

Mentor, colleague, co-learner and judge: using Bourdieu to evaluate the motivations of mentors of Newly Qualified Teachers.

Abstract

This study uses Bourdieu's interconnected notions of fields, habitus and capital as a theoretical template to analyse the responses of eight mentors of Newly Qualified Teachers with regard to the motivations and challenges of their role. This is an original grounded approach to the analysis of the experiences of such mentors. The data reveal that each mentor was a highly committed re-creator of the fields and habitus in which they operated, although this was not consciously done. They were each also committed to helping the NQTs develop professional cultural capital. Although Bourdieu famously referred to education as 'symbolic violence' the data from this study give no indication that the recreation of fields through the mentoring of professional practice was viewed as an act of dominion on the part of the mentors. Rather, these mentors saw their role as an empowering aspect of professional agency in which both parties shared in a co-authoring of a (usually) positive and mutually-affirming outcome.

Key words

Mentor, NQT, Bourdieu, assessment of professional practice, teaching practice

Introduction and context

This study was undertaken in primary and secondary schools in South East London and Kent, England. Traditionally, the model of Initial Teacher Training (ITT) in England has been arranged through undergraduate or post-graduate programmes, and in both routes trainees' time is spent in multiple locations. Some time is spent in the university, where trainees study theoretical, regulatory and statutory aspects of teaching in the trainee's chosen age phase. Additionally, a large proportion of time (currently a minimum of 120 days) is spent in placement schools, where trainees, under the support and judgement of designated mentors who are typically experienced teachers or senior managers at the schools, manage and engage with the lesson planning, teaching and assessment of children. To be successful on these placements, trainees are required to demonstrate that they satisfy the standards (DfE, 2011) required to achieve Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT) status. Since 1992, schools and universities have been rigorously inspected by the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted), and since 2012, the impact that schools, teachers and trainee teachers have on the progress of pupils has been a key indicator of effectiveness in the most recent iteration of the guidance inspection handbooks published by Ofsted (Ofsted, 2016 & 2012).

The mentoring of trainee teachers, and as a corollary the significance of the role of the mentor, has moved on a long way in the last twenty five years. In the 1980s and 1990s, the provision of all teacher training in England was housed in universities (or in polytechnics prior to the Further and Higher Education Act, 1992), and the focus of the mentoring of trainee teachers was exclusively on the trainee. To be a mentor was to be interested and involved in the professional progress of a trainee teacher or teachers. The mentor was a third party facilitator, overseeing a trainee's professional development, but did not have responsibility for it. The success or failure of the process was realised predominantly by the success or failure of the trainee. Much of the published work at the time identified stages of progression that trainee teachers might go through, or the most common categories of

concern expressed by student teachers (Guillaume & Rudney, 1993; Furlong & Maynard 1995; Campbell & Kane, 1998; Twiselton, 2000). It was all very trainee-centric.

A number of factors have instigated a seismic shift in attitudes to mentoring and mentor processes since 2000, and as a corollary, the way mentors see themselves has changed too. Firstly, a number of new routes into teaching were introduced, including School Consortium Initial Teacher Training (SCITTs, from approximately 1998), Teach First (2002), and salaried or unsalaried School Direct (2012). These are each work-based routes into teaching, in which universities, although often having a quality assurance role, were not directly responsible for recruitment and outcomes of the programmes. Each route had (and still has) slightly different priorities for mentors. For example, in the salaried School Direct route, the stakes are high for a successful outcome for both the trainee and the school, making satisfaction of standards and targets a pre-requisite for both parties.

Secondly, when inspecting Initial Teacher Training (ITT) providers, Ofsted inspectors now take a highly interested view of the efficacy and accuracy of mentoring, and the equitable judgements that ITT partnerships make about trainees' performances, both within institutions, and nationally. Over the last five years the focus of mentoring has been expanded, not least as a result of successive Ofsted frameworks and handbooks. For example, within the Ofsted handbook (2012), Initial Teacher Training providers were asked to give "evidence of the experience and expertise of mentors and trainers" (p12), and the document makes clear that Ofsted would make a judgement about "the accuracy of the ITE partnership's assessment of trainees" (p15).

More recently, the Ofsted School Inspection Handbook (2016) makes clear that the responsibility to ensure trainees' progress, even in the first two years of their teaching as Newly Qualified Teachers, lies in the hands of ITT partnerships, and the NQTs' mentors. "Inspectors must assess the effectiveness of the support and professional development put in place for NQTs ... This must include the quality of mentoring and what the school has done to support [trainees'] development in areas for improvement identified by initial teacher training providers" (p22). This responsibility is likely to be reinforced still further, given the recent consultation document (DfE, 2017) which seeks to strengthen Qualified Teacher Status in the UK by delaying the awarding of QTS until the end of a two-year induction period, one year longer than that recommended by the European Commission (2006). This will raise the status and accountability of mentors within UK schools, as the key decision to award NQT status will lie with the school and mentor, not with the ITT institution.

