



Research on Mentoring Language Teachers: Its Role in Language Education

Yuly Asención Delaney
Northern Arizona University

Abstract: *Mentoring has been considered a key component in teacher education and professional development. This literature review considers publications on language mentoring from the last 10 years that have described programs and mentoring practices in pre-service (i.e., student teaching) and in-service contexts (i.e., graduate teaching assistants and beginning language teachers) in the United States and abroad. The main goal of this review is to document the effects that some variables have on the mentor-mentee relationship, to describe the impact of mentoring on language teachers' professional development, and to identify areas of further research that can help improve mentoring practices in language teaching.*

Key words: *mentoring, reflective practitioner, second language teacher education, teachers' professional development, teacher training*

Introduction

A recent article in *Time* magazine argued that many of our deepest educational problems are rooted in finding good teachers and keeping them in the public system (Cloud, 2010). Further, the belief that once teacher training is completed new teachers are fully qualified to face every professional challenge has proved to be detrimental to schools and students. Several studies have reported that up to half of new teachers leave the profession in the first five years (Jonson, 2002; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Researchers have cited multiple reasons for this exodus, including a lack of supportive mentoring in schools. Clearly, new teachers should not be left to face the many challenges of their professional lives alone.

Among subject areas, language teaching is no exception to this reality, and that is why ACTFL has undertaken an initiative to promote research in areas considered priorities for improving foreign language (FL) education. One such area is the role of mentoring practices in FL teacher development. This literature review considers publications on language mentoring from the last 10 years that have described programs and mentoring practices in pre-service (i.e., student teachers) and in-service contexts (i.e., graduate teaching assistants and beginning language teachers) in the United States and abroad. Most of the research reviewed has been carried out abroad, but it has clear implications for the mentoring efforts occurring in the

Yuly Asención Delaney (PhD, Northern Arizona University) is Associate Professor of Spanish at Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

United States because it addresses variables impacting the effect of mentoring in different language teaching contexts. Specifically, this review addresses the benefits of mentoring in language teachers' professional growth, discusses the variables affecting the effectiveness of mentoring relationships, and identifies areas in mentoring that need further research in the United States to understand better how mentoring language teachers could improve FL education.

The Mentoring Process

Why Mentor Language Teachers?

Mentoring has been considered essential to teacher retention. Various studies have stressed the importance of reducing first-year attrition by providing beginning teachers with mentoring from teachers of the same subject, scheduling common planning time with others, and building a collaborative network with teachers in other schools (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). In addition, FL teachers in the United States have expressed the need for professional development programs involving experienced mentor teachers with whom they can plan lessons and discuss classroom observations (see Cooper et al., 2004).

Studies have found that mentoring relationships can have a positive impact on mentees' early teaching experiences. For example, in their study of student teachers in England, Malderez, Hobson, Tracey, and Kerr (2007) collected data via questionnaires and face-to-face interviews showing that most student teachers praised their mentors for boosting their confidence, providing support for classroom management, and offering guidance on time and workload management. They also considered it important to have mentors observe their lessons and provide feedback. In a study of pedagogy journals written by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) student teachers in Israel, Rajuan, Beijgaard, and Verloop (2008) also reported that student teachers learned from their mentors about the personal characteristics necessary for building

positive student-teacher relationships while deepening their knowledge of English grammar and developing their subject matter teaching skills. Similarly, based on observations and interviews, Vélez-Rendón (2006) described how one student teacher reported that her mentor helped fine-tune her lesson plans with essential background information and teaching materials. This support helped her make a successful transition into teaching. In their synthesis of research on mentoring, Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, and Tomlinson (2009) also added that mentoring leads to the improvement of self-reflection and problem-solving skills.

Furthermore, mentoring is considered a good way to introduce positive change into educational programs (Wang & Odell, 2002; Wedell, 2003). Following the standards revolution in education, ACTFL and other language organizations developed the national *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project [henceforth the National Standards], 1996), which led to important curricular changes in many schools. Consequently, it is important not only to inform new teachers about the standards in teacher training programs, but also to help them implement them within the unique contexts of their schools. Mentors can facilitate the implementation of standards by acculturating the new teacher into school policies and identifying contextual factors that foster or hinder standards implementation. Indeed, Zimmer-Loew (2008) claimed that, to meet the needs of FL speakers in the 21st century, educational funding should more strongly support mentoring to facilitate new teacher training that has the potential to result in mutually beneficial professional development opportunities.

Indeed, mentoring is believed to contribute to both the professional development of experienced teachers and the formation of professional networks among teachers (Hobson et al., 2009). Mentors grow by talking about teaching with their mentees, participating in mentor training, self-reflecting through action research and

class observation, and learning new instructional techniques. Mentoring relationships also lead to increased collaboration and collegiality among teachers by fostering a culture of professional support. Although the benefits of mentoring are many, Hobson et al. (2009) noted that they have mostly been identified through the participants' perceptions and that there has been limited direct evidence linking mentoring to objective measures of development in teaching skills. Therefore, empirical documentation and evidence of this growth is needed to understand the needs, challenges, and measurable impact of mentoring.

What Does It Mean to Be a Mentor?

The definition and roles of mentors have evolved from the 1980s, when language education was viewed as acquiring knowledge from an expert. The traditional behaviorist approach to second language (L2) teacher education emphasized the transmission of teaching skills from the mentor-expert to the novice. Currently, however, mentorship is perceived as a personal and professional relationship in which both participants co-construct their professional identities within a specific context. This view springs from sociocultural views of learning in which scaffolding, or instructional support in the context of a social relationship between novice and expert, are necessary to build new professional knowledge by participating in the school's culture (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Malderez & Wedell, 2007; Richards, 2008; Smith, 2001; Wright, 2010). The constructivist view of the curriculum for L2 teaching education in the 21st century, according to Wright (2010), has as its main goal the formation of reflective teachers who engage in collaborative learning in real classrooms where they can evaluate their personal and professional development. Reflective practitioners, according to Schön (1983, 1987), generate new knowledge about their practice by engaging in the critical study of that practice, leading to innovation and intervention. From this per-

spective, mentors are essential to fostering reflective practices through their support and collaboration.

Contexts for Mentoring

Research on language teaching mentoring indicates that mentoring can occur in different professional contexts where support is provided to pre-service student teachers (e.g., Maynard, 2000; Tomaš, Farrelly, & Hasam, 2008) and to in-service novice teachers (e.g., Bowman, Boyle, Greenstone, Herndon, & Valente, 2002). In pre-service contexts, student teachers engage in relationships with different teaching professionals. First, student teachers are taught pedagogical theories and methods by teacher educators or trainers. Once placed in a school for student teaching, pre-service language teachers then receive feedback about their practice from the university supervisor, who evaluates their performance in the classroom. Mentoring in this context is also offered by cooperating teachers who have the responsibility of supporting the student teacher in understanding the complexities of theories and their practical application to teaching in actual language classrooms.

