integrated fully to give a clear and complete picture of the study.

Review of Related Literature

Definition of Practicum

"Practicum is a studying course aimed at comprehending, analyzing, reflecting and evaluating events and entities in schools." (TESO, 2003:10). Schön (1987) in Wallace (1991) defines practicum as a practice 'workshop similar to the teaching practice' situation.

Practicum is a school experience, which has a period of school observation, peer teaching in training institutions, microteaching using school students, continuous reflection on school practice including block week's observation throughout the courses, and an extended period of actual school teaching.

In the traditional teaching practice, schools have no formal relationship with teacher education institutes and they have been given no chance to participate in the training

process, "They have simply been places to which student teachers have been sent for teaching practice" (Hagger, Burn and McIntyre, 1995:7).

Practicum, on the other hand, is a school-based teacher education system, which gives a chance for schools to participate in the training process. "...Universities and colleges recognized the need for schools and teachers to play a fuller and clearer part in initial teacher education, and in some cases they developed stronger partnership with schools for this purpose" (Ibid: 7).

Practicum has emerged as a studying course that gives student teachers a chance to integrate the theoretical and practical aspects of their training.

Thornton and Randall, (2001:26) also mention, "Teaching is a profession and one of the most important aspects of professional training is that knowledge needs to be integrated with practice". They further stress, "This balance between theory and practice is critical in any professional training program, and ELT is no different".

So, producing professionally able teachers in general, and teachers of English in particular involves, "equipping the trainees with the necessary knowledge in their area of specialization and the development of the practical skills that enable them to transfer their knowledge successfully. Practical skills of teaching are much more demanding than the acquisition of theoretical knowledge. James, (1982:33) states, "... of course, you can impart knowledge to thousands at a time, but the development of professional skills requires a lot of one-to-one supervisor-to-trainee relationship".

Definition of Mentoring

Different scholars define "mentoring" using different words of almost the same meaning. Randall and Thornton (2001:14) for instance, say, "The term 'mentor' in itself is highly attractive one for native English language speaker teacher educators...the connotation with the language are those of warmth, experience and sympathetic guidance".

Jeffrey and Ferguson (1992) say, "Mentoring is a process by which an older and more experienced person takes a younger person under his/her wing freely offering advice and encouragement."

According to Smith and West, (1993) and Early and Kinder, (1994), mentoring is supporting, facilitating, coaching, counseling guiding and advising a younger or a new colleague.

Mentoring in initial teacher education

As already been mentioned in the previous sections, student teachers need to integrate their theoretical knowledge into practice. To do so, they need an experienced colleague (school-based mentor) in addition to their college or university instructors. This experienced colleague paves the way to the student teacher's professional development.

The overall objective of mentoring in initial teacher education is to provide newcomers (student teachers) with a local guide but the particulars in regard to character and content of these programs widely vary. Richard Ingersoll and Jeffrey M.Kralik, (2004) say that mentoring programs vary from a single meeting between mentor and mentee at the beginning of a school year, to a highly structured program involving frequent meetings.

Mentoring is a process of creating a conducive environment for the professional development of the novices. In line with this, John Kulman (1998:474) states, "It is assumed that as long as mentors create the appropriate conditions, student teachers will be ready and willing to participate in a voyage of exploration..."

Since school experience is taken as an essential training component in initial teacher education, school-based mentors are facilitators whose task is to provide a good climate for the student teachers' practical knowledge.

Learning through practice is much more effective if it is supported by a competent and well-experienced practitioner (i.e. a mentor). Lawlor, (1990:8) suggests that the skills of teaching are essentially practical ones.

They can be acquired only through experience, trial and error, and careful individual supervision and "the mentor would attend the trainee's classes and guide their preparation and organization of lessons" (Ibid: 38).

Furthermore, in initial teacher education, the mentor and the student teacher are expected to perform collaborative teaching.

In collaborative teaching, a mentor and a student-teacher take joint responsibility for a lesson, plan it together, and each play different parts in the teaching with the parts played by the student-teacher being selected to provide focused learning experiences, very nearly ideal conditions can be achieved for the practicing of particular teaching skills or strategies, (Burn, 1997).

