

An Empirical Study on Mentoring B.Ed Students in Pakistan

Muhammad Saeed, Ivan Reid, Shafqat Hussain

Abstract: This paper focuses on perceptions of B.Ed students and their teachers on key indicators for effective mentoring, in pedagogical skills. The study was conducted in late 2006 on a purposive sample of 252 B.Ed students and 44 teachers of two Government Colleges for Elementary Teachers (GCETs) – Lahore and Mianwali in Pakistan. Data were collected through developing two questionnaires - one each for B.Ed students and their teachers. Their opinions were invited on indicators for effective mentoring, and mentoring B.Ed students in six pedagogical areas during the one-year B.Ed programme. Findings revealed that mentor-mentee good relationships, mentor's commitment to achieve targets and effective supervision, monitoring and evaluation were the most important indicators for effective mentoring. The B.Ed students were relatively better mentored in lesson planning and assessment techniques, but they liked to be more mentored in lesson presentation and communication skills, and attitudinal development. Male students were relatively better mentored than female; likewise the students were relatively better mentored at GCET Lahore than Mianwali.

Keywords: mentoring indicators, pedagogical skills, B.Ed students, teachers

Introduction

With the advancement in science and technology and explosion of knowledge in interdisciplinary research, the needs of the society are changing rapidly and this has put a healthy impact on the teaching profession. There was a time when bookish knowledge was considered as the chief source of knowledge, but now the electronic media has changed the culture of teaching learning process. Teachers need to be aware of the educational developments in global perspective. There is a need for on-going innovations in the three main modes of teacher development: initial teacher training, induction and in-service training or continuous professional development. Teachers' development at each stage is important to enable them to become effective or successful teachers to deal with

the complex teaching learning discourse in the school. Many stakeholders can play their pivotal role to improving teachers' effectiveness, but perhaps the head teacher and their colleagues can best guide newly inducted teachers. Literature refers to this help and guidance to colleagues as 'mentoring'.

The notion of mentoring corresponds to ancient Greek. The original Mentor was described by Homer as the "wise and trusted counselor" whom Odysseus left in charge of his household during his travels. Mentoring has become the focus of much attention in the recent literature on initial teacher education, induction and in-service training. Flaxman et al. (1968) defines mentoring as a supportive relationship between a youth or youth adult and someone who offers support, guidance and concrete assistance as the younger partner goes through a difficult period, takes on important tasks or corrects earlier problem. Haney (1997) also refers mentoring as the relationship between more experienced and less experienced person, as he says 'it is actually a relationship between an experienced and a less experienced person in which guidance, advice, support and feedback are provided.

A more recent perception about mentoring is presented by Mentoring and Befriending Foundation (2006) in UK that describes "mentoring is a one-to-one, non-judgemental relationship in which an individual voluntarily gives time to support and encourage another. This is typically developed at a time of transition in the mentee's life, and lasts for a significant and sustained period of time". Mentoring is an open vista of new experiences and possibilities. The mentoring process links an experienced Mason (mentor) with a less experienced Mason (mentee) to help foster Masonic development and growth. A mentor is more than a teacher. He facilitates personal and Masonic growth in an individual by sharing the knowledge and insights that have been learned through the years.

It is really hard to comment about 'effective or successful mentoring' as these are relative terms and these are linked with the goals and objectives of a programme or an activity. Successful mentoring must meet the core characteristics or indicators: mentors' own personal and professional qualities, better criteria for mentors' selection and training; friendly and caring relationships with mentees; and continuous encouragement, support and feedback by the mentor.

Gay (1997) states that training of mentors and protégés and the support staff is necessary for the successful mentoring. The success of the mentoring programme largely rests with the selection and training of mentors. Hudson and Skamp (2001) in the context of reforms in primary science mentoring in Australia suggested that ‘the mentor must be well-prepared and informed on successful and effective mentoring practices’. Most higher education institutions provide regular training sessions for mentors. Training is effective when it meets the specific needs of both mentors and schools. It is effective where mentors are encouraged to recognize the importance of developing their own school-based training programmes (Estyn, 2001).