Thirdly, schools are now much more interested in the demonstration of pupil progress (DfE, 2011, Teachers' Standard 2) than they once were, and so the focus of mentoring has moved from the progress of the trainee to the progress of the learner(s). As a result of these three factors, the focus of mentoring has moved from trainee-centred approach to instead encompass measurable aspects of progress of the pupil or learner, and the mentor has become responsible for the quality of the trainees' support and progress. The trainee teacher is no longer the central figure in the process, and the mentor is no longer just an interested and supportive third party. The NQT mentor has become both colleague and judge.

Thus, incrementally over the last twenty five years, the mentor's role has changed so that the mentor has become an accountable part of a quality assurance process by which NQTs, schools and providers of ITT are judged. Once, schools simply asked experienced teachers whether they might like to oversee one or more aspiring entrants to the profession. Now, the

stakes are higher and increasingly mentors have become the gatekeepers to the profession. Ingelby (2011, and 2010), referencing Tedder and Lawy (2009), argues that mentorship has been altered “from a developmental into a judgemental function” (2011:16) as a direct result of a standards-led model of teacher training. Ingelby goes on to argue that the professional development enjoyed by trainees in the 1980s and 1990s has been narrowed and homogenised, making mentoring a bureaucratic exercise as much as a personal, intellectual, emotional and professionally developmental one.

This is an arena laced with tension: an arena in which all those who function within it need to have a clear sense of self identity and to have an ability to confidently articulate their professional values in order to be successful. For example, Gibson, Dollarhide, & Moss (2010) describe “the transformational tasks that are required for professional identity development” (p 21). Similarly, Lewis (2011) explores the “emphasis on boundary maintenance” (p 836) within the sociology of professions. These writers identify and emphasise the significance, sometimes unspoken, of a shared and mutually transmitted understanding of professional values and ideology, together with an appreciation of the power dynamics which pertain within the mentor and mentee relationship.

Review of the literature, including cross-European perspectives.

This study explores the rules, attitudes and motivations that one group of mentors of Newly Qualified Teachers, working in schools in South East London and Kent, bring to the field, and uses the ‘toolkit’ of Bourdieu (Bunn & Palmer, 2016) as a lens to explore the way these mentors see themselves professionally within that process. However, the study also sits in an international field, as a large body of the available literature is comparative, with scope across European and global settings.

Bourdieu’s identification of the interrelated concepts of field, habitus and capital, are referred to by Heimans (2012) as Bourdieu’s “theoretical triumvirate” (p.376). For Bourdieu, fields are the multiple arenas in which a person or persons live and work their daily lives. Humans are very adept at juggling, connecting or keeping separate a range of often very nuanced or compartmentalised aspects of living (professional, personal, matrimonial, managerial, social, cultural, linguistic, gendered, educational ...), by varying their behaviours and attributes in each. Walther (2014:8) refers to Bourdieu’s fields as “relatively autonomous microcosm[s]”, which are based upon “an historically generated system of shared meaning” (Iellatchitch et al., 2003:732). A field will have, and will continually reinforce, its own rules and values, and anyone wishing to function within the field will need to articulate the norms of that field consistently. This articulation, through such characteristics as behaviours, dress, attitudes, speech, routines, unspoken understandings, co-authored happenings and shared experiences, is (for Bourdieu) habitus. Because of the constant reaffirmation of identity, fields tend to recreate themselves. The shared values, resources, and protocols that operate within a field make the field autonomous (Bourdieu 1996; Maton, 2005), and the habitus within it is, by nature, inert.

Such a description of fields and habitus has immediate resonance for schools, and it was in regard to the fields of education that Bourdieu was impassioned, as he made analysis not only of the social spaces which are schools and classrooms, and the ways in which both learners and teachers interact and compete with their peers within them, but also of the relationship between policy makers (macro- and micro-). Capital is, in Bourdieulian terms, habitus in action, and those that have most capital are most influential, for better or for worse, in

defining, reinforcing and recreating the field. “Crucially, a field is a social space of conflict in which agents compete to establish monopoly over the species of capital effective in it ... and the power to decree the hierarchy ... between all forms of authority in the field of power” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992:17). In other words, if habitus is the game, capital is the ability to play the game well.

Bourdieu is not without his critics. His concepts of fields, habitus and capital give the rather bleak and deterministic outlook that social reproduction is inevitable. Goldthorpe (2007) is nothing short of scathing of such an approach, damning with faint praise a “domesticated understanding of Bourdieu’s work as tolerably sound, at least for its time” (p18), and pronouncing Bourdieu’s social reproduction “signature concept” (Lareau and Weininger 2003: 568) as being unsound on the grounds that a serious difficulty in Bourdieu is “a kind of latent functionalism” (Savage, Warde and Devine, 2005: 11) which renders as unattainable significant social or cultural change for individuals or for institutions. Goldthorpe prefers to speak of social, linguistic or cultural values or resources (p1) for a society which is less class driven than when Bourdieu was writing in the 1970s and 1980s.