The Mentor's Roles

Sampson, J. and Yomans, (2002) mention the role of mentors as three dimensional: structural, supportive and professional dimensions. According to these scholars, school mentors in their structural role dimension are enablers, establishing and modifying social and organizational structures. They are considered as planners, organizers, negotiators and inductors.

The supportive role dimension of mentoring is closely linked to the nature of the relationship created between mentor and mentee, 'a mutually open and trusting relationship is both the means to, and outcome of effective support.' So, the supportive dimension of mentoring minimizes stress for student-teachers. In this role, mentors are considered as hosts, friends and counselors.

In their professional dimension mentors are trainees, educators, and assessors.

Fullerton and Malderez (1998 in Malderez and Bodóczyk, 1999) summarizes mentor roles in the following table:

Role	Function
1. Model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to inspire - to demonstrate
2. Acculturator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to show mentee the ropes - to help mentee get used to the particular professional culture
3. Sponsor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to open doors - to introduce mentee to the 'right people' - to use their power (ability to make things happen) in the service of the mentee
4. Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to be there - to provide safe opportunities for mentees to let off steam/release emotions - to act as a sounding board for cathartic reasons
5. Educators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to act as a sound board for articulation of ideas - to consciously create appropriate opportunities for the mentee - to achieve professional learning objectives

Factors Affecting the Implementation of Mentoring in Initial Teacher Education

There are various factors that contribute to the success/failure of mentoring activities. These include: mentor–mentee relationship, expected knowledge and skills of mentors, accountability, the cooperation between training institutes and the partner schools etc.

Let's see some of these factors more closely:

Mentor-Mentee Relationship

Mentoring is the establishment of a personal relationship between mentors and mentees for the purpose of professional instruction and guidance.

Bova and Philips (1981) compiled a list of characteristics inherent in many mentor-mentee relationships.

- 1) Mentor-protégé relationships grow out of voluntary interaction.
- 2) The mentor protégé relationship has a life cycle: introduction; mutual trust building; teaching of risk taking, communication, and professional skills; transfer of professional standards, and dissolution.
- 3) People become mentors to pass down information to the next generation.
- 4) Mentors encourage protégés in setting and attaining short – and long –term goals.
- 5) Mentors guide technically and professionally. Mentors teach protégés skills necessary to survive daily experiences and promote career-scope professional development.
- 6) Mentors protect protégés from major mistakes by limiting their exposure to responsibility.
- 7) Mentors provide opportunities for protégés to observe and participate in their work.
- 8) Mentors are role models
- 9) Mentors sponsor protégés organizationally and professionally.
- 10) Mentor-protégé relationships end amiably or bitterly.

From these relationships both the mentor and the mentee benefit a lot. The mentor's benefit is the satisfaction of being able to transfer skills and knowledge accumulated through extensive professional experience. Further more, mentoring practices provide opportunities for mentor teachers to reexamine their own classroom practices.

The mentee benefits in three major ways: fast assimilation into the school environment, establishment of professional competence, and introduction to teaching as continually developing, lifelong career, (Evenson, 1982).

Clauson (1980 in Anderson and Shannon 1988:43) puts, "There should be a relationship that must entail mutual personal involvement in which the protégé feels admiration, respect, appreciation, gratitude and even love for the mentor". He added that the relationship cannot be one sided; it must be comprehensive, involving the mentor in the protégé's total life, not just work.

A meaningful relationship between the teacher mentor and the student teacher establishes an effective mentoring experience since the relationship mediates the experiential exchange (Covey, 1997; Hawkey, 1997).

Compatibility between the two is based on the interpersonal interactions that occur during the mentoring process (Cline and Nechochea, 1997). If the communication between mentor and mentee shows understanding, caring and trust then it is credible. Hawkey, (1997), Nelson and Quick, (1997) suggest that the mentor and protégé's understanding of each other's roles and expectations is essential in establishing a basis for compatibility.

Mentor Selection and Training

In previous sections, it is made clear that mentors are school teachers who are identified as having a specific responsibility for one or more student teachers. It is also clear that these mentors have the responsibility of supervising the teaching practice, observing lessons and giving constructive feedback, tutoring student teachers, guiding, advising, assessing the teaching competence of students teachers, etc. (Atkinson, T. 1996).