Another key indicator for effective mentorship is the ‘mentor-mentee good relationships’. Kochan and Trimble (2001, p.21) state that ‘mentor and mentee are co-learners in a process of discovery’. The success of one is the success of the other; the emphasis should be on co-mentoring and peer mentoring. Mullen and Lick (1999) coined the concept to capture the essence of co-mentoring as a synergistic process that ‘supports opportunity, dialogue, enthusiasm and change’. The relationships should be so strong and informal that both should be the learners at one end; both should be the mentors for each other, and this notion in literature is called as ‘peer mentoring’ (LeCornu (2005).

Research shows that mentoring has a positive impact on the prospective teachers at all stages of their teaching career. It starts with the initial teacher training, passes through the transitional stage of induction and leads to the continuous professional development. Collison (1998) states “mentoring is the interaction between a novice (the student teacher) and an expert (the teacher), which contributes to the novice’s learning”. He rather gives the concept of active mentoring which he means “responses offered by the mentor to the student teacher’s teaching whilst that teaching is on-going”. Lindgren (2005) found that “mentoring is a proficient method for supporting novice teachers.

Price and Willett (2006) investigated in the context of UK, that prospective primary teachers bring with them a lot of benefits from the university or college during their initial teacher training to the school, teachers and children and these contribute to school’s improvement. The school needs to improve the procedure of evaluating school-based training consistently so as to maintain high standards across the schools.

Walkington (2003; 2004) found that mentoring not only enhances efficiency and quality of work in the pre-service student teachers, it enhances their personal and professional motivation. Kapanka (1998) found in the context of health sciences education that effective mentoring becomes a source of invaluable emotional support for the mentee. Research also shows that the cooperating teacher (mentor) has an impact on the attitude and behaviour of the student teachers (Zeicher, 1978; Yates, 1982; Thompson, 1982; Boydell, 1986). Holloway (2001) states that the mere presence of a mentor is not enough: the mentor's knowledge of how to support and guide the new teacher is also crucial?

In Pakistan like many other developing countries, mentoring during initial or pre-service teacher training is not structured. The prospective B.Ed student teachers get partial mentoring support during tutorials in the college/university and during teaching practice in schools. In view of this scenario, it was imperative to know the opinions and perceptions of the faculty and B.Ed students to put forward certain recommendation for the University of Education and other teacher education institutions to modify mentoring practices at B.Ed level. To achieve this objective, following two core research questions and seven null hypotheses were developed.

Research Questions

1. Are all the indicators important for effective mentoring of B.Ed students?
2. How far B.Ed students are mentored in the six pedagogical areas and what more they desired to be mentored?

I Hypotheses

- Ho1 There is no significant difference in the opinions of male and female B.Ed students of GCET Lahore and Mianwali in regard to key indicators for effective mentoring of B.Ed students.
- Ho2 There is no significant difference in the opinions of B.Ed students of GCET Lahore and Mianwali in regard to key indicators for effective mentoring of B.Ed students.
- Ho3 There is no significant difference in the opinions of male and female teachers of GCET Lahore and Mianwali in regard to key indicators for effective mentoring

of B.Ed students.

Ho4 There is no significant difference in the opinions of teachers of GCET Lahore and Mianwali in regard to key indicators for effective mentoring of B.Ed students.

Ho5 There is no relationship in the opinions of B.Ed students and teachers about key indicators for effective mentoring in GCETs

Ho6 There is no significant difference in the opinions of male and female teachers of GCET Lahore and Mianwali in regard to mentoring of B.Ed students in six pedagogical areas.

Ho7 There is no significant difference in the opinions of teachers of GCET Lahore and Mianwali in regard to mentoring of B.Ed students in six pedagogical areas.

II METHODOLOGY

The study was based on two sources of data: 1) literature review focused on indicators for effective mentoring; and 2) empirical evidence by developing two questionnaires, one for B.Ed students and the other for their teachers. The sample was drawn purposively which comprised of the complete cluster of B.Ed students (252) enrolled in the year 2006-7 and the teacher educators (44) of the two GCETs (Lahore and Mianwali) affiliated with UE.

