

MENTORING STYLES AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO PEDAGOGICAL AND DIDACTIC COMPETENCE DEVELOPMENT

Nijolė Čiučiulkienė

Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

Rita Mičiulienė

Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

Abstract. *The current educational theoretical and practical discourse intensively highlights the issue of the relationship between the mentor and mentee, in other words, the style of mentoring. The issue of influence of mentoring style to the development of mentees' pedagogical and didactic competencies is still not sufficiently investigated. The purpose of the study is to explore mentoring styles and examine their contribution to the development of pedagogical didactic competencies of mentees. Reflective reports of student teachers (N=10) who had their internship practice in secondary schools, were analyzed using content (deductive) analysis method. The findings suggest that emerging mentoring style depends on the age and the previous pedagogical experience of mentee's: young and having no pedagogical practice mentees tend to follow the traditional-hierarchical mentoring relationship, while older and with some pedagogical experience mentees prefer to practice reciprocal relationship with their mentors. Anyway, in both highlighted cases, the emphasis of mentors is placed on the development of didactical competencies rather than pedagogical. The prevailing mentor – mentee relationship in secondary education and implications for the professional identity of student teachers are discussed as well.*

Keywords: *didactic competencies, mentoring styles, pedagogical competencies, reciprocal mentoring, traditional mentoring.*

Introduction

Mentoring is a process when a more qualified and experienced person teaches, supports, promotes, advises and maintains good relationships with a less skilled or experienced person in order to facilitate the professional and/or personal development of this person within the organization (Žukauskaitė, 2014; cites Lankau & Scandura, 2002). A number of studies were designed to illuminate the professional and personal development of new teachers at their career start (Hutchison & Colwell, 2012; Kemmis, Heikkinen, Fransson, Aspfors, & Edwards-Groves, 2014) and to explore the relationship between mentor and mentee for beginning teachers (Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, & Tomlinson, 2009;

Jones & Brown, 2011; Kupila & Karila, 2018) or in pre-service teacher education (Ambrosetti & Dekers, 2010; Ambrosetti, 2014; Ambrosetti, Dekkers, & Knight, 2017).

Mentoring is considered to be one of key forms of emotional and psychological support while providing the professional induction of beginning teachers (Hobson, 2002; Marable & Raimondi, 2007; Malderez et al., 2007), developing their competence repertoire that would emancipate their pedagogical socialization (Wang et al., 2008). No wonder that the issues of successful development of future teachers' professional emancipation still regard mentoring as educational priority, the effective realization of which needs efficient models and styles (Jones & Brown, 2011).

Professional benefits of mentoring occur when mentors clearly articulate and model pedagogical knowledge in such a way providing the possibilities for both: mentor and mentee teacher development (Hudson, 2013). For this reason, some of researchers tried to find the connections between the mentoring models and teacher development (Kensington-Miller, 2011; Geeraerts et al., 2015), beginning teacher's self-authorship process (Augustinienė & Čiučiulkienė, 2013), key components specific for mentor–mentee/protégé behaviors and interactions (Eller, Lev, & Feurer, 2014) or examined the contribution of mentoring styles to academic success among mentees (Leidenfrost, Strassnig, Schabmann, Spiel, & Carbon, 2011).

The above presented insights may be rounded up while highlighting the most relevant issues such as: mentoring as a professional support, mentoring as developmental process with its specific models and styles, mentoring models and styles' benefits to teacher development. Since there are studies researching the contribution of mentoring upon teacher development, our intention was to look deeper into this process.

In the current study, we aimed to examine in-depth mentoring styles, so as to elucidate mentor–mentee relationship prevailing in secondary education and determine mentoring style contribution to pedagogical and didactic competence development of student-teachers.

A theoretical framework that focused on a holistic mentoring standpoint was utilized to frame the research and analyze the data. Employing a qualitative approach, we conducted content (deductive) analysis of individual mentees' reflections in order to test the prevailing mentoring style. Then, a complementary method – a framework method – was used to structure the summarized data so that it can support answering the research questions.