In in-service contexts, newly hired language teachers in schools or graduate language teaching assistants in college have varied experiences or knowledge about language learning and teaching. Research reports (e.g., Smithey & Evertson, 2003) have described how novice teachers become involved in different professional relations in the workplace. In this context, the beginning teachers interact with school supervisors, the principal, or the department head who assesses their practice, while mentors or fellow teachers provide emotional and professional support to help them reflect on and learn from their teaching.

What Is Mentoring, and What Is Not?

Regardless of the teaching context, pre-service or in-service, Malderez (2009) argued that mentors need to redefine their

roles and not consider themselves supervisors, teacher trainers, or evaluators of what they may consider sound classroom practices. Malderez pointed out that assuming an evaluative orientation to mentoring can interfere in the development of trust and open communication between mentor and mentee. According to Malderez and Bódoczky (1999), mentors need to go beyond simply being models of accomplished teaching, and they need to assume additional professional roles such as that of (1) acculturator of their mentees to the policies and practices of the school community, (2) supporters of emotional and cognitive processes in the development of their mentees' professional identity, and (3) sponsors of their mentees for full acceptance by the school community. Hicks, Glasgow, and McNary (2005) added that mentors must also support their mentees in developing (1) instruments for assessing learning, (2) strategies for helping at-risk and special needs students, (3) approaches to celebrating diversity, (4) techniques for using new technologies, and (5) approaches to building positive relationships with parents and the community.

Orland-Barak (2001) presented an interesting analogy between L2 learners and new L2 teachers and their mentors. He explained that both the L2 learner and the mentor or new teacher already have a "first language" that they use to compare, transfer, and understand a "new language." Specifically, in the case of novice teachers, their belief system about language teaching and learning is analogous to language learners' first language, and the reconceptualization and restructuring of this belief system is analogous to learning an additional language. It is the mentor's job, then, to acknowledge the new teacher's perspective and provide opportunities for mentees to reconceptualize their knowledge in light of their current classroom context. While doing this, mentors also reflect on and modify their conceptualization of teaching, thus learning a "new language" to communicate about teaching. This view

contradicts the definition of mentoring relationships in which the sharing of expertise is unequal and unidirectional. The current model emphasizes that strong mentor-mentee relationships are characterized by parity and bi-directionality, or what Sherris (2010) defined as "coaching."

The differences between mentoring and coaching have also been delineated and discussed in the literature. According to D'Abate, Eddy, and Tannenbaum (2003), mentoring has a general goal of promoting long-term professional development, whereas coaching is more strongly associated with a specific goal situated in a teaching context to improve performance in a task or skill in a short-term framework. Mentoring also involves behaviors such as introducing the beginning teacher to the faculty, modeling instruction, counseling about difficult professional situations, providing professional and emotional support, and advocating for the novice when necessary, whereas coaching is more concerned with goal setting, providing practice, and giving feedback for specific instructional situations.

Characteristics of Effective Mentoring

A clear understanding of mentors' roles in this new language teacher education paradigm is key to successful mentoring, and various scholars have described what are believed to be effective traits and practices. For example, Orland-Barak and Hasin (2010) investigated the perspectives on mentoring held by five exemplary mentors in different contexts of the Israeli school system, including novice teacher mentoring, regional mentoring, internal school mentoring, and subject-matter mentoring. These practitioners were considered exemplary because they had at least five years of experience, had engaged in mentoring activities at least twice a week, and had been rated exemplary by their school supervisors, project leaders, and subject matter inspectors. Interviews with the exemplary mentors, mentees, school principals, and project supervisors revealed the importance of (1)

organizational skills; (2) interpersonal relationships that mediated emotional, social, and professional aspects of learning; (3) the integration of theory and practice; (4) rich content and pedagogical knowledge; (5) providing the right combination of challenge and support; and (6) being transformative leaders. Orland-Barak and Hasin concluded that in general, good mentoring resembles good teaching. For example, both the mentor and the teacher acknowledge diversity in their interactions with either their mentees or their students. They promote reflection through engaging questions. The language teacher promotes reflection about L2 culture and linguistic features, while the mentor promotes reflection about what being a teacher means in a given instructional context. Finally, both the language teacher and the mentor provide models. The language teacher provides models for acquiring the L2, while the mentor provides models of good teaching practices and effective relationships with students, parents, and school colleagues.

Maynard (2000) also examined student teachers' perceptions of good mentoring practices. Research findings showed that student teachers most valued the following: (1) making expectations clear, (2) receiving advice before attempting to teach, (3) hearing constructive criticism instead of just emotional support, (4) recognizing that student teachers need to develop their own identities and teaching styles, and (5) making mentees feel welcomed, accepted, and recognized as individuals. A key element in productive mentoring was a trusting relationship that allows mentees to disclose their opinions and ideas without fear of being judged.

Chamberlin (2000) investigated the perception of trustworthiness among supervisors of TESL degree candidates in American universities using the Individualized Trust Scale created by Wheelless & Grotz (1977). Teacher candidates identified as trustworthy those supervisors with an affiliative style, rather than those displaying nonverbal behaviors of dominance. Based

on his findings, Chamberlin concluded that supervisors should use verbal discourse that includes questions and nonjudgmental comments complemented with nonverbal behaviors of affiliation, such as close proxemics, eye contact, smiling, and nodding. Likewise, according to Leaver and Oxford (2001), effective mentoring provides support to mentees in "a specially tailored style" that is nonconfrontational and adaptive to the mentee, thus avoiding serious conflict. Leaver and Oxford explained that adaptive mentoring responds to differences in (1) personality traits such as introversion and extroversion, (2) cognitive differences such as abstract vs. concrete thinking, (3) modality preferences for either visual or auditory learning, (4) the amount of time needed to think before acting, and (5) gender and other biological differences. Pachler and Field (2001) explained that mentors are expected to support the mentee's content knowledge development, including the linguistic and cultural proficiencies required for providing a good target language model for learners. They should also support the mentee's curricular knowledge development, his or her familiarity with possible barriers to learning, and his or her competence with issues such as the place of grammar and the first language (L1) in instruction, and alternative teaching methods.

Based on the previous research, one can also conclude that good mentoring requires specific personality traits (e.g., experience, trustworthiness), relevant professional knowledge (e.g., second language acquisition and teaching methods), and interpersonal skills (e.g., communication). Although many traits of effective mentoring have been identified, it is also crucial to consider how mentoring may promote classroom learners' L2 abilities. The effective mentoring picture seems incomplete as the research to date has only included mentors and mentees' voices. A possible future line of research might survey mentees' L2 learners to understand the effects of good mentoring on the language classroom and on the acquisition of L2 abilities.

Approaches to Mentoring

Mentors use a variety of strategies, resources, and practices to promote and develop their mentees' ability to reflect. It is claimed that effective language teachers are reflective practitioners who assess and appropriately modify their performance to avoid falling into unanalyzed routines (Farrell, 2007; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Schön, 1983, 1987; Sowden, 2007; Wallace, 1991). To understand how new teachers develop the ability to engage in reflective practice, researchers have focused on different mentoring approaches such as practicum experiences, action research, classroom observations, case studies (e.g., analysis of narratives about teaching), and the use of technology as mentoring tools.