To carry out all these responsibilities, the school mentor should be some one who can shoulder all these responsibilities effectively. So, care should be taken in mentor selection, and the selected mentor should get appropriate mentor training which may help her/him acquire the necessary mentoring skills.

The mentor selection body (committee, etc) should address roles and expectations with prospective mentors.

The committee could provide prospective mentors with specific information about the mentoring position. This would include a job description outlining job responsibilities, expected working arrangements, type of organizational support / resources, and an accountability system, etc.

Moreover, the committee should also provide opportunities for the student teacher and prospective mentor to talk with one another about their background experiences and expectations of the mentoring process. These conversations may pave a way for forthcoming meaningful relationship (Cline and Necochea, 1997).

Mentor's Accountability

The school and/or TEI should establish an accountability system with procedures to ensure regular meetings and observations between mentors and student teachers. During these sessions, assessment of classroom teaching, constructive feedback and sharing and modeling of sound pedagogical techniques would occur. This accountability process could take the form of ongoing, standardized, written reports by both the mentor and the student teacher, submitted to a designated person (or a college tutor). The materials could be placed in a professional portfolio to display the student teacher's development and growth. Furthermore, there need to be face-to-face meetings between mentors, student teaches and the College /University tutors. Reliance on a system of self-monitoring by mentors could result in laxness or even negligence of responsibility (Lawrence T. Kajs, et al 1998).

Cooperation between TEI'S and Partner Schools

Both partner schools and mentors should clearly know what is expected of them from the TEIs. They should also know their roles and the extent of their responsibility to accomplish their roles. Hicking and Glenney (1992:146 in Solomon, 2001) suggest that placing the practicum at the centre of the course design requires effective communication with schools so that the range of school setting and activities can be provided.

Findings

Most of the school-based mentors under the study are not well experienced in the teaching profession in general and in language teaching in particular; Furthermore, they didn't get training, workshop, seminar, etc. on mentoring skill. In addition, they have no access to reading materials on mentoring.

Although the majority of the school-based mentor respondents consider serving as a mentor of a student teacher is part of their professional responsibility, they seek payment for the mentoring task they render. These two contrasting ideas indicate most of the respondent school mentors perceive mentoring as an extra responsibility.

Even though the majority of the respondent school mentors clearly know their relationship with the student teachers, quite a good number of them are in a confusion about their possible relationship with student teachers.

All school-based mentors under the study have volunteered to accept student teachers to work with.

Although the school mentors said they provided all the necessary supports to the student teachers, the student teachers felt that they did not get as much help as they expected to get from their mentors.

Regarding the kinds of help they gained from their mentors, the majority of the respondent student teachers of both colleges mentioned the following:

- The mentor was available and warmly accepted them whenever they wanted her/him for discussions or consultations;
- The mentors introduced them to other teachers and administrative workers.

Only St. Mary's university college respondent student teachers said they gained the following help from their mentors:

- They were invited to their mentor's classes to see their mentor's teaching and learn from it outside the observation week;
- Their mentors told them in detail the rules and regulations and the administration structure of the school,

The reason for this disparity is that the student teachers of Kotebe College of Teacher Education got school-based mentors' help towards the end of their training while St. Mary's University College student teachers start working with school-based mentors at the very beginning of their training.

On the other hand, the majority of the student teachers of the two colleges mentioned that they did not get the following kinds of help from their mentors:

- Their mentors did not encourage them to freely express their views about teaching;
- They (the student teachers) were not told the right way to teach by their mentors during feedback session;
- They were not helped to know the curriculum in general and the language syllabus in particular;
- Their mentors did not work with them in planning and team teaching the lesson.

Only student teachers of Kotebe College of Teacher Education said they did not get the following kinds of help from their mentors:

- They were not invited to their mentor's classes outside the observation week;
- Their mentors did not tell them in detail the rules and regulations and the administrative structure of the schools, etc.