Background

There is increased interest in and emphasis on mentoring theory and practice during the past years. The phenomenon is described in psychological terms, within the tradition of social psychology, from the theoretical view of business management or human resources development and from the perspective of social cognitive career theory (Kemmis et al., 2014). Therefore, the term is used differently in different terms and settings. In our view, mentoring in pre-service teacher education is defined as personal relationship between more experienced and a less experienced members of organization who work towards specific professional and personal outcomes for the mentee (Ambrosetti & Dekkers, 2010; Harvey, McIntyre, Thompson, Heames, & Moeller, 2009).

This relationship, or role models, can be different. The dominant, widely conceptualized in scientific literature, according to Kram's (1985) mentor role theory (cited in Jones & Brown, 2011) is **traditional mentoring**. Briefly, it can be summarized as one-way hierarchical relationship in passing experience where the mentor is older and more experienced while the protégé is younger and less well established within the organization (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007). The mentor serves as authority, an exemplar and a guide when the mentee (protégé) is inclined to fit into the organization. But both parts are holding the power, because of their ability to withdraw from the relationship having incurred less personal cost, arguing the protégé invests less into the relationship (Anderson & Shore, 2008).

Reverse mentoring is seen as appropriate for the current rapidly-changing and technologically-advancing social context (Harvey et al., 2009). Reverse mentoring occurs when young and technologically adept junior members teach senior colleagues (Kemmis et al., 2014; Jones & Brown, 2011). In traditional mentoring situations, the mentor is charged with transferring existing organizational knowledge to the mentee, while in reverse mentoring, the knowledge that is transferred is often knowledge from outside the organization (Kemmis et al., 2014).

The concept of **reciprocal mentoring** arises from the current mentoring literature that suggests that mentoring may be beneficial for both, the mentor and the mentee, and that in terms of learning these individuals may be 'co-learners' (Kemmis et al., 2014). They shape interdependent, collaborative relationship, based on mutual respect (Bryant & Terborg, 2008; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Ragins & Kram, 2007), in equity rather than equality (Harris, Freeman, & Aerni, 2009).

Peer mentoring usually is defined as a relation where both partners are at comparable levels of experience and may be both mentor and protégé simultaneously, as they work together to facilitate growth and development in each other (Mayrinac, 2005; Kensington-Miller, 2011).

In response to rapidly changing organizational and social environments, scholars have explored other models of mentoring such as lateral mentoring (Bryant & Terborg, 2008; Langer, 2010), developmental networks (Higgins & Kram, 2001), multi-mentoring (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007), team mentoring (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007), and mosaic mentoring in which “peers interact around an area of shared interest” (Mullen, 2009, p. 11). Palmberg (2009), Jones and Brown (2011) supplemented these frameworks by a complex adaptive systems (CAS) perspective as “a set of interdependent agents forming an integrated whole, where an agent may be a person or an organization” (Jones & Brown, 2011, p. 484). In one or another way, all these models proposed individuals the necessary developmental assistance from a set of people rather than just one person, moving beyond the dyad focus of both traditional and reciprocal mentoring.

Traditionally, mentors provide help in two general areas: career development which facilitates the mentee’s advancement in the organization, in other words, the mentor acts as a career coach and professional helper, with a focus on understanding how the organization operates at a cultural and political level (Stead, 2005); and psychosocial support which contributes to the mentee’s personal growth and professional development, including role modelling, personal support, increasing confidence and self-awareness in mentee’s ability, and professional identity (Kram & Isabela, 1985; Bennetts, 2002; Stead, 2005). In this study, we are interested in professional teacher’s growth which is understood as the development of teacher’s pedagogical and didactic competencies (Inventory of Pedagogical Professional Competencies, 2015).