For data collection two instruments were designed: 1) a questionnaire for the B.Ed students, and 2) a questionnaire for the teacher educators of GCETs. Each questionnaire contained three parts. Part-I contained biographical information such as gender, qualifications and experience. Part-II contained ten indicators for effective mentoring to be rated at three-point scale: most important (3), important (2) and least important (1). In part-III, the opinions of teachers on the need for mentoring in six pedagogical areas by B.Ed students were inquired at either three-point rating scale: most needed (3), needed (2) and least needed (1) or in open-ended form. Their opinions were asked on six pedagogical areas: attitudinal/behavioural development, teaching learning

strategies/skills, communication skills, lesson planning and preparation, lesson presentation, and assessment techniques.

Validation of the instruments was done through experts' opinion in mid December 2006. The questionnaires were piloted on a small sample in GCET Mianwali. The reliability of the students and teachers' questionnaires was established at 0.792 and 0.9 Cronbach's Alpha, respectively. Data were collected with the assistance of research students pursuing M.Phil/PhD with the researcher. The analysis was made using SPSS version 12. Besides simple frequencies and percentage, independent sample t-test was applied to investigate the by gender and by institution significant differences in the perceptions and opinions of the respondents. Pearson's correlation was used to investigate the correlation between students and teachers opinions about the ten key indicators for effective mentoring.

III RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Results on Perceptions of B.Ed Students

Response Rate among B.Ed Students

Of the 107 students at GCET Lahore, 95 (88.8%) responded to the questionnaire. At GCET Mianwali, with the exception of one B.Ed student; all other (134) responded to the questionnaire, hence the response rate was almost 100%. The relatively low response rate at GCET Lahore in comparison to Mianwali was due to the reason that data were collected just before and after winter vacation, and some students did not turn up to the college, most probably due to preparation of terminal examination. The institution-wise and gender-wise response rate of respondents can be seen in Table 1.

Students' Opinions about Quality Indicators for Effective Mentoring

The B.Ed students were asked to rate the ten key indicators for effective mentoring at three point scale: most important (3), important (2) and least important (1). The results were interpreted in terms of mean, standard deviation (SD) and coefficient of variation (CV). T-test was applied to test the hypotheses (Ho1 and Ho2) framed for the study.

Table II shows gender and institution-wise difference in the opinions of respondents about ten key indicators for effective mentoring in terms of mean values.

Male students ranked the indicators of ‘better criteria for mentors’ selection’ (mean 2.0) and ‘intensive training of mentors’ (mean 1.89) at the top. In their opinions, the indicators of ‘mentor-mentee good relationships’ (mean 1.11) and ‘monetary support for mentors on excellent performance’ (mean 1.50) ranked at the lowest. Female students, on the other hand, rated all the indicators as most important or important; but those ranked at the top as per their opinions were ‘mentors’ commitment to achieve targets’ (mean 1.90) and ‘effective planning and budgeting’ (mean 1.92). The relatively less important indicator according to female was ‘intensive training of mentors’ (mean 1.70). The average mean of the ten indicators for the male and female students was 1.64 and 1.78 respectively, which shows that overall female students relatively more rated the ten indicators for effective mentoring as ‘most important’ or important than male students.

Comparing the opinions of the B.Ed students against the variable of institution, it was found that students of GCET Lahore more rated the ten indicators as ‘most important’ or ‘important’ than their fellows at GCET Mianwali. The indicators relatively more emphasized by students of GCET Lahore were: mentor-mentee good relationships (mean 2.63) and mentors’ commitment to achieve targets (mean 2.58). Their opinions in regard to the indicators of ‘intensive training of mentors’ (mean 2.17) and ‘conducive learning environment’ (mean 2.29) were relatively less positive. The students of GCET Mianwali, on the other hand, more strongly recommended the indicators of effective planning and budgeting (mean 1.62), conducive learning environment and better criteria for mentors’ selection (each with mean 1.55). They rated the indicators of ‘mentor-mentee relationships’ (mean 1.19) as the least important. The average mean values of all the ten indicators for effective mentoring at GCET Lahore and Mianwali were 2.37 and 1.47 respectively, which clearly shows students at Lahore had more positive opinions about the ten indicators than of Mianwali.