Practicum for Pre-Service Teachers

A practicum includes an experiential component in which student teachers interact with a cooperating teacher or school mentor and university liaison while participating in a real teaching context. Tomaš et al. (2008) advocated a teaching practicum that reflects the potential resources and challenges that will be faced in student teaching. They reported on an international practicum involving several U.S.-based EFL student teachers in the Czech Republic. The student teachers abroad had the opportunity to interact with mentors, students, local community members, and each other in ways that would have been impossible in a campus-based practicum in the United States. The student teachers provided data through prompted journal entries and informal and formal discussions. The data revealed that teaching and interacting with EFL teachers and learners in an authentic instructional context helped the student teachers understand the nature of English teaching in settings where English is not the primary language, similar to the teaching of many foreign languages in the United States. In addition, the student teachers had extended opportunities for leading instruction because they were able to provide the

learners with native English input. Thus, the practicum benefited not only the mentees but also their mentors and students. Teaching experiences in FL contexts are extremely important in TESOL programs in which English teachers-in-training are expected to work abroad where they may face instructional challenges that differ from the ones in the United States where English is learned as a second language.

Action Research

Some scholars and researchers have advocated for the use of action research to develop language teachers' knowledge of teaching (Crookes & Chandler, 2001; Edge, 2001; Gebhard, 2005; Nunan, 1989). Action research has been defined as a systematic investigation whose main purpose is to bring about improvements and innovations in a given situation (Burns, 1999). Changes can relate to the teachers themselves (e.g., classroom discourse), classroom interaction, teaching activities, resources, or the physical instructional context (e.g., seating arrangements). This method of inquiry has also proved to be a valuable tool to help facilitate beginning teachers' reflections on context-specific personal theories of L2 learning (Mann, 2005).

In language teaching, McDonough (2006) conducted a small study on the impact of action research on the professional development of seven graduate assistants (GAs) teaching FLs and L2s. The GAs conducted action research as part of a graduate seminar and provided data about their experiences in learning journals, reflective essays, and reports that included oral and written comments from peers, students, and their supervisor. Her findings indicated that action research modified the GAs' perceptions about research, made them value peer collaboration more, and promoted new pedagogical practices. For example, at the beginning of the semester, some GAs reported a dislike for group work and a lack of interaction with colleagues. However, after the seminar, the GAs learned to seek and value

their peers' support, advice, and feedback during the research process. In addition, the opportunities for self-reflection, class observation, and hearing feedback from peers and students led GAs to experiment with new classroom techniques, thus improving their instructional practices. McDonough concluded that conducting action research had a lasting, positive impact on the GAs' professional development.

Similarly, mentors can also use action research to improve their practice. For example, Vásquez and Reppen (2007) reported on their participation in an action research project designed to improve their mentoring practices in post-observation meetings. After identifying an imbalance in the participation of the mentors and graduate teaching assistant during post-observation meetings, Vásquez and Reppen developed a protocol of questions to use in such meetings. They recorded and transcribed the GAs' contributions to the post-observation discussion in meetings where the new question protocol was used and compared it with the GAs' contributions in the meetings prior to implementation of the new protocol. Findings showed that the mentees increased their participation in the post-observation conversations from 16% of talk before the implementation of the protocol to 35% of talk with the use of the new template (p. 161). They found that the question protocol enhanced and increased the mentees' participation in both quantity and quality, allowing them to reflect on teaching as a decision-making process. This example shows clearly how mentors and mentees alike can use action research to identify an issue in need of improvement, collect data about the problem, analyze their findings, propose a new course of action, assess its impact, and then adopt or modify the new strategy, as appropriate. In this way, reflection on mentoring practices drives improvement.

Class Observation and Reflection

One routine yet crucial mentoring approach is class observation (Deacon, 2003; Geyer, 2008; Kullman, 1998; Pitton, 2006; Richards

& Farrell, 2005). Although observations are usually associated with evaluation and regarded as a threatening experience, Richards and Farrell (2005) stressed their importance for triggering reflection on teaching. According to Pitton (2006), productive observations require mentors to have a framework for interpreting classroom events. In some programs, this framework becomes the standard set for the profession by the school, the district, the state, or national organizations such as ACTFL. Pitton explained that the process starts with a pre-observation meeting in which the mentee and the mentor identify aspects of the class on which to focus. During the observation, the mentor gathers relevant information, and in the post-observation meeting, the data are shared and the mentor uses guiding questions to help the mentee analyze the results and generate new options for the future.

Kullman (1998) suggested different kinds of feedback and questions that promote reflection after an observation, such as asking mentees to recall specific incidents in the lesson. Similarly, Meijer, Zanting, and Verloop (2002) suggested stimulated recall interviews about videotaped lessons as a strategy for both mentors and mentees to explain and reflect on their practical teaching knowledge. In a study of mentors and student teachers at a Dutch university, the researchers analyzed data from four case studies with student teachers who conducted stimulated recall interviews on their mentors' videotaped lessons. The student teachers reported that having their mentors explain the rationale for their actions during the videotaped class gave them more insights about the "whys" and "hows" of teaching. Student teachers also felt that the stimulated recall allowed them to compare their mentors' practical teaching knowledge with educational theories from their teacher education program, thus developing their own practical teaching knowledge.

In addition to employing various discussion techniques, post-observation meetings can be delayed or occur immediately after

the class to promote reflection. In this regard, Williams and Watson (2004) investigated the effect of delaying the post-observation meeting and having TESOL student teachers complete a journal beforehand. Results showed that student teachers initiated slightly more topics in delayed debriefings than immediate debriefings, and that 54% of their topics were unprompted (p. 88). The data also showed that student teachers used more modality and hypothetical constructions (e.g., "I could have" + *verb* ..., "I think I'll go back ...") in their reflections during delayed debriefing than in the context of immediate debriefing sessions. The presence of this linguistic feature in their discourse might be interpreted as the beginning teachers' willingness to grow as language teachers. The researchers concluded that the delayed debriefing and structured journals provided student teachers opportunities to prepare to contribute more, and thus generated more reflection on teaching.

Case Studies and Narrative Writing

Researchers have also used case studies and narrative writing by mentors and mentees to learn about their roles and practices (e.g., Orland-Barak, 2002; Semeniuk & Worral, 2000; Zeek, Foote, & Walker, 2001). Orland-Barak (2002) investigated case studies of mentees written by 15 in-service mentors participating in an Israeli postgraduate course on mentoring. The mentors used the writing of case studies to articulate field experiences, personal values, and the requirements of their work. An interpretation of the cases revealed that for most mentors, their accountability to different school members created dilemmas and contradictions in performing their mentoring roles. Sharing mentors' cases with other mentors allowed them to reflect on recurring themes in their practice, analyze cases within a given context, and compare them with others. The author emphasized that teaching case study writing may also help pre-service mentees see examples of theoretical principles implemented in the classroom.