Pedagogical competencies include the teacher – learner relationship: good knowledge of their students, cooperation with students, interest and respect of their needs, their personal problems. In other words, it is good class management, including ethical and moral issues. According to McInerney (2013), positive pedagogical relationships with students and a good emotional atmosphere in the classroom are prerequisites for effective teaching and learning.

Meanwhile, the concept of didactic competence includes models of teaching, i.e., the planning, execution, and evaluation of lessons (ibid, pp. 752-753). This competence is conditioned by the acquisition of efficient teaching strategies associated with combatting erroneous personal theories of teaching and accompanied by constant reflection over one's own teaching activity (Opre, Opre, & Zaharie, 2012). The main shift from traditional teacher-centred conceptions of teaching to more student-centred ones with a greater emphasis on learning than teaching forces teachers to look for appropriate teaching strategies, methods and techniques.

Methodology

While referring to the pre-service teacher context, we stress a holistic mentoring approach which “is rooted in the desire to make connections, build relationships, and mend false separations in and out of educational spaces to construct meaningful teaching and learning experiences” (Bieler, 2013). “Holistic” implies an intervention that holds together all three classic components of mentoring: continuing education, personal support, and professional development (Freeman, 1997). In other words it highlights the interdependent web of relationships between all the participants in the mentoring process, which, on its turn, attends to professional, corporate and personal development (Clutterbuck, 2001; Keller, 2005; Stead, 2005; Ambrosetti & Dekkers, 2010; Ambrosetti, 2014). While analytically distinguishing between pedagogical and didactic competencies, as well as different mentoring styles, we treat all these theoretical components as a whole rather than in parts.

Qualitative research design best matched our holistic mentoring approach for data collection and analysis. As an instrument for data collection the written reflections of mentees were used.

Reflection is a process used to carefully consider values and practices in the light of supporting evidence. Written reflection is considered to have value for student teachers in that it promotes habits associated with construction of new ideas and reconstruction of existing ideas with a view to improving practice (Heirdsfield et al., 2008). The student teachers responded to 3 open-ended reflection questions: a) “*What were Your relations with Your mentor?* b) *Could You highlight the most important moments that influenced Your professional development during Your practice*” c) “*What pedagogical and didactic competencies were You developing during the practice?*”. The length of the reports varied from 2 to 7 pages.

Table 1 Participants’ socio-demographical characteristics

Participant No.	Code	Gender	Age	Teaching experience
1	R1	Male	31	Teaching experience was acquired during the pedagogical practice
2	R2	Female	34	5 years of teaching experience at the university, but not at school
3	R3	Female	39	16 years of teaching at the primary and secondary schools
4	R4	Female	41	18 years of teaching at the primary and secondary schools and university of applied sciences

5	R5	Female	32	5 years of teaching experience at the university, but not at school
6	R6	Female	35	4 years of teaching experience at the university; 7 years of teaching at private special language schools, tutoring small groups of adults, who wanted to learn a foreign language
7	R7	Female	43	20 years of teaching at the primary and secondary schools and university of applied sciences (mainly the course of language for specific purposes).
8	R8	Female	37	7 years of teaching at secondary schools and gymnasiums with special programmes for foreign language teaching.
9	R9	Female	32	3 years of teaching experience at the university, but not at school
10	R10	Male	32	2 years of teaching in private schools and Lithuanian weekend schools in Ireland

Participants. 10 student teachers who were in the final phase of their teacher education studies and who participated in the professional internship during the academic year 2016-2017 took part in this study. The specific feature of the pedagogical practice was the performance of the Action Research.

Table 1 displays the sample characteristics. All of the participants had some experience of teaching, at least of teaching practices included in their pedagogical studies. All participants are teachers / future teachers of a foreign language.

Procedures and ethics. The research idea, task and procedures were discussed during the staff meeting of Education department. The department of Education X University permitted organizing this study and the students were asked for permission to use their writings as research material. Mentees filled out a paper form reflection at the end of their internship.