Nonetheless Bourdieu’s concepts provide a useful theoretical tool with which to make analysis and evaluation of the responses of the participating mentors who participated in this study, as he provides a meta-language and vocabulary which can be used to underpin and contextualise the professional interplay priorities found between NQT mentors and mentees.

There are number of studies from across Europe (and globally) which explore and categorise different common aspects of mentoring in different countries. For example, Kemmis et al. (2014), referring to ‘practice architectures’ (p.154) of mentoring in Australia (New South Wales), Finland and Sweden, identify three common forms (or projects) of mentoring, each involving different preconceptions and discursive arrangements. The first of these three is a developmental approach, where the focus is process-driven. The new teacher is learning to be a teaching technician, and the successful completion of induction is paramount. The second is product-driven, and the progress of the pupils is important here. The third is social, and here the new teacher is being helped to ‘situate themselves within the school community’ (p155). It is in this third area that Bourdieulian principles can be keenly felt.

This social aspect has also been explored elsewhere. For example, building on the work of Franke & Dahlgren (1996), and of Orland-Barak & Klein (2005), van Ginckel et al. (2016) undertook a quantitative study of 726 mentors in 13 Dutch schools. Van Ginckel et al. sought to examine relationships between mentors’ motives for undertaking the role, and the beliefs and practices they brought to it. The study identified two conceptions which mentors may hold or prioritise to greater or lesser extents. Neither is mutually exclusive to the other, but these two conceptions are internally coherent sets of beliefs about the goals, sources and nature of mentoring. The first is an ‘instrumental conception’, in which mentors “orient themselves mainly to concerns for effective teaching practice” (p104). Here mentors and trainees concern themselves with the mechanics of teaching - behaviour and classroom management, planning and assessment, routines and control. The second is a ‘developmental conception’, in which mentors “orient themselves mainly to concerns about mentee learning and professional development” (p105). Here, the pupil experience is given priority. The mentor and mentee’s focus is on such things as pupil autonomy, thinking and learning processes, pupil progress, communication (teacher/pupil, and pupil/pupil), metacognition, and learning relationships.

Having identified the most prominent conceptions, van Ginckel et al. (2006) also noticed a pattern in the data, showing that amongst the participants of their study, “mentors with a personal learning motive for being a mentor teacher also tend to hold a developmental conception of mentored learning to teach, more than an instrumental conception” (p111). Such mentors reported a relationship with their mentees which engendered joint knowledge construction, and a strong element of co-working and mutual learning with their mentees. In other words, many mentors in Ginckel et al.’s study took on the role for their own continuing professional development, not just for the benefit of the mentee.

International comparisons are not universally welcomed. Välijärvi & Heikkinen (2012), again exploring mentoring in Finland, and Pennanen et al. (2015), who compare mentoring in Finland and Australia, each warn against the expectation that haphazardly disseminating or exporting systems or process from one education system to another will automatically have positive outcomes, because national contexts and cultural predispositions may not allow it. However, it is interesting to note that in all the studies in different countries referred to above, and in this study, the quest for a relationship that mentors and mentees seek beyond the necessary evidence-based paper processes of induction is a common and identifiable feature.

It may seem incongruous that an experienced teacher may seek or enjoy a co-learning experience with a novice NQT, yet Ingelby & Hunt (2008) note the satisfaction of mentors as they empathise with an apprentice who will have experienced a packed ITT programme, “... the intensity of [which] can mean that the trainees are unable to reflect fully on their developmental journey to qualified professional status” (p62) until they are actually in post. As such, on their first appointment, NQTs are not yet fully-formed autonomous professionals, and so there is potential for moulding. There are Bourdieulian elements here, in which professional power is experienced, conferred, and shared between both mentor and mentee as their discourse and co-experienced practice lead to a reproduction and re-creation of shared professional understandings.

Additionally, there is benefit to both parties within the mentor/mentee co-learning relationship as it can allow meaningful connections to be made between research-based principles and practical classroom contexts (Ginckel & Wood, 2015). This is true both in terms of pedagogy, and of a principled application of aspects of mentoring. However, there can be a tension here. Ginckel & Wood (2015) go on to suggest that ITT programmes, taught predominantly by former teachers who may no longer be faced with the “pressures and dilemmas that classroom teachers face” (p97), can often be divorced from a modern reality. As Ingelby & Hunt (2008) perceptively put it, “What if mentors are not talking about teaching in the same way that trainee teachers talk about teaching?” (p64). Smith (2010) asks whether it is desirable that the two agree, if dialogue is to be anything other than a mutually affirming experience.