Technology and Communities of Practice

To sustain professional development after initial teacher preparation, beginning teachers have used online communities of practice outside of school for support. According to Wenger (1998), communities of practice are groups of practitioners who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to improve it through regular interaction. Thus, both experienced and novice language teachers can form communities of practice either in the school or online to share concerns about teaching. They can learn to improve teaching practices while solving problems, requesting information, reusing assets, or discussing developments. Nowadays, communities of teaching practice are taking advantage of technology and computer-mediated communication (CMC). (See, for example, the Personal Learning Network for Educators created by Whitby, n.d.) According to Meskill (2009), CMC can contribute to teacher education by fostering careful thinking about complex issues, allowing quick access to resources (e.g., Web pages with materials for classroom use) and support (e.g., experts can offer suggestions to solve problems related with the use of technology in the classroom), and facilitating instructional conversations among teachers that can later be analyzed to promote the development of pedagogical knowledge. Meskill, Anthony, Hilliker, Tseng, and You (2006) conducted a yearlong project in which trios of pre-service, in-service, and doctoral students in language education exchanged e-mails about teaching practices involving uses of technology in the classroom. The pre-service participants brought practical, up-to-date technology skills; the in-service teachers offered pedagogical expertise; and the doctoral students mentored and guided the pre- and in-service teachers in their implementation of technology. The analysis of questionnaires, interviews, and written reflections provided evidence that participants perceived the online collaboration as a powerful tool for sharing knowledge

and experiences. Pre-service teachers found that working with experienced teachers helped them understand classroom logistics that facilitated or impeded the uses of technology. In addition, in-service teachers improved their attitudes toward technology while doctoral students gained an understanding of the contextual constraints and support needed for effectively implementing technology in the classroom.

Bowman et al. (2000) provided another account of an e-mail peer-mentoring group organized by 12 in-service English as a Second Language (ESL)/EFL teachers in different countries and educational contexts. This online reflection and sharing became a method of action research in which a member of the group posed a question about an issue affecting his or her teaching, and the other members responded to the question via e-mail. After a month of exchanges over an issue, one group member summarized the responses given by the others. Findings of the study indicated that the teacher posing the question used the group input to improve his or her professional practice and reported to the group on the outcome. Participants in this experience also perceived that the online discussion provided resources, support, and motivation to reflect on their teaching.

Research comparing the effectiveness of online mentoring and face-to-face mentoring is nonexistent. It could be that both types of mentoring serve different purposes. One can speculate that online mentoring offers advantages such as gaining perspectives from a variety of language teachers about activities, resources, and classroom management. There might be more opportunities to collaborate in action research projects with others while reducing the threatening sense of being evaluated that face-to-face mentoring could imply. Online mentoring could address issues such as mentor training, working with mentors in different instructional contexts, and developing trusting relationships in virtual environments.

The studies reviewed in this section indicate that using a variety of approaches

enhances the ways that mentors can promote their mentees' professional growth. The strategies and resources discussed here are only the most commonly reported in the literature, and they are not an exhaustive inventory of available resources. It is clear that variations in these strategies are possible depending on the goals, instructional contexts, and use of online tools for mentoring. For example, practicum experiences provide a real context for student teachers and their mentors to compare their teaching beliefs with the challenges posed by school policies, parents, and students. Reflection on classroom practices and pedagogical knowledge can be achieved by both mentors and mentees through action research, class observation, case studies, and the writing and interpretation of narratives.

Impact of Mentoring

Program evaluation should be a logical step in assessing language mentoring experiences and their impact on language teaching, but research on such assessment is scarce. Pitton (2006) suggested different tools that can be used to measure the impact of mentoring in new teachers' development. Assessment should comprise data gathered from mentors, mentees, and mentors' supervisors via tools such as questionnaires, interviews, portfolios, and mentoring session observations. Traditionally, the effectiveness of a mentoring program has been measured in terms of the retention rate for first-year teachers (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). However, mentoring assessment should offer information about the processes involved as well. In language teaching, Arnold (2006) offered one of the few examples of assessment of a mentoring program for novice language teachers in a Middle Eastern military EFL school. The program included an introduction to the school and its policies, class observations, pre- and post-lesson discussions, and workshops on the materials and methods used in the school. The assessment involved data collected from mentors and mentees

through questionnaires, interviews, diary entries, and other documents. Findings revealed that mentors approached the task from different perspectives due to their varying expertise in observing and giving feedback. In addition, most of the mentors saw the learning experience as one-way and did not use the mentoring relationship to learn about their own teaching. Consequently, only the mentees seemed to benefit. Other issues that emerged as areas for improvement included increasing the time available for mentoring and promoting more effective dialogues about teaching that went beyond narrow discussions of specific techniques or materials. As observed, the assessed impact of mentoring practices in novice language teachers has been measured in terms of mentors' and mentees' perception of professional growth; however, no objective instruments have been employed to measure how the participation in a mentoring program translates into language learners' acquisition of the L2.

Mentoring Programs

Programs in the United States

Descriptive research reviewed in this section includes reports of mentoring programs in the United States that illustrate the relationships between the participants and the contextual variables affecting different mentoring experiences. Given that no single ideal mentoring program exists that is suitable for all contexts, some scholars have proposed several mentoring models that can be adapted to a particular teaching context. Pitton (2006), for example, proposed a cyclical model based on data gathering and peer dialogue to promote decision-making skills, reflection on choices adopted, and the monitoring and adjustment of practices. The cycle includes the following stages: (1) posing a question or concern, (2) setting goals for both the mentor and mentee, (3) gathering data via class observation and feedback, (4) analyzing the data, (5) researching and implementing modifications, (6) assessing the effectiveness of

changes introduced in the classroom, (7) observing again and receiving feedback, and (8) generating new questions and concerns. This cycle ensures that instructional decisions made by novice teachers are informed by data and continually evaluated to facilitate professional growth.

Language teacher mentoring in the United States has not been extensively investigated in the literature. The few publications that exist are not data-driven but rather describe programs cosponsored by university schools of education and local school districts for pre-service teachers, mentoring experiences with university language teaching assistants, and small-scale projects independently pursued by in-service language teachers to build support systems within their schools. Some schools of education have implemented formal programs to provide systematic support for student teachers. Fairbanks, Freedman, and Kahn (2000) reported on the benefits of a mentoring program for English teachers among several Texas school districts entitled "Effective Mentoring in English Education." In this program, student teachers were paired with cooperating teachers in a mentoring relationship where they attended monthly workshops, observed each other, and kept dialogue journals. Based on written and videotaped documentation of the participants' progress, the authors concluded that the program proved effective because mentors helped the student teachers survive their first teaching experiences and define their teaching styles. In addition, mentors and mentees built valuable professional partnerships based on dialogue and reflection.