The study also reveals the following issues as the factors that affect the implementation of school-based mentoring during practicum. These issues include:

- Considering mentoring as an extra responsibility;

- The school based mentors lack of enough time to work with student teachers;
- Inappropriacy of the practicum programs;
- The number of student teachers working with a mentor;
- The colleges' failure to clearly tell the objective (s) of the practicum;
- Failure of the college representatives to regularly visit their partner schools and discuss the problems of the student teachers and seek solution;
- Lack of assistance from school administrators;
- Lack of student teachers readiness to discuss problems and exchange ideas with their mentors;
- Absence (or being late) of student teachers from classes or schools; and
- The student teachers failure to behave in a professional manner when they interact with students; etc.

In addition, the college/the partner schools did not establish an accountability system with procedures. Most of the school-based mentors rely on a system of self-monitoring. Some student teachers have no confidence in the language teaching competence of their mentors. As a result, they are reluctant to learn from them.

The relationship between the colleges and their partner schools is loose, as a result, the colleges' and the partner schools' communication on the issue of practicum in general and mentoring in particular are infrequent.

Most school principals consider practicum as an intervening program to their regular activities.

Both the colleges and /or the partner schools have no criteria for the selection of school-based mentors. In most cases, all teachers are mentors.

Recommendations

- 1) Since the very essence of school-based mentoring in pre-service teacher education is sharing professional expertise and experience to student teachers, teachers who serve as mentors should have the necessary expertise and experiences. So partner schools and /or colleges should establish criteria for the selection of school mentors. It is advisable to use more experienced and more efficient teachers.
- 2) School-based mentors should be given a refresher or an awareness raising course in the form of seminars, workshops, discussion forums, etc. which would make them see problems and seek solutions for school-based mentoring. Doing this may acquaint school-based mentors with up to date skills of mentoring.
- 3) School-based mentors should be motivated to carry out their mentoring duties effectively (by giving incentives like scholarship to some competent mentors or their families, giving certificate of service, etc.)
- 4) Colleges should organize and give frequent training, workshops, and seminars to the school-based mentors on mentoring skills. They should also provide mentors with reading materials on mentoring .
- 5) Teacher education colleges and partner schools should establish strong links. They should arrange frequent visits and discussions on their joint responsibilities. The colleges are expected to give some material and intellectual support to their partner schools to strengthen their relationship, which in turn facilitates the student teachers school-based training.
- 6) The colleges and/or the partner schools should establish an accountability system with procedures to ensure regular meetings and observations between mentors and student teachers.
- 7) School-based mentoring should be started at the very beginning of the student teachers' training as school-based teacher education primarily requires it. Furthermore, this will give enough time to the student teachers to get much help and professional experience.
- 8) Further research should be conducted on how to make pre-service teacher education more school –based.

REFERENCE

- Anderson, E.M. and Shannon, S.L. (1988). "Towards conceptualization of mentoring", *Journal of Teacher Education* 39, 1, 43-45.
- Atkinson, T. (1996). "Teacher mentors and student teachers, what is transmitted?" In Claxton, G.,T. Atkinson, M.Osborn and M.Wallace (eds.)Liberating the Learner: Lessons for Professional Development in Education. London: Rout ledge.
- Bova, B.M., and R.E. Philips (1981). The Mentor Relationship: A Study of Mentors and Protégés in Business and Academia. Loredo: Texas.
- Burn, K. (1997). "Collaborative teaching", in Wilkin, M. (ed.)Mentoring in Schools. London: Kogan page.
- Cline, Z. and Nechochea, J. (1997). "Mentoring for school reform". *Journal for a Just and Caring Education* 3(2), 14-159.
- Covey, S.R. (1997). Modeling and Mentoring. Executive Excellence. Laredo: Texas
- Early, P. and Kinder, K. (1994). Initiation Rights: Effective Induction Practice for New Teachers. Windsor: NFR- Nelson.
- Evenson, J.S. (1982). Work place mentoring. Far west laboratory for Educational Research and Development. New York: west.
- Fullerton, H. and Maldarez, A. (eds.) (1998). "Facets of Mentoring in Higher Education 2". staff and development association Lorado: Texas
- Hawkey, K. (1997). "Roles, Responsibilities, and Relationships in Mentoring: A Literature Review and Agenda for Research, *Journal of Teacher Education*," 48(5), 325-335.
- Ingersoll, R. and Kralik, J.M. (2004). "The Impact of Mentoring on Teacher Retention: What the Research Says". In Teaching Quality. Education Commission of the States: Denver.
- James, E. (1982). "Letter from paradise." In *Journal of Teacher Education* 33/1-6. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