Table III explores the overall situation of students’ opinions by gender and institution in terms of mean, standard deviation, coefficient of variation and Independent Samples Test (Levene’s test and 2-tailed t-test) about all the ten key indicators for

effective mentoring. It shows that female students more favoured the ten key indicators for effective mentoring than the male students. The value .421 of 2-tailed sig. is higher than 0.05, therefore it was found that the difference between genders was not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis (Ho1) was accepted at $\alpha = 0.05$. Institution-wise, the students at GCET Lahore more strongly recommended the key indicators for effective mentoring than students at GCET Mianwali. t-test also revealed a significant difference in the opinions of B.Ed students regarding the importance of ten indicators for effective mentoring. Therefore, the null hypothesis (Ho2) was rejected at $\alpha = 0.05$.

The above results show that all the indicators identified through literature review were considered either most important or important by the B.Ed students in the GCETs, and this satisfactorily answers to research question 1 of the study. The female respondents relatively more emphasized the ten indicators for effective mentoring than male, and students of GCET Lahore perceived those more important than their fellows at GCET Mianwali. None of the indicators was rated as least important. These findings were in line with the previous research (Feiman-Nemser, 1995; Ganser, 1995; NFIE, 2001).

Students Opinions about their Mentoring in Six Pedagogical Aspects

Part-III of students' questionnaire contained six pedagogical aspects: attitudinal/behavioural development, teaching learning strategies/skills, communication skills, lesson planning and preparation, lesson delivery or presentation skills, and assessment techniques. About each aspect, the students were asked to give their opinions as to 'how far they were mentored? And if they still needed to be mentored or taught? At GCET Lahore, between two-thirds to three-fourths of the B.Ed students responded to each aspect, while at GCET Mianwali, about 90% B.Ed students gave their opinions about mentoring in the six pedagogical aspects. This part answers to research questions 2 of the study.

Regarding the first aspect i.e. attitudinal/behavioural development, at GCET Lahore, about half of the students reported that they learnt 'good behaviour'. Almost the same majority also remarked that they still needed to develop their behaviour and attitude through interaction with their teachers and fellows. At GCET Mianwali, about 40%

responded that they were mentored by their teacher educators to a large extent and about the same proportion reported that they learnt about the behavioural development to some extent. They desired for more mentoring in the latest techniques of attitude and behavioural development.

Some of the respondents gave interesting remarks. For example, one of them said that “she doesn’t know deeply”. Another remarked as ‘no need’. Other comments given by a single respondents were: *We learnt discipline, I have become punctual, They have gained confidence, I need mentoring about tolerance in behaviour, I want to create the quality of tolerance in my behaviour.*

Two of the respondents stressed on the need of learning ethics and moral values, while one wrote beautifully “Our behaviour is always good. We are perfect so there is no need to develop behaviour”.

The second pedagogical aspect about which students were asked to give their opinions was ‘teaching learning strategies/skills’. Around half of the students reported that they learnt better skills of teaching and learning and needed more mentoring in this area. However, with the exception of a few, students at both GCET Lahore and Mianwali, did not indicate particular teaching skills or strategies which they learnt. A few remarked that had learnt the proper use of white board and projector, while some others said that they learnt how to deliver a good lecture?

Eight students claimed that they learnt computer skills and multimedia to some extent and they needed to learn more. Five students stressed over the need for developing the skills of use of A.V. aids.” A female student reported as “she has learnt lecture and demonstration method. And she wants to learn ‘cooperative learning’, questioning...”.

The third pedagogical aspect about which mentoring support asked from the B.Ed students was ‘communication skills’. A little less than two-third majority (62%) opined that they had learnt the communication skills from their teachers, and almost the same majority was of the view that they still needed to improve their communication skills, especially in English. 6.7% reported that they learnt the technique of ‘questioning’; almost the same claimed that they improved their communication skills in Urdu, but they

needed to improve or learn more to communicate well in English. A student remarked as ‘now we can communicate with students easily’. Another student said ‘now I can convey my ideas in good way’. About two of the ten students pointed out the problem of ‘English as a medium of instruction and assessment’.