Research has also addressed mentoring programs for language teaching assistants (TAs) at U.S. universities. Kost (2008) described an apprenticeship model for new TAs in which they were paired with a principal instructor so that they could participate in all aspects of teaching during a semester without being responsible for the whole class themselves. The new TAs were also expected to keep a reflection journal,

observe other classes, and participate in professional development activities. After three years of implementation and analysis of the data, the program was deemed effective because (1) instructors had been able to reflect on their teaching practices, and (2) the TAs had learned about different teaching styles. However, there were TAs who felt that some mentors might have benefited from training on giving feedback and establishing the mentees' responsibilities.

Silva, Macián, and Mejía-Gomez (2006) described a mentoring program at Ohio State University for language teaching assistants in which mentoring was provided by experienced TAs. TA mentors had some training at the beginning of the semester, such as orientation workshops and readings about mentoring. They also observed and worked with new TAs in pre-observation meetings, lesson planning, suggestions for activities, classroom management, and discussions of issues related to graduate student life. Mentors interacted among themselves frequently because they shared offices. The program was considered effective when the new TAs received positive comments from supervisors and students in their teaching evaluations.

Chalupa and Lair (2001) reported on a mentoring program specifically designed for international foreign language teaching assistants (IFLTAs) in a large U.S. Midwestern university. The authors first surveyed the IFLTAs to identify the issues that IFLTAs faced when teaching for the first time at an American university. Most of their concerns related to language use, acculturation, and university policies. IFLTAs in the study felt that their English was sufficient enough to manage their classrooms, as they were expected to teach in the L2 (i.e., their native language). However, from the IFLTAs' perspective, acculturation to the United States was difficult and often viewed as undesirable by their departments because they were perceived as the embodiment of the culture associated with the language they were teaching. They also often had problems understanding university policies

vis-à-vis the institutional regulations in their own countries. In order to help IFLTAs resolve these issues, Chalupa and Lair proposed a training model that included a six-week colloquium organized by a team of TA mentors. The colloquium involved talks by university administrators and panel discussions with experienced IFLTAs and undergraduate language students. In addition to the colloquium, IFLTAs participated in yearlong mentoring with experienced IFLTAs and American FLTAs. The authors did not provide any assessment of the implementation of this training model or its effectiveness in solving these issues. However, the proposed model seemed to address the many difficulties that new language teachers with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds experience in university language programs.

Clearly, language teacher mentoring is occurring throughout the United States in a variety of instructional contexts. However, few programs are being adequately documented in published reports. Although the programs reviewed seem to be effective in their given contexts—school districts, universities, or language programs—the impact of these programs on FL education in the United States seems to be limited, given that they are isolated efforts to improve the professional growth of inexperienced language teachers and are hardly ever assessed adequately for effectiveness. What is clearly needed is more collaboration between organizations such as ACTFL, university language teaching programs, and school districts around the United States to coordinate mentoring efforts and resources, conduct studies of mentoring and analyze data, and draw conclusions that will have an impact on FL teaching nationwide.

Variables That Affect the Quality of Mentoring

Mentoring researchers have studied numerous variables affecting its outcomes, including (1) linguistic features of mentoring discourse, (2) interaction between

participants with different L2 cultural backgrounds, (3) expectations that participants bring to the relationship, and (4) mentor training (e.g., Johnson, 2003; Vásquez, 2004). Various scholars have noted that good communication skills are essential to mentoring (e.g., Kullman, 1998; Malderez, 2009). How mentors listen and provide feedback is crucial to discovering themes for discussion, reflecting on classroom episodes, and ultimately promoting the mentee's growth as a teacher. In regard to listening skills, research has indicated that both mentors and mentees must demonstrate engaged listening to facilitate discussion. Farr (2003) investigated the linguistic characteristics of engaged listening in interactions between master's students and their tutors in an English language teaching program at an Irish university. Her analysis focused on minimal response tokens (e.g., "mm," "yes," "OK," "no") to express agreement and confirmation, non-minimal tokens (e.g., "right," "exactly," "absolutely") to respond affectively, and overlaps and interruptions. Her findings revealed that tutors increased student teachers' self-reflection by allowing uninterrupted talk and providing frequent, supportive responses using minimal tokens. Mentors and mentees also used non-minimal tokens to offer a nonthreatening way to comment on the pedagogic and instructional content in the conversation. The author also explained that interruptions, rather than being viewed negatively or used as a way to dismiss a comment, were considered positive markers of interest when they were used to close conversation topics, to justify a performance, or to show agreement.

Where effective feedback is concerned, research has also focused on linguistic features of mentors' discourse. For example, Vásquez (2004) researched the strategies used by mentors to mitigate criticisms and suggestions in post-observation meetings. The participants in the analyzed meetings were TESOL graduate teaching assistants and their mentors in an intensive program of English at an American university. The

findings showed that the supervisors used a variety of positive adjectives, adverbs, and intensifiers to express approval (e.g., "nice," "good," "very"). The supervisors' discourse included longer turns than the teaching assistants', consisting of suggestions, advice, and non-evaluative descriptions of class events. Surprisingly, however, the mentors' positive language and politeness discourse markers used for suggestions and for giving advice were not perceived by the teaching assistants as constructive criticism. Rather, they thought that their mentors' positive remarks were simply kind words that did not help them improve their teaching. This finding suggests a challenge in mentor-mentee interaction: how to provide emotional support while also giving feedback that leads to constructive reflection on practices in need of improvement.

Research has also examined the relationship between the use of certain linguistic features and new teachers' identity. Vásquez and Urzúa (2009) examined how novice teachers' use of reported speech on concrete actions and reported speech on mental states in post-observation mentoring meetings show the emergence of their professional identity. The meetings took place in an intensive English program at an American university between ESL teacher-graduate TAs and their mentors. The mentees' discourse revealed a frequent use of reported speech on concrete actions and reported speech on mental states. Reported speech on actions was used to depict the self as competent, resourceful, and in control of the class (e.g., "I gave them a sheet that had those options and I said 'Some of them will not have every form so you have to remember that,'" Vásquez & Urzúa, 2009, p. 10). Reported speech on mental states, however, conveyed mentees' questions or negative assessments about the class and their performance (e.g., "I mean I've been thinking about it. I was like 'Is that really appropriate to combine my classes in that way?'" Vásquez & Urzúa, 2009, p. 9). This combination of reported speech on concrete actions and on mental states suggests

that the new teachers simultaneously presented themselves as competent professionals while acknowledging vexing issues and questions about their teaching practices.