- Jeffrey, H. and Ferguson, S. (1992). The Mentoring Guide Book, The Mentor Programmed. North London College.
- Kajs, L.T., Willman, E and Alaniz, R. (1998). "Technology Education in a Mentor-teacher Professional Program: A Case Study." In Association for the Advancement of Completing in Education (AACE) proceedings. Charlottes ville: VA.
- Kullman, J. (1998). "Mentoring and the Development of Reflective Practice: Concepts and Context." In An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics vol 26 No. 4. pergamon.
- Lawlor, S. (1990) . Teachers Mistaught, London: Centre for Policy Studies.
- McIntyre, D. and Hagger, H. (1994) In McIntyre, D., Hagger, H. and Wilkin, M. (eds.) Mentoring: Perspective on School-based Teacher Education. London: kogan page.
- Mcintyre, D., Hazel H. and Kathanne, B. (1995). The School Mentor Handbook: Essential Skills and Strategies for Working with Student Teachers. London: kogah page.
- MOE (2003). "A National Curriculum Guideline for Pre-service Teacher Education Programs." Addis Ababa.
- Nelson, D.L. and Quick, J.C. (1997). Organizational Behavior (2nd ed.). New York: West.
- Sampson, J. and Yemans, R. (2002): "Analyzing the Role of Mentors." In A. Pollard (ed.) Readings for Reflective Teaching. London: Continuum.
- Schon, D.A. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions. Sanfrancisco: Jossey Bass.
- Smith, P. and west Bernhum, J. (1993). Mentoring in the Effective School. Harlow: London.
- Solomon Geda (2001). "Some Insights into the Mentoring Role of High School English Teachers. Five Secondary Schools in Focus". M.A. Thesis. Addis Ababa University.
- TESO, (2003). "A Guideline for Practicum". Addis Ababa.

Tharp, R. and Gallimore, R. (1988). Rousing Minds to Life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, M. (1991). Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Appendix-Tables

Part I : Analysis of Mentors' Responses about their Background Experience Background Information of the School-based Mentors

Table 4.1. Qualification of the Mentors by Institution

	QUALIFICATION	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE %
Respondents from KCTE's partner school mentors	Certificate	1	6.66
	Diploma	14	93.33
	Above diploma	-	-
Respondents form SMUC's partner school mentors	Certificate	-	-
	Diploma	15	100%
	Above diploma	-	-

Table 4.2. Teaching Experience and Experience as Mentors by Institution

	RESPONSE	TEACHING EXPERIENCE		EXPERIENCE AS MENTORS	
		No. of respondents	%	No. of respondents	%
KCTE's partner school mentors	Less than One year	-	-	-	-
	1-5	10	66.66	15	100
	6-10	2	13.33	-	-
	11 and above	3	20	-	-
SMUC's partner school mentors	Less than one year	1	6.66	1	66.66
	1-5	11	73.33	14	93.33
	6-10	2	13.33	-	-
	11 and above	1	6.66	-	-

Table 4.3. The Mentor’s Workshop, Seminar, etc. Participation by Institution

ITEM		RESPONSE	NO. OF RESPONDS	PERCENT AGE
Have you ever participated in a workshop, seminar or any sort of training about mentoring?	KCTE’s partner school mentors	Yes	2	13.33
		No	13	86.66
	SMUC’s partner school mentors	Yes	4	25.66
		No	11	73.33

Table 4.4. The Mentor’s Access to the Reading Material about Mentoring by Institution

ITEM		RESPONSE	NO. OF RESPONDS	PERCENTAGE
Do you have access to reading materials about mentoring either in your school or out of your school	KCTE’s partner school mentors	a) Yes to great extent	-	-
		b) yes to some extent	3	13.55
		c) I don’t have any access at all	12	80
	SMUC’s partner school mentors	a) yes to great extent	-	-
		b) yes to some extent	2	13.33
		c) I don’t have any access at all	13	86.66

Part II. Analysis Of Mentor's Responses About Awareness Of Their Mentoring Role.