Data analysis. Deductive content analysis is a qualitative data analytic approach that allows to identify and describe emerging patterns within a data-set. This technique was used to analyze the content of mentees' reflections. We started our analysis with a theory and relevant research findings as guidance for initial codes (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). A coding scheme was developed before the analysis and responses were reviewed carefully. First, we used existing theoretical background to develop key concepts or variables such as traditional, reciprocal, reverse, peer-mentoring styles as well as pedagogical and didactic competencies, as initial coding categories seeking to evaluate the prevalence of mentoring styles. Next, operational definitions for each mentoring style category were determined while using the theoretical ground. We (the two authors) independently reviewed all of the mentees' final reflection reports and coded all the data following initial coding categories. No data illustrating peer-review and reverse mentoring styles was found, therefore, these categories were eliminated from further analysis.

Then, we applied a framework method aiming to find links between mentoring styles and teachers competencies. This analytical strategy, with notation to pragmatism, is appropriate for the analysis of textual data, where it is important to be able to compare and contrast data by themes across many cases, while also situating each perspective in context by retaining the connection to other aspects of inquiry (Gale, Heath, Cameron, Rashid, & Redwood, 2013).

A framework method is a way of summarizing and analyzing qualitative data which allows to analyze the data both by case (in our case, competencies) and theme (mentoring styles). According to Gale et al. (2013), there are 7 stages to data analysis using the framework method: transcription of the data; familiarization with the text of interviews; coding (using the deductive approach, we looked for data which corresponded with our defined themes); development of framework for analysis and based on the identified codes; applying the analytical framework; charting data into the framework matrix, and interpreting the data. Coded responses were subsequently organized in a matrix: the horizontal axis of the matrix includes mentoring styles, while the vertical axis – teacher competencies (pedagogical and didactic). Accordingly, the matrix output of summarized data provides a structure that can support answering the research questions (Gale, Heath, Cameron, Rashid, & Redwood, 2013). According to Groenland (2014), the semi-quantitative components (such as counting of responses, ranking) are possible in the framework method, and we included them in order to enable case comparisons. Thus, the framework method was aimed at finding confirmation of the structure and contents of the conceptual model of the study, as based on scientific knowledge.

Results

In table 2 the main data illustrating dominant mentoring styles is presented. We identified two mentoring styles: traditional and reciprocal. Unfortunately, we did not detect reverse and peer-mentoring.

Table 2 Dominating mentoring styles

Traditional	Reciprocal
<p><i>“I worked together with a very experienced teacher and mentor. She always knew what she wanted. ... It is difficult to argue with her ... I always felt safe” (R1).</i></p> <p><i>“At first our relationship with my mentor was quite traditional. She was instructing me how to organize the class. <...> While preparing for my class, I tried to follow my mentor’s directions” (R2)</i></p>	<p><i>“I must confess that at the beginning I was worried about mentor’s being bossy. <...> Though the mentor presented her models, I was given space enough to insert my ideas. The mentor respected my opinion and my small initiatives.”(R2)</i></p> <p><i>“Though I had some teaching practice, this experience was new to me. I especially appreciate my discussions with my mentor. We discussed many questions, argued as colleagues, she accepted my</i></p>