There is also a question of pre-service training experiences contributing to preconceived expectations of mentors on the part of mentees. NQTs will have completed a gruelling ITT programme in which their performances were continually assessed and graded against agreed national standards and descriptors. The agent of this judgement would often have been their mentor. On completion of their programme NQTs are armed with the knowledge that they have satisfied a range of standards, but Ambrosetti (2010) identifies and ranks expectations that NQTs have of their mentors (Table 1) from a survey of 75 Australian students on completing their ITT programme. In particular in Ambrosetti’s study, NQTs looked forward to the experience of working ‘with’ a mentor, as opposed to working ‘under’ him or her. The

outcome of Ambrosetti's study shows that overwhelmingly NQTs spoke of aspects of relationship and power; of 'becoming'; of self-responsibility; of "being treated as an equal" (p128); of learning without judgement; and of 'learning from', not 'learning about' or 'learning for'.

Table 1: Expectations NQTs hold about the professional relationship they hope to have with their mentors

- Mentees prefer a mentoring relationship that is supportive and comfortable and one where they are given feedback about their progress.
 - Mentees prefer mentors from whom they can learn, rather than someone who will judge and grade them.
 - Mentees view their own role as one of self-responsibility.
 - Mentees expect that mentor teachers will provide opportunities for learning, and that they themselves will make use of the opportunities.
- Ambrosetti (2010:129)

The aspect of the mentor role that these 75 NQTs valued least, almost without exception, was the opportunity to be graded and assessed. Again, tensions arise here in the NQT/mentor relationship. Much as modern mentors may strive to liaise with NQTs in the manner to which NQTs hope to be treated, there continues to be an essential assessment and accountability component within the relationship (Ofsted 2012 & 2016) which has a serious effect on the efficacy of the mentoring process (Porter, Youngs, & Odden, 2001; Grudnoff, Tuck, & Hawe, 2005; Smith, 2010). Haigh & Ell (2014) speak of the way in which the dual purposes of the mentoring role, "professional learning, and professional accountability, ... have a confounding influence on how it is done" (2014:11). Again there is a power dynamic here, which can be informed by Bourdieu's identification of the interrelated concepts of field.

If Ambrosetti's (2010) NQTs speak of 'becoming', then what they 'become' will be dependent upon the influences and incentives found within the field. As Bourdieu put it, "the combination of dispositions and interests associated with a particular class of social position inclines agents to strive to reproduce, at a constant or increasing rate, the properties constituting their social identities" (Bourdieu, 1988:176), or to put it another way, fields have a tendency to recreate themselves, and the players within any given field exercise habitus in order to develop the capital needed for that recreation to be facilitated. However, within the field of the NQT in a school, one of those properties which would constitute a confirmed social identity occurs when Ingelby's (2011) developmental function becomes a judgemental one (as it must at the conclusion of the NQT process). At this point the professional characteristics required to be successful must be seen to be formally satisfied. Mentor and mentees therefore cooperate (or perhaps collude) to confirm standards; to affirm processes; to recreate the field. For the NQT to be successful, s/he must articulate and demonstrate the norms of the field, and the mentor must formally acknowledge that the NQT's articulation is sufficient.

These considerations do not simply pertain to a parochial UK setting. From an international perspective, Zuljan & Požarnik (2014) acknowledge how economic, cultural and social changes in Europe have led to the role of the teacher becoming "much more complex and demanding, [resulting in] the induction period and early career years requiring special attention" (p192). They go on to cite the European Commission's (2006) recommendations which should be met in an NQT's induction, which include quality management (the competence of mentors), and a culture focused on school as a learning community in which

all the participants can benefit from mutual professional development. Stîngu (2013), comparing mentoring provision for NQTs in Estonia and Romania, found similar tensions to those found in our study. She found that Estonian and (to a lesser extent) Romanian mentors were instrumental in both creating and imposing learning climates and professional environments, recreating conditions they each perceived as desirable.

Method

The primary research question of this study sought to identify what were the principle motivations and challenges of mentors of Newly Qualified Teachers. The study achieves originality because it takes a new approach to analysis of the mentor experience by applying Bourdieu's toolkit of fields, habitus and capital as a lens upon the responses of a set of eight participant mentors, in particular his concept of a field's propensity to recreate itself. The study explores the extent of the participating mentors' potential conscious or unconscious role in any recreation.

We adopted an intrinsic case study approach (Stake 1995), since we were interested only in the participants themselves as a group. The mentors were not representative of a wider community. The study was also exploratory in nature (Yin, 2003), an approach adopted to identify the motivations of the participants without preconception of what their responses might contain. The data we collected were exclusively qualitative, since we took a phenomenological approach in that the study aimed to "focus on how life is experienced, [and was] not primarily concerned with the causes of things but ... instead [aimed] to provide a description of how things are experienced first-hand by those involved" (Denscombe, 2014:95). As such the responses are presented as indicative, localised realities which we acknowledge to be informative of lived experiences within specific and diverse settings, not as generalisable phenomena.