Post-observation interactions have also been analyzed to identify issues of language, power, and control. Hyland and Lo (2006) examined post-observation interactions between ESL student teachers and their university tutors during a teaching practicum in Hong Kong. Through interviews and recorded conferences, the researchers investigated variables such as turn-taking, turn length, topic initiation, and feedback type. Their findings showed that student teachers had clear expectations that tutors would be friendly, provide emotional support, and give constructive feedback. The analysis of tutors' speech revealed most of their interventions to be directive in nature, offering prescriptions, suggestions, and critique to inform the student teachers' practice. However, while some positive interventions offered encouragement, support, and praise, few comments invited student teachers to express their feelings. Most student teachers' turns were devoted to providing information or signaling acceptance of the tutor's comments. Thus, the interaction reflected an imbalance of power between the tutors and student teachers, where the former played a dominant role and the latter played a more passive one. It was also noted that issues in cross-cultural communication could have influenced the directness or indirectness in the interaction between the eight Chinese student teachers, two Chinese tutors, and two non-Chinese tutors. In contrast with Vásquez and Urzúa's (2009) work, these novice Chinese ESL teachers might have had few opportunities to develop their identities as ESL teachers in these interactions because mentoring focused strongly on faults in their teaching practice.

Mentors and mentees' discourse has shown that although the new paradigm in language teacher education calls for more bi-directional communication, in some contexts both participants reinforce the traditional mentor role as a supervisor whose

authority is rarely questioned. This is understandable given the mentor's seniority and experience and the fact that a mentor never truly can leave this role. However, asymmetrical mentoring relationships may lead to perpetuating traditional classroom practices that impede learner-centered approaches and prevent mentoring benefits from extending to both participants (Hobson et al., 2009). As explained earlier, bi-directional communication fosters development not only for the mentee but also for the mentor. This kind of communication can only happen if both participants feel they can legitimately contribute to the discussion of teaching issues. Only when both participants equally explore, discuss, and reflect on their teaching practice can a variety of actions be identified, implemented, and assessed. The research suggests that this type of open dialogue requires mutual trust and respect so that mentors may also grow as teaching professionals despite their years of experience in language teaching (Brown, 2001; Jonson, 2002).

New language teachers and mentors in the United States often come from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Native- or heritage-speaking novice language teachers often work with English-speaking, nonnative mentors, and nonnative novices may work with native-speaking mentors. Given their different backgrounds, how do such participants negotiate meaning? How do they develop a common language about teaching to improve their practices and facilitate mutual professional development? Some researchers have argued that nonnative speaking (NNS) mentees should be given the opportunity to voice their beliefs and ideas about language teaching without seeing mentors as experts just because they are native speakers (NSS). NS mentors should recognize their mentees' knowledge and beliefs about teaching and work to either confirm or challenge them in ways that contribute to students' L2 acquisition. Kamhi-Stein (2000), for example, has suggested the importance of providing pre-service NNS teachers with opportunities to develop support networks where they can

have a voice in their language teaching experiences while being guided by an experienced NNS mentor. In the UCLA TESOL master's program, a practicum included a Web-based group for engaging novice NNS English teachers in discussing issues and effective practices implemented by NNS experienced teachers or mentors (Kamhi-Stein, 2000). This Web-based discussion was complemented with other mentoring activities such as classroom observations of the NNS teachers, and group discussions and planning lessons with the teachers in preparation.

In another pre-service mentoring context, Bayliss and Vignola (2007) reported that English-speaking novice L2 French teachers in an immersion program in Canada had mixed feelings about receiving feedback regarding their L2 skills. They thought that they were willing to accept feedback on their use of the L2, if delivered in a positive way; however, this kind of feedback, although positive, still made them less confident as teachers. It is clear that feedback about mentees' language skills is an issue in mentoring relationships, particularly when the mentoring situation involves NS mentors and NNS mentees.

Johnson (2003), on the other hand, examined some of the issues that can arise when NS mentors interact with NNS mentees. She explained that, in such relationships, mixed linguistic and cultural identities, and individual values and beliefs, could create tension and affect communication. Specific incidents in Johnson's experience when tutoring Ali (a pseudonym), an Angolan teaching assistant in an American university's TESL program, made her reflect on the myth of the NS as expert. When Johnson started mentoring Ali, she found that her mentee perceived her as the language expert in the relationship. He constantly asked her language questions, they often discussed linguistic issues arising from class observations, and on some occasions, he and his students turned to her in class to clarify linguistic doubts. One day, during a writing activity, one of the students asked Ali a question about a preposition and he provided the

answer without hesitation or turning to his mentor. It was obvious that Ali had gained enough confidence to disregard his status as an NNS. After this critical incident, Johnson concluded that focusing on language harms an NNS teacher's self-confidence and is an obstacle to ongoing professional development because the novice teacher is continually reminded of his or her NNS status.

It is worth noting that none of the studies reviewed suggested that pairing mentors and mentees should be done on an L1 basis. What seems to be crucial is that both mentors and mentees are aware that communication difficulties may arise from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In addition, mentoring issues can arise from not sharing expectations for mentor-mentee interactions.

Another variable that affects mentoring relationships is the expectations that participants bring. In a study of student teacher mentoring in an Israeli FL English practicum, Rajuan, Beijgaard, and Verloop (2007) found that cooperating teachers held primarily technical and practical expectations for mentoring that emphasized artistry, knowledge, behavioral skills, and classroom techniques. Cooperating teachers with these expectations saw themselves as models to follow. On the other hand, student teachers described their expectations for cooperating teachers predominantly with a personal and practical orientation. Student teachers saw the cooperating teachers as guides or friends who shared information about interpersonal relationships in the classroom and provided a supportive environment to foster the student teachers' motivation. In comparing these expectations, it was clear that student teachers expressed a greater need for building a personal relationship than the cooperating teachers. However, both sides agreed that their relationship should focus on classroom experiences and instructional skills. The authors conclude that in the initial stages, both parties should focus on their shared expectations while working on the dissimilar ones to make the relationship more effective.

Mentor training is, therefore, another important variable that influences the

effectiveness of the mentoring process. If educators believe that language teachers need training, then the same applies to mentors (Bódoczky & Malderez, 1997; Holden, 2002; Pitton, 2006; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Wright, 2010). Teachers are usually asked to mentor newcomers into the profession based on their years of experience in the subject or the school. It is often frustrating for mentors to facilitate a new teacher's development with no training on their role or information on approaching and achieving the program's goals. In some cases, assigned mentors see mentoring as just another school task and fail to perceive its potential to benefit their own professional development. To effectively support beginning teachers, mentors need training in observation and feedback skills. They must also have effective knowledge of interpersonal skills, mentoring styles, and lesson planning and evaluation. Models of this training exist in the literature on mentoring. For example, Bódoczky and Malderez (1997) reported on mentor training in Hungary for English teacher educators. The course included critiques of classroom teaching videos, mentoring role-plays, and task-based discussions. At the end of the training, the mentors agreed that the course helped them grow as both mentors and teachers and that it enhanced their personal relationships with colleagues.

Although mentoring practices in language teaching have proved to be beneficial to the different participants in the programs reviewed, it is important to note that mentoring is a complex relationship in which the discourse used by mentors and mentees, the expectations of the participants, the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of participants, and mentors' training interact with contextual variables to determine the effectiveness of this form of professional development for language teachers.