<p>“My mentor is a really good example of a mentor-teacher”. She has answers and solutions to the majority of the situations. I like to observe her classes” (R5)</p> <p>“I was always thinking that there is a very little difference in teaching university students. I expected to be prior with my university teaching experience. But very soon I understood that I need my mentor not only for formalities, but for practical advice how to model my classrooms.”(R6)</p> <p>“My mentor is an expert teacher. Though I always feel suspicious about various authorities, she is a good example even for more experienced teachers than me. I decided to follow her instructions in order not to be a failure” (R9)</p> <p>“Teaching in Ireland is my first normal job. The system is different. One has to work as a teacher, to be on duty at school and many other things. My mentor here is a great help. He explained me the school rules, the documents, the classroom culture. I always feel his support” (R10)</p>	<p>ideas. On my turn, I was inspired to re-evaluate my experience. This practice was a real professional development”. (R3).</p> <p>“Our main meeting topic is the reflection of our activities. My mentor is very positive. Sometimes it seems to me that there is nothing to discuss, but she always finds something to speak about. We discuss my methods used during the class. I like station method very much. My mentor is not so fond of this method still during our reflection she recognized and appreciated the pupils’ progress and my opinion”. (R4)</p> <p>“We with my mentor were colleagues. But me, being a student, and her, being my mentor, opened new ways of our relationship. We both became more open with our ideas about organizing classes. We tried CLIL and team teaching. These activities need a lot of planning, arrangement and rearrangement of the ideas. There should be a lot of reflection. But the most important to me is our changed relations: from colleagues we turned into friends” (R7)</p> <p>“We spent a lot of time with my mentor thinking how to make our classes more interesting. I explained the possibilities of Action research. Now we both are doing action research, speak about our didactical and pedagogical progress. It makes our practice more inclusive...” (R8)</p>
---	---

Participants, who had had no or very little experience in teaching (R1, R2, R5, R6, and R10) shaped traditional relationships with their mentors (“My mentor here is a great help. He explained me the school rules, the documents, the classroom culture. I always feel his support” R10; “My mentor is a really good example of a mentor-teacher”. She has answers and solutions to the majority of the situations. I like to observe her classes” R5; “But very soon I understood that I need my mentor not only for formalities, but for practical advice how to model my classrooms.” R6). The rest of the respondents (R3, R4, R7, R8) already had some experience at school and teaching, therefore the relationship was different: more trust (“Mentor said that she trusted me“ R3) and respect (“The mentor respected my opinion and my small initiatives” R2, “during our reflection she recognized and appreciated the pupils’ progress and my opinion” R4), collaboration (“She [mentor] accepted my suggestions” R3; “We both became more open with our ideas about organizing classes “ R7) and inspirations (“The discussion with my mentor inspired my personal search for organizing it” R2; “...I wanted to try my own ideas” R2; “Now we both are doing action research, speak about our didactical and pedagogical progress. It makes our practice more inclusive...” R8), sharing of ideas was implicated in this relationship.

Experience of Participant 2 unfolded the move from one mentoring style to other: at the beginning of internship the mentoring relationship seemed to be more traditional, but somewhere in the activities the change occurred. Reciprocal mentoring brought more satisfaction to both parties (*“We both (me and the mentor) were pleased with the lesson” R3, R4, R7, R8*), and mentees expectations were exceeded (*“... I have made a considerable progress in becoming a teacher” R2; “But the most important to me is our changed relations: from colleagues we turned into friends” R7; “Now we both are doing action research, speak about our didactical and pedagogical progress ...” R8*). While reflecting on traditional mentoring style Participant 1 remembered their relationship as *“demanding”*, setting *“clear tasks and terms”* (*“My mentor has suggested the ideas, I grouped them, prepared my plan and gave it my mentor to check” R1*) although this did not discouraged teaching (*“I would like to choose to teach” R1*).

Table 3 A framework matrix illustrating mentoring styles contribution on competence