The eight mentors who participated in this study by being interviewed face-to-face were diverse in terms of their age, teaching experience, mentoring experience and the age phases within which they worked. They were not an homogenous group. All worked in different schools. No mentor was known to any of the others. Their teaching experience varied from 5 to 26 years; their mentoring experience ranged from 1 to 16 years; the time they had worked in their current school ranged from 3 months to 24 years; and their current phase of teaching ranged from Early Years to Secondary. All participants received assurances of anonymity, and so the names of all the mentors have been changed, and no school has been identified.

They were sampled opportunistically. They had in common that they were each mentoring an NQT who in July 2016 had successfully completed a programme of Initial Teacher Training, and each responded to an invitation to participate in a study exploring the professional experiences of NQTs who had been trained by the University. Three mentors had leadership roles (headteacher or deputy head) and all had a number of curriculum or pastoral responsibilities. Seven were female, one male. Four mentors were white, one was of a minority ethnicity, and three preferred not to identify. Finally, two mentors had acquired their own teaching qualification via a PGCE, five qualified via a B.A. or B.Ed, and one qualified via a four-year BSc. The study produced some rich data with regard to both NQT development and mentor experiences, and we have published elsewhere our findings with regard to dialogical self perceptions amongst the NQTs and context-dependent early career support needs of NQTs.

The study was simple in design. We visited the schools, and interviewed the mentors, asking a semi-structured series of questions designed to help them identify, reflect upon and analyse their values and motivations regarding the mentoring of NQTs. Cohen et al (2011:417) identify a number of types of interview question, of which we employed four - background questions (e.g. 'How long have you been a mentor'); experience questions ('What do you find most rewarding and most challenging about being a mentor'); construct-forming questions ('Tell me about the status of NQTs in this school'); and feelings questions ('What do you feel that the NQT has learnt from their ITE course that supports them the most when they come into school'). The length of interview ranged from 25 to 55 minutes. Two interviews were undertaken in pairs, with the NQT present (at the behest of the participants), and six were individual. So as not to skew the data, Bourdieu was not mentioned by name in these interviews, neither was the vocabulary which is inherent within his work. The results were collated and analysed, and in spite of the diverse professional characteristics the participants, some clear patterns in responses were recorded. It was during the data analysis process that the researchers identified that the responses strongly contained a Bourdieulian articulation.

There were three stages to the data analysis. Firstly, the interviews were transcribed and the data subjected to an inductive grounded approach, enabling the "theories to emerge from, rather than exist before, the data" (Cohen et al. 2011:598). Data were identified thematically by hand, the three researchers working separately. Secondly, the researchers worked together, to identify potential areas of focus that could each support a coherent article for publication, and in the third stage the researchers each made further analysis of one such area.

Data and discussion

This study attempted to explore, amongst a set of eight mentors of NQTs in schools in South East London and Kent, their motivations for mentoring, and their experiences of mentoring. Of the eight mentors in this study, when asked about their motivations in becoming a mentor, two responded that they were approached directly to perform the role, whilst six offered to do it. There is a clear divide in responses between these two routes of introduction to the role. The two mentors who were approached responded that prior to being asked, their reputation within the school was of someone who was strong in the classroom, and who had already been happy to share good practice with others, and so they accepted, seeing it as a natural continuation of their existing unofficial practice. By contrast, the six who offered to become mentors made no mention of their existing reputation within the school, but wanted first and foremost to nurture fellow professionals.

Ms Bailey: It's about sharing good practice and helping people to learn how to develop themselves. If people are enthusiastic enough to get into teaching, you've got to nurture them so they stay in it.

Ms Douglas: The helping, the nurturing, and wanting to help people be the best they can be. It's a classic teacher thing.

Ms Finch: It's rewarding. I enjoy supporting other teachers and seeing them grow, especially if I have seen them as a student, and then their transition to becoming a teacher.

One mentor took on the role to be nearer to the children.

Ms Cottingham: A previous role as a subject coordinator was just taking me away from the children. Mentoring is very much class-based, and you can be supportive, and I really enjoy doing it.

The tensions that mentors experience when wearing the twin hats of being a colleague who develops professional practice and being an assessor who judges it were raised quickly and without exception when the question ‘What are the biggest challenges of mentoring?’ was asked.

Mr Arthur: When a NQT is not doing well, it can get very messy. A school is a very unusual environment. It’s not like any other workplace. I have had an NQT who was not successful. It was all very upsetting. We all worked so hard on it.

Ms Bailey: When you give feedback and they don’t understand what it is that you’re trying to portray to them, why it’s important or, they take it too personally.

Ms Cottingham: If they don’t take advice. They have to take advice, and some won’t. But that only happened once.

Ms Douglas: The challenge is getting the balance between supporting them as an NQT and then supporting them as a teacher, as in what [the NQT] thinks a teacher is. It’s making sure the school’s non-negotiables are adhered to, whilst still being supportive. I know I am putting [the NQTs] under pressure, but it comes from higher up, doesn’t it?