The fourth and fifth inter-related pedagogical aspects were ‘lesson planning and presentation skills’. Around two-thirds of the B.Ed students reported that they had learnt lesson planning and presentation to a large extent, but a few of them also asserted that they still feel problem in lesson presentation. Here again, a few indicated the problem of English as a medium of instruction. A few however, stated that they have developed confidence in lesson planning and presentation in the classroom. A female student, for example, reported as “I learnt to develop objectives of lesson planning and I need learn lesson delivery to gain confidence’. Another female asserted as;

I have learnt how to plan the lessons of different subjects...we need to plan lessons through computer. I have also learnt better delivery/ presentation of lessons ... we need to gain more confidence”.

A female remarked as “we can now prepare lesson plans with new ideas”. Another reported that she has learnt lesson planning and presentation to a small extent, as she reported “I learnt the lesson planning to some extent... but I am not satisfied with my presentation skills... and I want to do more practice in this field”.

The sixth pedagogical aspect was about “mentoring need in assessment skills”. About half of the B.Ed students reported that they learnt assessment skills, and many of those and some others also pointed out they needed more to learn assessment skills. A few reported that they learnt to construct test items, especially multiple choice questions. A few of them also reported that they learnt the skill of making classroom observations and conducting interviews, as a female asserted “we learnt observations, interviews, projects and assignments’ assessment”. A female B.Ed student reported as “this ability has been improved among us”. Some students showed their partial satisfaction, for example, as a student remarked as, “we did not learn assessment techniques so much”. A few, however, remarked that they did not learn this skill, as female responded straightforwardly “no”.

If we talk about the overall picture of the six pedagogical aspects that how much the B.Ed students learnt and they needed to learn? It becomes clear that about two-thirds of the B.Ed students were mentored in the six pedagogical areas. They were mentored relatively better in teaching learning strategies and lesson planning in comparison to behavioural and attitudinal development, and lesson presentation. They needed structured mentoring in all these six pedagogical areas to become effective teachers.

3.2 Perceptions of Teachers' Opinions about Mentoring

Response Rate and Results on Demographic Profile

At GCET Lahore, against the total of 34 administered questionnaires, 32 were received back. Three of the questionnaires were excluded during data reviewing and cleaning process, hence 29 responses were considered for analysis; the overall response rate remained 85.3%. In this training college, there was co-teaching staff in equal proportion. The response rate among male and female was 90% and 76.5% respectively. Hence, it was better among male teachers than female by about 13.5%. In correspond to this, at GCET Mianwali, there were a total of ten teacher educators; five of them were drawn for the pilot study so that they were excluded from the main study. The remaining five sampled teacher educators responded the questionnaire; the response rate remained 100%. Being an institution for men, gender-analysis was not required.

The demographic information in teachers' questionnaire included: gender; university qualifications; training/mentoring experience; teaching and administrative experience at primary/elementary level; teaching and administrative experience at secondary level; and research publications. Of the 34 male and female respondents, only two respondents (6%) held M.Phil qualification; no one held a PhD degree in any discipline. Twelve (35.3%) had earned two master degrees – a degree in Education and one in any other subject. The educational qualification of the other 20 respondents (58.8%) was master's degree in any subject with B.Ed/B.S.Ed.

In regard to training experience, three held an experience between 1-3 years, three between 4-6 years, six between 7-9 years; ten between 10-15 years, five between 16-20 years, and two held an experience as teacher trainers of 21 years or more. Five of

the teacher educators, however did not indicate their experience. Of those who mentioned about their experience, 60% had an experience of 10 years or more. There was no marked difference in the male and female respondents in regard to their training experience at the GCETs. In regard to their teaching, research and administrative experience, about three-quarters held some teaching experience, while others possessed some administrative and/or research experience.

Only three teacher educators of GCET Lahore and Mianwali reported to had some teaching experience in any primary or elementary school prior to joining the GCET as teacher trainer. It can be inferred from here that the majority of the teachers either started their teaching career from GCET or some government secondary or higher secondary school.

Of the 34 teacher educators, nine (26.4%) reported to had published work in the form of research reports, books and/or articles. Of these nine, two did not report the amount of publications actually at their credit. The seven who indicated; one earned five publications in some magazines/journals, while the others published either one/two reports or books. Overall, about three-quarters of the respondents had no research publication in any form.