Table 4.5. The School-Based Mentor's Awareness Of Their Mentoring Role:

Item	Number of respondents and percentage					
		Strongly agree	Agree	Have no idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. The mentor is more appropriate in helping the student teachers during practicum practice than the college tutor.	KCTE's partner school mentors	6 (40%)	5(33.33%)	-	3 (20%)	1 (6.66%)
	SMUC's partner school mentors	7(46.66%)	5(33.33%)	-	2 (13.33%)	1 (6.66%)
2. Training the student teachers is basically the responsibility of the college instructors. Therefore, the mentor should play little role in the training of the student-teachers.	KCTE's partner school mentors	4(26.66%)	3(20%)	-	6 (40%)	2 (13.33%)
	SMUC's partner school mentors	-	8(53.33%)	-	5(33.33%)	2(13.33%)
3. Because the college instructors have more knowledge about teaching/learning, they are more appropriate to help the student-teachers during practicum than the mentors.	KCTE's partner school mentors	5(33.33%)	1(6.66%)	-	3(20%)	6(40%)
	SMUC's partner school mentors	1(6.66%)	1(6.66%)	-	13(86.66%)	-
4. Because the mentor is engaged in extra work when working with the student-teachers, she/he should be paid for it.	KCTE's partner school mentors	6(40%)	3(20%)	-	1(6.66%)	5(33.33%)
	SMUC's partner school mentors	1(6.66%)	4(26.66%)	1(6.66%)	1(6.66%)	8(53.33%)
5. Serving as a mentor of the student teachers during practicum is part of the professional duties of the school teachers (mentors)	KCTE's partner school mentor	6(40%)	4(26.66%)	-	1(6.66%)	4(26.66%)
	SMUC's partner school mentors	6(40%)	7(46.66%)	-	1(6.66%)	1(6.66%)
6. The mentor should repeatedly observe the student teacher's teaching and give feedback.	KCTE's partner school mentors	7(46.66%)	4(26.66%)	-	-	4(26.66%)
	SMUC's partner school mentor	7(46.66%)	4(26.66%)	1(6.66%)	1(6.66%)	2(13.33%)
7. The mentor should look upon student teachers as his peer.	KCTE's partner school mentors	6(40%)	5(33.33%)	3(20%)	-	1(6.66%)
	SMUC's partner school mentors	3(20%)	6(40%)	-	1(6.66%)	5(33.33%)
8. The mentor should create a strong and close relation with the student-teacher, she/he has worked with and the relation should be long lasting even after the practice is over.	KCTE's partner school mentors	4(26.66%)	-	6(40%)	5(33.33%)	-
	SMUC's partner school mentors	-	7(46.66%)	2(13.33%)	5(33.33%)	1(6.66%)
9. Because the student-teachers have current knowledge about the methods and techniques of	KCTE's partner school mentors	3(20%)	8(53.33%)	-	3(20%)	1(6.66%)
	SMUC's partner	6(40%)	2(13.33%)	2(13.33%)	4(26.66%)	1(6.66%)

language teaching, the mentor could learn a lot from them.	school mentors					
--	----------------	--	--	--	--	--

Part III.

Table 4.6: Responses regarding the school based mentors’ readiness to work as mentors by institution to the question ‘Do you voluntarily accept student teachers?’

	RESPONSES AND NO. OF RESPONDENTS		
	Responses	No. of respondents	%
KCTE’s partner school mentors	Yes	15	100%
	No	-	-
SMUC’s partner school mentors	Yes	15	100%
	No	-	-

Part IV

Analysis of Response about the Extent to which the Mentors Carryout their Mentoring Role

Table 4.7. The school based mentors response to the questions related to the extent to which they are carrying out their mentoring role:

QUESTION		RESPONSES & NO OF RESPONDENTS WITH PERCENTAGE			
		Once in 2 weeks	Once a week	Twice a week	More than twice a week
1. How often do you observe a student teacher’s teaching?	KCTE’s partner school mentors	-	8(53.33%)	-	7(46.66%)
	SMUC’s partner school mentors	2(13.33%)	7(46.66%)	1(6.66%)	5(33.33%)
2. How often do you discuss with the student teacher issues related to their teaching or issues related to the teaching profession?	KCTE’s partner school mentors	1(6.66%)	1(6.66%)	1(6.66%)	12(80%)
	SMUC’s partner school mentors	1(6.66%)	2(13.33%)	6(40%)	6(40%)

Table 4.8: Responses of school-based mentors by institution regarding to the question whether the school-based mentors let the student teachers observe their classes and help them (the student teachers) to plan their lessons.