Ms Elgar: How to challenge a particularly strong NQT, and knowing what an NQT should be capable of.

Ms Finch: Target setting, if the NQT does not share my view of what needs to be a priority. This is a big school, and we need them to engage with what we are doing.

Ms Gray: At the end of the day we need them to meet our standards for the sake of the progress of the children. It’s hard if [the NQTs] are not taking on our advice.

Ms Hodge: It’s hard when they won’t take on board what you are saying. It is staying professional with them, and reminding them of our expectations and trying to put change in place.

In each response, the immediate focus of the mentor is on helping the NQT to become someone that is, at the time of mentoring, not professionally fully formed, yet who must be developed in a given and perhaps prescribed direction. The mentor may or may not want to be the chooser and judge of that direction, but without exception the mentors in this study were aware of the tension, and they articulated it without any prompting. Mr Arthur, Ms Cottingham and Ms Hodge are trying (with degrees of success) to bring their NQTs into an understanding of the unique workplaces which are schools. They are trying to help their NQTs make a transition in order to share the professional vision of what it is to be a teacher in a given school, a vision which they hope (and expect) to be embraced by the NQT. Ms Bailey is frustrated when NQTs resist change in the form of their personal reactions to professional feedback. Ms Elgar takes a compliance view, being worried about standards, and

knowing what the minimum expectations of an NQT should be, and her role in judging whether these standards have been satisfied. Ms Douglas hits the tension head on when she refers to “the school’s non-negotiables [which] must be adhered to”. Ms Douglas has become, wittingly or not, the appointed catalyst of the school’s desire to recreate itself through the prescribed moulding of its NQT.

There is an interesting and telling use of language in several of these excerpts. Many mentors (Mr Arthur, Ms Finch, Ms Gray and Ms Hodge) chose to speak in the plural, articulating their responses as ‘we’ or ‘our’, referring to their own views as being representative of the school: its needs, its procedures and its standards.

Where and when an NQT fails to, in Bourdieulian terms, articulate the norms of the field, power struggles develop, and all eight mentors in this study articulated this specific tension when responding to a general question about the challenges mentors face. If NQTs want to succeed in their chosen workplace, they must either subscribe to the vision (or to the non-negotiable), or suffer the consequences, which can be severe, as Mr Arthur confirmed. In reality, in the context of NQTs embracing their new profession, this is very rarely a dictatorial struggle. It could be argued that what the mentors are experiencing and enforcing is compliance, not agency. However, the experience of the mentors in this study was that generally, NQTs want to subscribe. They want to share the vision that their school articulates, and in the absence of their own strong views of how a school should operate and what it should value they embrace and learn to articulate the norms of the school. They want to be successful, and so they become active and willing agents, co-authors in the recreation of the field. This is not brainwashing or symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1991) in the cause of something sinister. For the participants in this study, this is mutually-forged professional empowerment leading to collegiate best practice and affirmation.

An awareness of the recreation of fields is less prominent than a celebration of habitus and cultural and social capital when mentors in this study were asked to identify the most rewarding aspects of the role.

Mr Arthur: I love working with people who are new to the profession, who will have a go, take a few risks.

Ms Bailey: When you see the impact of your advice on the trainee of how to get better, and then they’re applying it and that they’re building better relationships with the students and progressing and they’re feeling more confident.

Ms Cottingham: Helping them access different support, meeting with them, see how they’re getting on. So I think, for me, I like to go and see what other people do and I think, although I’ve been teaching, what is it, 24 years, I still think you learn things from other people just talking through problems with them.

Ms Douglas: Seeing them teach lovely lessons, and, and seeing them grow from when they first come in, a bit overwhelmed to becoming autonomous, confident and happy in what they are doing.

Ms Elgar: Watching people remain happy teachers. That the culture of a love of teaching is something I’m really passionate about.

Ms Finch: When you can see the NQT is becoming clear on how things are done. I love it when NQTs want to better themselves as teachers, and become professional.

Ms Gray: You learn so much from them, with their fresh ideas, new training, new eyes on our old problems.

Ms Hodge: You get a buzz out of it when they take on board the things you are telling them, and you are helping them to become how we want them to be ... and then they thank you for doing it. It is empowering for both of us.

Mr Arthur, Ms Bailey and Ms Douglas each value autonomy, identifying confidence as an attribute to be valued. An example of Iellatchitch et al's (2003) 'system of shared meaning' occurs when this confidence is highlighted to the NQT as being a strength, a process which formally endues the NQT with capital, and an invitation to grow (Ms Douglas), get better (Ms Bailey), get on (Ms Cottingham) remain happy (Ms Elgar), and engage in what we are doing (Ms Finch).