Opinions of Teachers about Ten Indicators for Effective Mentoring

The GCETs' teachers were asked to rate the ten key indicators for effective mentoring at three-point scale: 'most important (3), important (1), and least important (1)'. The analysis in this part accepted or rejected the null hypotheses (Ho3, Ho4 and Ho5) at $\alpha = 0.05$. It also partially answered to the research question 1 of the study.

The results showed that more female than male teachers had rated the ten indicators as 'most important' or 'important'. Likewise, more teachers at GCET Lahore rated the ten indicators for effective mentoring as 'most important or important'. Table IV displays the gender and institution-wise comparison against the ten indicators for effective mentoring of B.Ed students in terms of mean values. It indicates that there was a little difference in the opinions of male and female teachers; the latter relatively more

rated as 'most important' to the various indicators for effective mentoring at B.Ed level than the former. The average mean of all the ten indicators among the male and female teachers was 2.23 and 2.32, respectively. Male teachers more rated as most important or important to 'mentee-mentor good relationships', mentors' commitment to achieve targets' and conducive learning environment. The female respondents, on the other hand, had more positive opinions about 'mentee-mentor good relationships' and 'intensive training of mentors'. The least important indicator for both male and female gender was 'mentors' selection criteria', 'monetary support for mentors' and 'mentees eagerness to learn'.

Institution-wise, there was a marked difference in the opinions of the teachers at GCET Lahore and Mianwali; the teachers at GCET Lahore more emphasised the ten indicators as 'most important or important'. It can be seen from the overall average mean values of respondents at each institution, Lahore (2.47) versus Mianwali (1.20). At GCET Lahore, the highest mean was in favour of mentor-mentee good relationships, and then for indicators of 'intensive training of mentors and mentors', and 'commitment to achieve targets' while the lowest mean was for better criteria for mentors' selection and monetary support for mentors on excellent performance.

Table V revealed that female teachers had relatively more positive opinions about the ten indicators for effective mentoring at B.Ed level than male teachers. This is evident on the basis of high mean (by 1.9), and low SD and CV values for female respondents. t-test revealed no significant difference in the opinions of male and female teachers about all of these ten indicators. Hence the null hypothesis Ho3 was not rejected at $\alpha = 0.05$. Institution-wise, teachers in GCET Lahore had more positive opinions about the ten key indicators for effective mentoring than their counterparts in Mianwali. This is evident on the basis of high mean (by 12.9), and low SD and CV values for respondents at GCET Lahore. t-test demonstrated significant difference in the opinions of the respondents of GCET Lahore and Mianwali regarding the ten key indicators for effective mentoring; the teachers at the GCET Lahore more emphasised these indicators by rating as 'most important' than their counterparts at GCET Mianwali. Therefore, the null hypothesis (Ho4) was rejected at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Overall the most five prioritized indicators across both genders were: mentee-mentor good relationships, intensive training of mentors, mentors' commitment to achieve targets, supporting and encouraging attitude of mentor, and effective supervision, monitoring and evaluation. Previous research supports this finding (Fieman-Nemser, 1995; Ganser, 1995, NFIE, 2001).

Ho5 of the study was 'there is no correlation between the opinions of the B.Ed students and teachers at GCET Lahore and Mianwali about key indicators of effective mentoring'. Pearson correlation was applied to investigate the extent of correlation. It was found that there was a moderate correlation (.552) in the opinions of the students and teachers. It means both teachers and B.Ed students were of the view that the ten indicators for effective mentoring were important at B.Ed level in the GCETs. But as the value of correlation (.552) was not high, so 2-tailed t-test revealed that the correlation was not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, hence the null hypothesis (Ho5) was accepted.

Teachers' Opinions on B.Ed Students' Mentoring in Six Pedagogical Areas

Part-III of the questionnaire was about rating B.Ed students in regard to mentoring about six pedagogical aspects at three-point scale: most needed (3), needed (2) and least needed (1). The analysis given in this part accepted or rejected the null hypotheses - Ho6 and Ho7 of the study.