ITEM	RESPONSES & NO. OF RESPONDENTS WITH PERCENTAGE		
		Yes	No
1. Do you let the student teachers observe your classes while you are teaching?	KCTE's partner school mentors	12(80%)	3(20%)
	SMUC's partner school mentors	14(93.33%)	1(6.66%)
2. Do you help the student teachers to plan their lessons very well?	KCTE's partner school mentors	12(80%)	3(20%)
	SMUC's partner school mentors	14 93.33	1 6.66%

Table 4.9: Responses of the student teachers' feeling about the help they get from their mentors by institution

ITEM		RESPONSES & NO. OF RESPONDENTS WITH PERCENTAGE				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Have no idea	Diagree	Strongly disagree
1. The mentor was of more practical help for me than my college tutor during the practicum	KCTE's student teachers	2(13.33%)	1(6.66%)	4(26.66%)	6(40%)	2(13.33%)
	SMUC's student teachers	1(6.66%)	2(13.33%)	2(13.33%)	6(40%)	4(26.66%)
2. I did not gain as much help and practical experience as I had thought to gain from the mentor	KCTE's student teachers	3(20%)	5(33.33%)	4(26.66%)	1(6.66%)	2(13.33%)
	SMUC's student teachers	2(13.33)	7(46.66%)	3(20%)	1(6.66%)	2(13.33%)

Table 4.10. The responses of the student teachers to the questions related to the kinds of help they gained from their mentors by institution.

ITEM	RESPONSES & NO. OF RESPONDENTS WITH PERCENTAGE		
		Yes	No
1. The mentor wanted me to teach just like she/ he did and criticized me when I deviated.	KCTE's student teachers	8(53.33%)	7(46.66%)
	SMUC's student teachers	6(40%)	9(60%)
2. The mentor introduced me to other teachers and administrative workers. This helped me to feel at home in the school compound.	KCTE's student teachers	11(73.33%)	4(26.66%)
	SMUC's student teachers	9(60%)	6(40%)
3. Whenever I wanted the mentor for discussion or any sort of consultation, she/he was available and she/he warmly accepted me.	KCTE's student teachers	11(73.33%)	4(26.66%)
	SMUC's student teachers	9(60%)	6(40%)
4. She / he encouraged me to freely express my views about teaching: she/he did not try to tell me the right way to teach during feedback session.	KCTE's student teachers	3(20%)	12(80%)
	SMUC's student teachers	3(20%)	12(80%)
5. She/he invited me to his/her class while she/he was teaching to enable me to observe her/his lesson presentation and learn from it outside the observation week	KCTE's student teachers	3(20%)	12(80%)
	SMUC's student teachers	13(86.6%)	2(13.33%)
6. The mentor helped me to know the curriculum in general and the language syllabus in particular.	KCTE's student teachers	6(40%)	9(60%)
	SMUC's student teachers	5(33.33%)	10(66.66%)
7. she/he sometimes worked with me in planning and team teaching the lesson.	KCTE'S STUDENT TEACHERS	6(40%)	9(60%)
	SMUC's student teachers	5(33.33%)	10(66.66%)
8. she/he told me in detail the rules and regulations and the administrative structure of the school how to deal with disruptive students, etc.	KCTE'S STUDENT TEACHERS	2(13.33%)	13(86.66%)
	SMUC's student teachers	11(73.33%)	4(26.66%)
9. I want to take the mentor as a model in my professional and general personal life.	KCTE's student teachers	2(13.33%)	13(86.6%)
	SMUC's student teachers	5(33.33%)	10(66.66%)

Part V

Analysis of Responses on Factors Affecting the Implementation of Mentoring in Pre-Service Teachers Education

The data related to this idea have been collated from all of the subjects of the study. They are integrated so that it would be possible to identify the factors that are commonly shared by the subjects.