The shared meaning is also evidenced by Mr Arthur, Ms Cottingham, Ms Elgar, Ms Finch, Ms Gray, and Ms Hodge. Their responses show a celebration of Bourdieu's habitus: a love of the game. These four mentors teach and mentor as 'we', not as 'I'. They are highly (if unconsciously) aware of the habitus of the field. Ms Finch came closest to an undiluted expression of Bourdieu in her assertion that "... this is a big school, and we need them to engage with what we are doing". Similarly Ms Hodge is openly Bourdeulian when she positively stated that she was 'helping them to become how we want them to be', and she found it mildly ironic that the NQT would be thankful and grateful for this semi-enforced metamorphosis. The mentors are each openly trying to recreate the field; to articulate the habitus through shared practice; and in so doing to foster professional capital in both themselves and in their NQT.

However, within the responses of the mentors in this study, there is no hint of Bourdieu & Wacquant's (1992) "... social space of conflict in which agents compete to establish monopoly over the species of capital effective in it" (p17). No response of any mentor suggested competition, or a power struggle, with the NQT. The opposite was true. The mentors actively encouraged confidence and capital within their NQTs, overtly endeavouring to recreate the field, and certainly to reaffirm habitus. Perhaps there is no need to compete for power when both parties know that inevitably a summative assessment of the articulation of the norms of the field will be a required logistic of the relationship between them. It is also the case that mentors, in judging the NQT at given assessment points, feel aspects of judgement themselves. Mr Arthur agonised over the "... NQT who was not successful. It was all very upsetting. We all worked so hard on it". He was the reluctant instrument of that decision, yet when the NQT failed, Mr Arthur felt he had failed too. One reason why mentors find a tension when mentoring moves from being a "developmental [role] into a judgemental function" (Ingelby, 2011:16) is because each of the participants in this study were united in one thing - they were not impartial disinterested judges. Their responses show that they are highly-committed field-makers, habitus-nurturers and capital-developers.

Conclusion

This study cannot be considered to be representative of all mentors everywhere. It has taken responses from a small number of mentors, each with different degrees of experience, and has demonstrated that a selected aspect of Bourdieu's theoretical tool kit remains relevant as a

theoretical underpinning of social science research. This study deliberately did not attempt to contextualise the ways in which the mentors felt positioned within a national framework for mentoring excellence (Ofsted, 2016 & 2012), and further studies might take a more political stance on the role of the mentor. Bourdieu (although he did not write about specific educational policy) could equally be used as a theoretical lens, although such a study might have to take in to account Bourdieu's notion of education being 'symbolic violence' (Colaguori, 2010), with all the linear notions of perpetrated domination and repression that such a phrase engenders.

The findings resonate with international literature. Stîngu (2013) sought to identify the extent to which novice Estonian and Romanian teachers receive personal, social and professional support. She noticed the tension between the important ongoing cooperative relationship between NQT and mentor, and the contrasting separatism of the end-of-induction evaluation through which the satisfaction of the Professional Standards for Teachers (Talilina Ülikool, 2008) is validated. Zuljan & Požarnik (2014) took a more philosophical approach, seeking to identify how the status of NQTs is perceived, and giving examples from different European countries. They ask, for example "Is the novice teacher treated as a civil servant or as an autonomous professional? Is the induction period more knowledge-based, experience-based or focused on purely organisational matters?" (p.195). These are all contributing factors in mentors' motivation and professional self-perception which were each being juggled and grappled with by the eight participating mentors in this study.

The preponderance of European literature in this field is focused on comparative studies of mentoring systems and processes in Norway, Sweden, Finland, Australia and Holland (Väljjarvi & Heikkinen, 2012; Kemmis et al., 2014; Pennanen et al., 2015; van Ginckel et al., 2016). Although none of the international studies we have presented makes direct reference to Bourdieu, there are Bourdieulian elements in each, and the motivation of mentors in each study is demonstrated to lie beyond the simple need to guide new teachers through induction processes, but extends to relationship and power dynamics. Similarly in each international study, another common Bourdieulian feature, although unvoiced by name, is the desire for new teachers to embrace the ethos and culture of their local setting, to articulate the norms, and to master or conform to locally-situated aspects of practice and professionalism in order to become more powerful and effective within the field in which they work.

This study has used Bourdieu as a vehicle to build on, and additionally theorise, these international studies, and to make analysis of the micro-relational experiences of eight mentors working in one small area of South East UK. We have used his vocabulary to articulate the lived and worked professional experiences of mentors of Newly Qualified Teachers. The study has shown mentors to be active agents in the process of field recreation and capital development. In speaking of their use of shared practice and a co-authoring of the NQTs' early-career experiences, they demonstrate that the fields within which they operate are not repressive regimes in which competition is rife, but rather that such fields, although to some extent autonomous from school to school, maintain professional values which mentors and NQTs are pleased to share and recreate.