All the male and female teachers were of the opinions that the six pedagogical aspects were either 'most needed' or 'needed'. The mean values showed that both male and female teachers agreed to the need for mentoring B.Ed students in these six pedagogical areas: behavioural/attitudinal development, teaching-learning strategies/skills, communication skills, lesson planning and preparation, lesson presentation or delivery and assessment techniques. In regard to these six pedagogical skills, female teachers perceived that they need more mentoring than male teachers. This is also evident on the basis of high mean, and low SD and CV values for female gender. t-test revealed no significant difference in the opinions of male and female respondents; the null hypothesis (Ho6) was not rejected at $\alpha = 0.05$ (Table VI).

Institution-wise, the teachers at GCET Lahore were of the opinions that the B.Ed students needed mentoring in the six pedagogical aspects in comparison to their colleagues at Mianwali. This is evident on the basis of high mean and low SD and CV values for Lahore respondents. t-test revealed highly significant difference in the opinions of the respondents at GCET Lahore and Mianwali; the former were more of the opinions that their students needed mentoring in the six pedagogical areas than the latter. Therefore, H_0 was rejected at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table VII further displays the item-wise teachers' opinions in regard to mentoring need of B.Ed students at GCET Lahore and Mianwali. It reveals that there was no marked difference in the opinions of male and female teachers; however the difference was prominent against the variable of institution. On the basis of high mean value for female respondents (2.67) for the item 'behavioural/attitudinal development', it can be inferred that their B.Ed students have more need for mentoring in this pedagogical area in comparison to their male counterparts. The female teachers gave second priority to 'communication skills' (mean 2.50). They however perceived that their students needed the least mentoring in 'assessment techniques'. The greatest need in regard to mentoring B.Ed students as reported by male gender was in 'attitudinal/behavioural development', and they perceived that their students needed the least mentoring in lesson presentation and assessment techniques. The other aspects i.e. communication skills, lesson planning and teaching learning strategies were ranked some where in the middle. Gender-wise, more female than male teachers emphasised on the need for mentoring their B.Ed students in the six pedagogical areas. The overall mean value for the male and female teachers was 2.29 and 2.45, respectively.

A marked difference was found in the opinions of teachers at GCET Lahore and Mianwali. The mean values were more than twice in favour of respondents at GCET Lahore in comparison to the respondents at Mianwali. To teachers at GCET Lahore, the highly needed areas for students' mentoring were: behavioural and attitudinal development, communication skills and lesson planning. The results were surprising in the sense that Mianwali teachers perceived that their students needed the least mentoring in all the six pedagogical areas. The overall mean value of the six pedagogical areas at

GCET Lahore and Mianwali were 2.55 and 1.20 respectively.

Analysing the above discussions on the extent of need for mentoring B.Ed students in six pedagogical areas, it is asserted that there was a significant difference in the opinions of the respondents at GCET Lahore and Mianwali; the former more realized the need for mentoring B.Ed students than the latter. As a caution, it is essential to mention here, that the variations in results against the variables of gender and institution might be due marked difference in their sample size.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the above results, following conclusions and recommendations can be put forward;

- ✚ Around two-third of the B.Ed students receive partial mentoring at the GCETs; it should be more structured or systematic.
- ✚ B.Ed students are relatively more properly mentored in lesson planning, teaching learning and assessment skills than attitudinal or behavioural development, communication and lesson presentation skills. They need more mentoring, especially in these three deficient areas.
- ✚ More female than male are adequately mentored, though they more desire for mentoring in the six pedagogical areas. Likewise, students at GCET Mianwali are relatively better mentored than of Lahore, though they still desire to seek guidance and help from their teachers/mentors.
- ✚ Almost all the students and teachers recommended the ten quality indicators for effective mentoring. Females, both students and teachers, have more positive opinions about these indicators than males. The relatively more emphasised indicators are: selection criteria for mentors, intensive training for mentors, mentee-mentor good relationships, and mentors' commitment to achieve targets.
- ✚ Instruction and assessment in English medium is a barrier in effective mentoring of students in college and on teaching practice. Therefore, either Urdu as a

medium of instruction and assessment should be allowed at the University of Education Lahore and all its constituent and affiliated colleges.