Future Research

This review of research has shed light on various elements of language teacher mentoring that need further investigation. These

elements focus on two main areas: (1) mentors and mentees—approaches, variables affecting mentoring, and conditions facilitating mentoring; and (2) the impact of mentoring on language teaching. It is worth noting that much of the research reported here has been done abroad and that drawing conclusions based on studies conducted in one context may not apply to all contexts. However, the questions that these studies raise and the methods of investigation that they use potentially inform research on mentoring in the U.S. context and contribute to the growing body of knowledge on this important research priority.

Mentor training programs for language teachers are already in place in many countries (e.g., Bódoczky & Malderez, 1997). These programs might serve as a basis to enhance the skills of mentors in different instructional contexts in the United States. As mentioned before, mentor training program developers should assess the effectiveness of different training models, keeping in mind the specific contextual needs of mentors and mentees. Professionals in language teaching may also find it worth asking whether mentoring is really a skill that can be learned. Can any language teacher be trained to be a mentor? If so, what is the impact of a mentor's participation in different kinds of training activities?

With respect to the different mentoring approaches available to mentors, one could investigate which ones are most beneficial for the different roles the mentor must perform, and how technology could facilitate them. What conditions increase the effectiveness of a given strategy or practice? For example, Geyer (2008) proposed to examine the impact of different modes of observation (observations guided by a set of tasks) or different types of instruments (e.g., video recording) to collect information about pre-service and in-service teachers' professional development.

There are other pressing and vexing issues that need answers (Hobson et al., 2009). For example: What criteria should one consider when selecting mentors? How

long should mentoring last to be effective? What kind of support or recognition (e.g., reduced teaching load) do mentors need to facilitate their work? How does pairing mentors and mentees from different linguistic backgrounds facilitate or hinder mutual professional development? It is often the case that the matching of mentor with mentee is made by those who are not directly involved in the mentoring relationship. This situation makes one wonder how mentoring might be affected if mentees could select their own mentors.

An additional line of research might investigate the relative merits of formal mentoring sponsored by the school or school district compared to informal mentoring initiated by new teachers. Semeniuk and Worrall (2000), for instance, argued that formal mentoring as organized by institutions may have drawbacks. Spontaneous mentoring relationships allow teachers to consider more deeply what it means to be a teacher, to improve teaching, and to engage students more fruitfully in instruction. Because informal mentoring is initiated by novice and experienced teachers themselves and derives from perceived needs and goals, their likelihood of success may be greater.

Furthermore, mentors often assume that mentees come to them with solid subject matter knowledge, including L2 proficiency and theories of pedagogy and L2 acquisition. However, this is often an unrealistic expectation even under the best of circumstances. Thus, how can mentors help mentees who lack subject matter knowledge or have fixed and uninformed beliefs that interfere with their practice? As previously mentioned, a balance between providing emotional support and constructive feedback is necessary for productive mentoring relationships. It has been found, however, that mentors are often afraid to hold new teachers accountable to standards in the profession, perceiving it as a threat to the trust that they feel they must promote (Carver & Katz, 2004).

Hobson et al. (2009) identified other gaps in the general mentoring literature

that can be applied to mentoring beginning language teachers. For example, in cases where mentees resist mentoring because it is imposed on them or because they cannot see its benefits, how might educators change new teachers' beliefs about the role and importance of professional development through ongoing mentoring? Similarly, what are the characteristics of mentoring relationships that promote a change of attitude in mentees who initially express resistance to the mentoring process?

Finally, based on Ingersoll and Kralik (2004), educators could also investigate whether language teacher mentoring actually produces improvements in instruction and gains in student L2 abilities. Related to new teachers, one might ask if mentoring contributes to their retention and, if so, what characteristics of mentoring programs produce career stability. Implied in these research questions is the fact that most research is based on the analysis of mentors' and mentees' perceptions about the role and effectiveness of mentoring. Another important area to investigate is the use of other kinds of data and analyses to assess the effectiveness of particular types of mentoring procedures.

Conclusion

This initial review of research on language teacher mentoring reveals that publications in the United States are not as extensive as in England and Israel, for example, where national projects on mentoring teachers have been documented and evaluated. Studies on language teacher mentoring in the United States have described programs and mentoring practices in pre-service (i.e., student teaching) and in-service contexts (i.e., graduate TAs and language teachers in schools) and have documented the effect of some variables on the mentor-mentee relationship, such as discourse features and observation procedures. However, more research is needed to fully understand the characteristics of an effective mentor, the types of mentor training that are most

effective, the conditions that facilitate mentoring, and the impact of mentoring on the development of effective language teachers and on student learning. Only when empirical documentation on these issues is collected, analyzed, and disseminated among language educators will the complex and pivotal role of mentoring in strengthening FL education in the United States be clear.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Paul Toth, Richard Donato, and Eileen Glisan for their detailed and extremely helpful comments on various drafts of this manuscript.

References

- Arnold, E. (2006). Assessing the quality of mentoring: Sinking or learning to swim? *ELT Journal*, 60, 117–124.
- Bayliss, D., & Vignola, M. (2007). Training non-native second language teachers: The case of Anglophone FSL teacher candidates. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, 63, 371–398.
- Bódoczky, C., & Malderez, A. (1997). The INSET impact of a mentoring course. In-service teacher development. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *In-service teacher development: International perspectives* (pp. 50–60). Hertfordshire, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Bowman, I., Boyle, B., Greenstone, K., Herndon, L., & Valente, A. (2000). Connecting teachers across continents through on-line reflection and sharing. *TESOL Journal*, 9, 15–18.
- Brown, K. (2001). Mentoring and the retention of newly qualified language teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31, 69–88.
- Burns, A. (1999) *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Carver, C., & Katz, D. (2004). Teaching at the boundary of acceptable practices. What is a new teacher mentor to do? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55, 449–462.
- Chalupa, C., & Lair, A. (2001). Meeting the needs of international TAs in the foreign language classroom: A model for extended training. In B. Rifkin (Ed.), *Mentoring foreign language teaching assistants, lecturers, and adjunct faculty* (pp. 119–142). Boston: Heinle & Heinle/American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs.
- Chamberlin, C. (2000). TESL degree candidates' perceptions of trust in supervisors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 653–673.
- Cloud, J. (2010, September 20). How to recruit better teachers? *Time*, 176, 46–53.
- Cooper, T., Hall, K., Hawkins, A., LaFleur, R., Rossbacher, B., Chaves Tesser, C., Walz, J., & Young, M. (2004). How foreign language teachers in Georgia evaluate their professional preparation: A call for action. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 37–48.
- Crookes, G., & Chandler, P. (2001). Introducing action research into post-secondary foreign language teacher education. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34, 131–140.
- D'Abate, C., Eddy, E., & Tannenbaum, S. (2003). What's in a name? A literature-based approach to understanding mentoring, coaching, and other constructs that describe developmental interactions. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2, 360–384.
- Deacon, B. (2003). Priceless peer-mentor observation. In J. Egbert (Ed.), *Becoming contributing professionals* (pp. 81–88). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Edge, J. (Ed.). (2001). *Action research*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Fairbanks, C., Freedman, D., & Kahn, C. (2000). The role of effective mentors in learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 102–112.
- Farr, F. (2003). Engaged listenership in spoken academic discourse: The case of student-tutor meetings. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 67–85.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2007). *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice*. London: Continuum.
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 397–417.
- Gebhard, J. G. (2005). Awareness of teaching through action research: Examples, benefits and limitations. *JALT Journal*, 27, 53–69.
- Geyer, N. (2008). Reflective practices in foreign language teacher education: A view through micro and macro windows. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 627–638.