Competence area	Traditional	Reciprocal
Pedagogical	<p><i>“We discussed with our mentor long-term training plans, their curriculum requirements” R1</i></p> <p><i>“Our discussion was about how to motivate our students” R1</i></p> <p><i>“Today we have spoken methods, textbooks, and lesson planning. My mentor highlighted the importance of additional material also about homework load” R1</i></p> <p><i>“Together with the mentor we examined the data of the electronic diary” R1</i></p> <p><i>“I tried to fulfil my mentor’s recommendations how to motivate class leaders to participate in our theatre” R5</i></p> <p><i>“My mentor and me organized consultations for parents who wanted to know about their children’s achievements. My mentor wanted that we all could come to agreement about homework control” R6</i></p> <p><i>“As my mentor suggested, I tried to highlight and rely on school regulations to stop being late” R10</i></p>	<p><i>“I learnt that my standards were a little too high when evaluating pupils and that I should have given them better marks” R2</i></p> <p><i>“I was given a remark that I failed to summarize what the pupils learnt in the lesson.” R2</i></p> <p><i>“... we analyzed differentiation with my mentor..” R2</i></p> <p><i>“Following mentor’s and my discussion points I pay a lot of attention to the class character analysis and understanding of individual pupils” R3</i></p> <p><i>“She [mentor] referred to the assessment of individual pupils as an area to be improved in the lesson” R3</i></p> <p><i>“We with my mentor came to common conclusion that we need to give the pupils more time for their reflection at the end of the class” R4</i></p> <p><i>“We both with my mentor cultivate positive critics, not only regarding us, but also we try to direct it towards pupils. We teach how to think and even criticize in a positive manner” R7</i></p> <p><i>“We involved into Action Research our students as well”. I was so happy when they started to ask the AR question: HOW COULD I HELP...” R8</i></p>
Didactic	<p><i>“Preparation for a lesson was devoted to the teaching how to prepare the debate file” R1</i></p> <p><i>“Mentor gave me ‘Teacher’s Book’ and asked to prepare listening</i></p>	<p><i>“I learn this technique from my mentor during lesson observation and was glad to put it to test” R2</i></p> <p><i>“During the whole class mentor was able to match active material teaching („if clauses“) and explaining didactics to me. At the end of the class</i></p>

	<p><i>tasks with the hints stimulating a discussion” R5</i> <i>“Mentor explained how to organize video reporting. She said that we would do team teaching and presented the guidelines as well” R6</i> <i>“I devoted much time to plan the grammar exercises, following mentor’s directions” R9</i> <i>“Mentor stressed that in Ireland teaching is quite traditional. Teachers stick to curriculum given tasks.” R10</i></p>	<p><i>we all participated in reflection what we have learned” R2</i> <i>“The mentor noticed that I sometimes have lesson time management problems” R3</i> <i>“While preparing for my class, I tried to follow my mentor’s directions: to take away the tension, not to correct the speaking slips” R2</i> <i>“We were discussing with my mentor about introducing methods for vocabulary teaching” R3</i> <i>“I enjoyed the art and language integrated classes very much. It opens more possibilities for creativity development. My pupils always were happy about these classes. We have even illustrated our exercise books” R4</i> <i>“My top is “Station” method. It is vivid, communicative, and collaborative. I persuaded my mentor to practice it” R7</i> <i>“As we were doing Action Research, I always tried to prepare different task for basic group and for those students I observed. I always involved them in direct language learning. I was very happy when they started to use active vocabulary and participate in the discussion” R8</i></p>
--	--	---

Student teachers develop their pedagogical and didactic competencies in both, traditional and reciprocal mentoring styles, although there are some differences. Traditional mentoring style pays major attention to the development of pedagogical competencies of student teachers: they are taught to motivate their pupils, to work with parents, to fulfill the curriculum requirements and stick to school regulations.

Didactic competencies are developed by explaining and practicing particular teaching/learning methods, instructing how to plan lesson time. On the whole didactic competencies are developed by following methodical directions.

Reciprocal mentoring style preserves the balance between pedagogical and didactic competencies. Mentors and their mentees analyzed reflection, differentiation, evaluation of students’ achievements. Didactic block of competencies highlight the effective lesson management, practice of active teaching/learning methods, team teaching and content and language integrated learning (CLIL).

Conclusions

As it is known to us, this is the first attempt to examine contribution of mentoring styles to professional development of teachers in pre-service education. We did not make any a priori hypotheses about this relation – we conducted the qualitative study as if to have a deeper comprehensive approach on these relationships.

We expected the mentees to identify their didactic competence development more than pedagogical since it is very important to become a great “master” in the very start of the career. But more emphasis was placed on pedagogical competence. Especially this “correlation” emerged within traditional mentoring style. Reciprocal model, on its turn, more inspires the development of both competencies.