Table 4.11. Responses of the school-based mentors in number and percent by institution to the questions related to factors that affect their mentoring role:

Table 4.11. Responses of the school-based mentors in number and percent by institution to the questions related to factors that affect their mentoring role: ITEM	RESPONSES & NO. OF RESPONDENTS WITH PERCENTAGE				
	partner school mentors	Not a problem	Some problem	Serious problem	Very serious problem
1. Getting no payment for the extra responsibility I assume during the practicum in working with the student teachers.	KCTE's	3(20%)	3(20%)	-	9(60%)
	SMUC's	2(12.33%)	7(46.66%)	3(20%)	3(20%)
2. Lack of enough time to sit down and work with the student teacher.	KCTE's	2(20%)	2(13.33%)	9(60%)	2(13.33%)
	SMUC's	2(12.33%)	6(40%)	6(40%)	1(6.66%)
3. Inappropriacy of time of the practicum program.	KCTE's	2(12.33%)	8(53.33%)	2(13.33%)	3(20%)
	SMUC's	1(6.66%)	4(26.66%)	2(13.33%)	8(53.33%)
4. Number of student teachers given to me to work with.	KCTE's	4(26.66%)	5(33.33%)	4(26.66%)	2(13.33%)
	SMUC's	4(26.66%)	6(40%)	2(13.33%)	3(20%)
5. Lack of adequate knowledge about the current language teaching theories	KCTE's	9(60%)	2(13.33%)	2(13.33%)	2(13.33%)
	SMUC's	7(46.66%)	3(20%)	2(13.33)	3(20%)
6. The college's failure to clearly tell me the objectives of the practicum	KCTE's	1(6.66%)	4(26.66%)	5(33.33)	5(33.33%)
	SMUC's	1(6.66%)	5(33.33%)	6(40%)	3(20%)

8.Failure of the representative of the college to usually come to my school to discuss the problem of the student teachers and solve them for further improvement	KCTE's	-	3(20%)	6(40%)	6(40%)
	SMUC's	3(20%)	2(13.33%)	5(33.33%)	5(33.33%)
8. Lack of assistance from the schools administrators while I was working with the student teachers	KCTE's	6(40%)	9(60%)	-	-
	SMUC's	4(26.66%)	6(40%)	5(33.33%)	-
9. Lack of the student teachers readiness to discuss problems and exchange ideas with me and to receive advice from me	KCTE's	2(13.33%)	11(73.33%)	2(13.33%)	-
	SMUC's	2(13.33%)	5(33.33%)	3(20%)	5(33.33%)
10. Absence (or being late) of the student teachers from classes or schools	KCTE's	2(13.33%)	6(40%)	7(46.66%)	-
	SMUC's	3(20%)	2(13.33%)	6(40%)	4(26.66%)
11. The student teachers low language command that has negatively affected their teaching	KCTE's	2(13.33%)	2(13.33%)	4(26.66%)	7(46.66%)
	SMUC's	-	6(40%)	3(20%)	6(40%)
12. Student teachers failure to behave in a professional manner when they interact with students.	KCTE's	2(13.33%)	6(40%)	2(33.33%)	5(33.33%)
	SMUC's	6(40%)	5(33.33%)	2(13.33%)	2(13.33%)
13.The student teachers' reluctance to create relation with other teachers in the school	KCTE's	4(26.66%)	8(53.33%)	3(20%)	-
	SMUC's	6(40%)	7(46.66%)	2(13.33%)	-
14.The student teachers' unpreparedness before they come to classes	KCTE's	3(20%)	9(60%)	3(20%)	-
	SMUC's	5(33.33%)	6(40%)	1(6.66%)	3(20%)
15. The student teachers failure to give clear and precise directions to students in the classroom	KCTE's	-	6(40%)	6(40%)	3(20%)
	SMUC's	5(33.33%)	5(33.33%)	2(13.33%)	3(20%)
16. The student teachers overuse of mother tongue while teaching English	KCTE's	-	3(20%)	9(60%)	3(20%)
	SMUC's	1(66.66%)	1(6.66%)	7(46.66%)	6(40%)
17. The student teachers inability to manage classes very well	KCTE's	-	6(40%)	9(60%)	-
	SMUC's	-	7(46.66%)	8(53.33%)	-