- Hicks, C., Glasgow, N., & McNary, S. (2005). *What successful mentors do. Research-based strategies for new teacher induction, training, and support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hobson, A., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 25, 207–216.
- Holden, G. (2002). Towards a learning community: The role of mentoring in teacher-led school improvement. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 28, 9–21.
- Hyland, F., & Lo, M. (2006). Examining interaction in the teaching practicum: Issues of language, power and control. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 14, 163–186.
- Ingersoll, R., & Kralik, J. (2004). The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says. *ECS Research Review: Teaching Quality*, 1–24. Retrieved February 17, 2012, from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/127
- Johnson, K. (2003). "Every experience is a moving force": Identity and growth through mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 787–800.
- Jonson, K. F. (2002). *Being an effective mentor: How to help beginning teachers succeed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. (2000). Adapting U.S.-based TESOL education to meet the needs of non-native English speakers. *TESOL Journal*, 9, 10–14.
- Kost, C. (2008). Innovations in teaching assistant development: An apprenticeship model. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 29–60.
- Kullman, J. (1998). Mentoring and the development of reflective practice: Concepts and context. *System*, 26, 471–484.
- Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. (2001). Mentoring in style: Using style information to enhance mentoring of foreign language teachers. In B. Rifkin (Ed.), *Mentoring foreign language teaching assistants, lecturers, and adjunct faculty* (pp. 55–88). Boston: Heinle & Heinle/American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs.
- Malderez, A. (2009). Mentoring. In J. Richards & A. Burns (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 259–268). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Malderez, A., & Bódoczky, C. (1999). *Mentor courses: A resource book for trainer-trainers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Malderez, A., Hobson, A., Tracey, L., & Kerr, K. (2007). Becoming a student teacher: Core features of the experience. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30, 225–248.
- Malderez, A., & Wedell, M. (2007). *Teaching teachers: Processes and practices*. London: Continuum International Publishing.
- Mann, S. (2005). The language teacher's development. *Language Teaching*, 38, 103–118.
- Maynard, T. (2000). Learning to teach or learning to manage mentors? Experiences of school-based teacher training. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 8, 17–30.
- McDonough, K. (2006). Action research and the professional development of graduate teaching assistants. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 33–47.
- Meijer, P., Zanting, A., & Verloop, N. (2002). How can student teachers elicit experienced teachers' practical knowledge? Tools, suggestions, and significance. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 406–419.
- Meskill, C. (2009). CMC in language teacher education: Learning with and through instructional conversations. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 3, 51–63.
- Meskill, C., Anthony, N., Hilliker, S., Tseng, C., & You, J. (2006). Expert-novice teacher mentoring in language learning technology. In P. Hubbard & M. Levy (Eds.), *Teacher education in CALL* (pp. 283–298). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century* (2nd ed.). Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding language classrooms: A guide for teacher-initiated action*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Orland-Barak, L. (2001). Learning to mentor as learning a second language of teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31, 53–68.
- Orland-Barak, L. (2002). What's in a case? What mentors' cases reveal about the practice of mentoring. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34, 451–468.
- Orland-Barak, L., & Hasin, R. (2010). Exemplary mentors' perspectives towards mentoring across mentoring contexts: Lessons from collective case studies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 427–437.
- Pachler, N., & Field, K. (2001). From mentor to co-tutor: Reconceptualising secondary modern foreign language initial teacher

- education. *Language Learning Journal*, 23, 15–30.
- Pitton, D. E. (2006). *Mentoring novice teachers* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Rajuan, M., Beijaard, D., & Verloop, N. (2007). The role of the cooperating teacher: Bridging the gap between the expectations of cooperating teachers and student teachers. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 15, 223–242.
- Rajuan, M., Beijaard, D., & Verloop, N. (2008). What do student teachers learn? Perceptions of learning in mentoring relationships. *The New Educator*, 4, 133–151.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal*, 39, 158–177.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers. Strategies for teacher learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Semeniuk, A., & Worrall, A. (2000). Rereading the dominant narrative of mentoring. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 30, 405–428.
- Sherris, A. (2010). Coaching language teachers. *CAL Digest*, July, 1–4.
- Silva, G., Macián, J., & Mejía-Gomez, M. (2006). Peer TA mentoring in a foreign language program. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 18, 241–249.
- Smith, J. (2001). Modeling the social construction of knowledge in ELT teacher education. *ELT Journal*, 55, 221–227.
- Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, 681–714.
- Smithey, M., & Evertson, K. (2003). System-wide mentoring for teachers: A school system and university partnership. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 16, 212–231.
- Sowden, C. (2007). Culture and the “good teacher” in the English language classroom. *ELT Journal*, 61, 304–310.
- Tomaš, Z., Farrelly, R., & Hasam, M. (2008). Designing and implementing the TESOL teaching practicum abroad: Focus on interaction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42, 660–664.
- Vásquez, C. (2004). “Very carefully managed”: Advice and suggestions in post-observation meetings. *Linguistics and Education*, 15, 33–58.
- Vásquez, C., & Reppen, R. (2007). Transforming practice: Changing patterns of participating in post-observation meetings. *Language Awareness*, 16, 153–172.
- Vásquez, C., & Urzúa, A. (2009). Reported speech and reported mental states in mentoring meetings: Exploring novice teacher identities. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42, 1–19.
- Vélez-Rendón, G. (2006). From student to teacher: A successful transition. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 320–333.
- Wallace, M. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, J., & Odell, S. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72, 481–546.
- Wedell, M. (2003). Giving TESOL change a chance: Supporting key players in the curriculum change process. *System*, 31, 439–456.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheless, L. R., & Grotz, J. (1977). The measurement of trust and its relationship to self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research*, 3, 250–257.
- Whitby, T. (n.d.). *The Educator's PLN*. Retrieved June 7, 2011, from <http://edupln.ning.com/>
- Williams, M., & Watson, S. (2004). Post-lesson debriefing: Delayed or immediate? An investigation of student teacher talk. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 30, 85–96.
- Wright, T. (2010). Second language teacher education: Review on recent research on practice. *Language Teaching*, 43, 259–296.
- Zeek, C., Foote, M., & Walker, C. (2001). Teacher stories and transactional inquiry: Hearing the voices of mentor teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52, 377–385.
- Zimmer-Loew, H. (2008). An audacious goal: Recruiting, preparing, and retaining high-quality language teachers in the 21st century. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 625–628.