The interrelation between mentoring styles and duration of mentee’s practical teaching experience was obvious: the more the experience mentee had, the more mutually equivalent relationship emerged between mentor and mentee.

References

- Ambrosetti, A. (2014). Are you ready to be a mentor? Preparing teachers for mentoring pre-service teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(6), 3.
- Ambrosetti, A., & Dekkers, J. (2010). The Interconnectedness of the Roles of Mentors and Mentees in Pre-Service Teacher Education Mentoring Relationships. *Australian journal of teacher education*, 35(6), 42-55.
- Ambrosetti, A., Dekkers, J., & Knight, B.A. (2017). Mentoring triad: an alternative mentoring model for preservice teacher education? *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 25(1), 42-60.
- Anderson, D.D., & Shore, W.J. (2008). Ethical issues and concerns associated with mentoring undergraduate students. *Ethics & Behavior*, 18(1), 1-25.
- Augustiniene, A., & Ciuciulkiene, N. (2013). Reverse mentoring as facilitating factor for the development of a beginning teacher’s self-authorship process. *Social Sciences*, 81(3), 73-84.
- Bennetts, C. (2002). Traditional mentor relationships, intimacy and emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(2), 155-170.
- Bieler, D., & Fink, L.S. (2013). Strengthening new teacher agency through holistic mentoring. *English journal*, 102(3), 23-32.
- Bozeman, B., & Feeney, M.K. (2007). Toward a useful theory of mentoring: A conceptual analysis and critique. *Administration & society*, 39(6), 719-739.
- Bryant, S.E., & Terborg, J.R. (2008). Impact of peer mentor training on creating and sharing organizational knowledge. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 11-29.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2001). Quiet transformation: The growing power of mentoring. *Mt Eliza Business Review*, 3, 47-52.
- Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in higher education*, 50(6), 525-545.
- Eller, L.S., Lev, E.L., & Feurer, A. (2014). Key components of an effective mentoring relationship: A qualitative study. *Nurse education today*, 34(5), 815-820.
- Freeman, R. (1997). Towards effective mentoring in general practice. *British Journal of General Practice*, 47(420), 457-460.
- Gale, N.K., Heath, G., Cameron, E., Rashid, S., & Redwood, S. (2013). Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC medical research methodology*, 13(1), 117.

- Geeraerts, K., Tynjälä, P., Heikkinen, H.L., Markkanen, I., Pennanen, M., & Gijbels, D. (2015). Peer-group mentoring as a tool for teacher development. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3), 358-377.
- Groenland, E. (2014). Employing the Matrix Method as a tool for the analysis of qualitative research data in the business domain. Retrieved from: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2495330>
- Harvey, M., McIntyre, N., Thompson Heames, J., & Moeller, M. (2009). Mentoring global female managers in the global marketplace: Traditional, reverse, and reciprocal mentoring. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(6), 1344-1361.
- Harris, J.B., Freeman, T.L., & Aerni, P.W. (2009). On becoming educational researchers: The importance of cogenerative mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 17(1), 23–39.
- Heirdsfield, A.M., Walker, S., Walsh, K., & Wilss, L. (2008). Peer mentoring for first-year teacher education students: The mentors' experience. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 6(2), 109-124. DOI.org/10.1080/13611260801916135
- Higgins, M.C., & Kram, K.E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *Academy of management review*, 26(2), 264-288.
- Hobson, A.J. (2002). Student teachers' perceptions of school-based mentoring in initial teacher training (ITT). *Mentoring and tutoring*, 10(1), 5-20.
- Hobson, A.J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P.D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and teacher education*, 25(1), 207-216.
- Hsieh, H.F., & Shannon, S.E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Hudson, P. (2013). Mentoring as professional development: 'growth for both mentor and mentee. *Professional development in education*, 39(5), 771-783.
- Hutchison, A., & Colwell, J. (2012). Using a wiki to facilitate an online professional learning community for induction and mentoring teachers. *Education and Information Technologies*, 17(3), 273-289.
- Jones, R., & Brown, D. (2011). The mentoring relationship as a complex adaptive system: Finding a model for our experience. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 19(4), 401-418.
- Keller, T.E. (2005). A systemic model of the youth mentoring intervention. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26(2), 169-188.
- Kemmis, S., Heikkinen, H.L., Fransson, G., Aspfors, J., & Edwards-Groves, C. (2014). Mentoring of new teachers as a contested practice: Supervision, support and collaborative self-development. *Teaching and teacher education*, 43, 154-164.
- Kensington-Miller, B. (2011). Peer mentoring: stories of three mathematics teachers. *Teacher Development*, 15(3), 293-304. DOI: 10.1080/13664530.2011.608510
- Kram, K.E., & Isabella, L.A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of management Journal*, 28(1), 110-132.
- Kupila, P., & Karila, K. (2018). Peer mentoring as a support for beginning preschool teachers. *Professional Development in Education*. DOI:10.1080/19415257.2018.1427130
- Langer, A.M. (2010). Mentoring nontraditional undergraduate students: A case study in higher education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 18(1), 23-38.
- Lankau, M.J., & Scandura, T.A. (2002). An investigation of personal learning in mentoring relationships: Content, antecedents, and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 779-790.