- ✚ There is a moderate positive correlation in the opinions of B.Ed students and teachers in regard to the ten key indicators for effective mentoring.
- ✚ There is a need for a large scale research on these mentoring themes so that a tangible mentoring model for B.Ed students could be developed at B.Ed level which may be followed at other universities and higher education institutions offering B.Ed programme in their own context in the country.

Acknowledgements

The researchers acknowledge the support of the School of Lifelong Education and Development, University of Bradford, UK and the financial support of Higher Education Commission Pakistan for this research project. They also acknowledge the professional support of Ph. D scholars, especially Muhammad Azeem and Khalil-ur-Rehman in data collection and analysis.

References

- Boydell, D. (1986) *Issues in teaching practice supervision research: A review of the literature*. Paper presented in the conference on Teaching Practice Supervision in Primary Schools, College of St. Paul and St. Mary, Cheltenham, (10 July).
- Collison, J. (1998) Mentoring: releasing the true potential of school-based ITE, in: C. Richards, N. Simco and S. Twiselton (Eds.) *Primary teacher education: High status? High standards* (London, The Falmer Press), 174-176.
- Estyn (2001) *Good practice in mentoring trainee primary teachers in Wales* (Wales: Estyn).
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001) Helping novice learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51 (1), 17-30.
- Flaxman, E., Ascher, L. & Harrington, C. (1968) *Mentoring programmes and practices: an analysis of the literature* (New York, Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Columbia University Teachers' College).

- Furlong, J. & Maynard, T. (1995) *Mentoring student teachers* (London, Routledge).
- Ganser, T. (1995) What are the concerns and questions of mentors of beginning teachers? *NASSP Bulletin*, 79 (575), 83-91.
- Gay, B. (1997) The practice of mentoring, in: J. Stephenson (Ed.) *Mentoring- the new panacea? Mentor and protégé* (Norfolk NR: Peter Francis Publishers), 19-28.
- Haney, A. (1997) The role of mentorship in the workplace, in: M.C. Taylor (Ed.) *Workplace education* (Toronto; Culture Concepts), 211-228.
- Holloway, J.H. (2001) The benefits of mentoring, *Educational Leadership*, May, 85-86.
- Hudson, P. & Skamp, K. (2001) *Mentoring pre-service teachers of primary science*. Paper presented at the Science Teachers' Association of Ontario Conference, Toronto, Canada .
- Kapanka, A. R. H. (1998) Journey to the millennium: mentoring in the clinical laboratory – includes related article on history and models of mentoring, *Medical Laboratory Observer*, May, 1-4. Available online at: http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3230/is_n5_v30/ai_20775737 (accessed on 5 February 2007).
- Kochon, F. K. & Trimble S. B. (2000) From mentoring to co-mentoring: establishing collaborative relationships. *Theory into Practice*, 39 (1), pp. 20-28.
- Le-Cornu, R. (2005) Peer mentoring: engaging pre-service teachers in mentoring one another. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 13 (3), 355-366.
- Lindgren, U. (2005) Experiences of beginning teachers in a school-based mentoring program in Sweden. *Educational Studies*, 31 (3), pp. 251-263.
- Mullen, C.A. & Lick, D.W. (1999) *New directions in mentoring: creating a culture of synergy* (London, The Falmer Press).
- National Foundation for the Improvement of Education (2001) Creating a teacher mentoring program (Washington, DC: NFIE). Available online at: <http://www.neafoundation.org/publications/mentoring.htm> (accessed on 8-11-2006).
- Price, A. & Willett, J. (2006) Primary teachers' perceptions of impact of initial teacher training upon primary schools, *Journal of In-service Education*, 32 (1), 33-45.
- Thompson, L. L. (1982) *Faculty and student perceptions of early field experiences*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Yates, J. W. (1993) Student teaching: results of a recent survey, *Educational Research*, 24 (3), 212-215.
- Zeichner, K. (1978) The student teaching experience, *Action in Teacher Education*, 1, 58-62.

Zeichner, K. and Liston, D. (1987) Teaching student teachers to reflect, *Harvard Education Review*, 57 (1), pp. 23-49. http://www.mandbf.org.uk/mentoring_and_befriending/25 (accessed on 5 January 2007).

Correspondence

Dr. Muhammad Saeed

Email: drsaeed61@hotmail.com