- Leidenfrost, B., Strassnig, B., Schabmann, A., Spiel, C., & Carbon, C.C. (2011). Peer mentoring styles and their contribution to academic success among mentees: A person-oriented study in higher education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 19(3), 347-364.
- Malderez, A., Hobson, A.J., Tracey, L., & Kerr, K. (2007). Becoming a student teacher: core features of the experience. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30, (3), 225-248.
- Marable, M.A., & Raimondi, S.L. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of what was most (and least) supportive during their first year of teaching. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 15(1), 25-37.
- Mavrinac, M.A. (2005). Transformational leadership: Peer mentoring as a values-based learning process. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 5(3), 391-404.
- McInerney, D.M. (2013). *Educational psychology: Constructing learning* Pearson Higher Education AU.
- Mullen, C.A. (2009). Re-Imagining the Human Dimension of Mentoring: A Framework for Research Administration and the Academy. *Journal of research administration*, 40(1), 10-31.
- Opre, D., Opre, A., & Zaharie, M. (2012). A cognitive behavioral approach of university staff didactic expertise. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 33, 969-973.
- Palmberg, K. (2009). Complex adaptive systems as metaphors for organizational management. *The Learning Organization*, 16(6), 483-498.
- Inventory of Pedagogical Professional Competencies/ Pedagogogo profesijos kompetencijų aprašas (2015). Projektas „Pedagogų kvalifikacijos tobulinimo ir perkvalifikavimo sistemos plėtra (II etapas)“. SFM Nr. VP1–2.2.–ŠMM–02–V–01–009, 2015. Parengė VšĮ Efektyvaus valdymo sprendimų centras, ekspertų grupė, 2015, Vilnius.
- Ragins, B.R., & Kram, K.E. (2007). The roots and meaning of mentoring. *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice*, 3-15.
- Sorcinelli, M.D., & Yun, J. (2007). From mentor to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39(6), 58-61.
- Shore, W.J., Toyokawa, T., & Anderson, D.D. (2008). Context-specific effects on reciprocity in mentoring relationships: ethical implications. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(1), 17-29.
- Stead, V. (2005). Mentoring: a model for leadership development? *International Journal of Training and Development*, 9(3), 170-184.
- Wang, J., Odell, S.J., & Schwille, S.A. (2008). Effects of teacher induction on beginning teachers' teaching: A critical review of the literature. *Journal of teacher education*, 59(2), 132-152.
- Žukauskaitė, I. (2014). Mentorystė ir naujų darbuotojų socializacija: laikas galvoti apie mentorių atranką? *Acta Paedagogica Vilnensia*, 33(33), 79-95.