6,675 words

References

- Ambrosetti, A. (2010) 'Mentoring and Learning to Teach: What do Pre-service Teachers Expect to Learn from their Mentor Teachers?' *International Journal of Learning* Vol 17 No.9 117-132
- Bourdieu, P. (1988) *Homo Academicus* Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Bourdieu, P (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power* Cambridge : Polity
- Bourdieu, P. (1996) *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity* London, Taylor & Francis
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant L. (1992) *An invitation to Reflexive Sociology* Paris, Seuil
- Bunn, C. & Palmer, V. (2016) 'Using Bourdieu's Toolkit to Critique and Improve Social Science Engagement with Physical Activity' In: Bourdieu Study Group Annual Conference 2016, Bristol, England, 4-6 2016
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison K. (2011) *Research Methods in Education (7th edition)* New York: Routledge
- Colaguori, C. (2010) 'Symbolic Violence and the Violation of Human Rights: Continuing the Sociological Critique of Domination' *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory* Vol. 3 (2), 388-400
- Campbell, A. & Kane, I. (1998) *School-Based Teacher Education* London: D Fulton
- Denscombe M. (2014) *The Good Research Guide (5th edition)* Maidenhead, England: Open University Press
- DfE (2017) *Strengthening Qualified Teacher Status and improving career progression for teachers: Government consultation* Crown Copyright
- DfE (2011) *Teachers' Standards: Guidance for school leaders, school staff and governing bodies* Crown Copyright
- Ell, F. & Haigh, M. (2015) 'Getting beyond "gut feeling": understanding how mentors judge readiness to teach' *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 143-155
- European Commission (2006) *Recommendations of the European Parliament and the Council on Key Competencies for Lifelong Learning* (Official Journal of the European Union 2006/962/EC)
- Franke, A., & Dahlgren, L. O. (1996). Conceptions of mentoring: An empirical study of conceptions of mentoring during the school-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 12, 627–641.
- Furlong, J. & Maynard, T. (1995) *Mentoring Student Teachers: the growth of Professional Knowledge* London: Routledge

Gibson, D.M., Dollarhide, C.T., & Moss, J.M. (2010) 'Professional Identity Development: A Grounded Theory of Transformational Tasks of New Counselors' *Counselor Education and Supervision* 50 (1) 21–38

Goldthorpe J.H. (2007) 'Cultural Capital': Some Critical Observations' *Sociologica* Vol.2 1-23

Grudnoff, L., Hawe, E. & Tuck, B. (2005) 'Effective teaching and standards for teaching: a loose coupling' *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 14, pp. 95–109

Guillaume, A.M. & Rudney, G.L. (1993). Student teachers' growth toward independence: An analysis of their changing concerns. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 65-80.

Gunckel, K.L. & Wood, M.B. (2016) 'The Principle-Practical Discourse Edge: Elementary preservice and Mentor Teachers Working Together on Colearning Tasks' *Science Education*, Vol. 100, No. 1, pp. 96–121

Haigh, M. & Ell, F. (2014) 'Consensus and dissensus in mentor teachers' judgments of readiness to teach' *Teaching and Teacher Education* Vol 40, 10–21

Heimans, S. (2012) 'Education Policy, Practice, and Power' *Educational Policy* 26(3) 369–393

Iellatchitch, A., Mayrhofer, W., and Meyer, M. (2003) 'Career fields: a small step towards a grand career theory?' *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 14:5 728–750

Ingleby, E. (2011) 'Asclepius or Hippocrates? Differing interpretations of post-compulsory initial teacher training mentoring' *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 63 (1) p15-25

Ingleby, E. (2010) 'Robbing Peter to pay Paul: The price of standards driven education' *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 15 (4): 427–40.

Ingleby, E. & Hunt, J. (2008) 'The CPD needs of mentors in post-compulsory Initial Teacher Training in England' *Journal of In-service Education* Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 61–74

Kemmis, S., Heikkinen, H.L.T., Fransson, G., Aspfords, J. & Edwards-Groves, C. (2014) 'Mentoring of new teachers as a contested practice: Supervision, support and collaborative self-development' *Teaching and Teacher Education* Vol 43, pp. 154-164

Lareau, A. and Weininger, E.B. (2003) 'Cultural Capital in Educational Research: A Critical Assessment.' *Theory and Society* 32: 567-606

Lewis, S.C. (2012) 'The tension between professional control and open participation' *Information, Communication and Society* 15 (6) 836-866

Maton, K. (2005) A question of autonomy: Bourdieu's field approach and higher education policy' *Journal of Education Policy* 20 (6), 687-704

Ofsted (2016) *School inspection handbook* Crown copyright 2016

Ofsted (2012) *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) inspection handbook* Crown copyright 2012

Orland-Barak, L., & Klein, S. (2005). 'The expressed and the realized: Mentors' representations of a mentoring conversation and its realization in practice' *Teaching and Teacher Education* 21, 379–402

Pennanen, M., Bristol, L., Wilkinson J., & Heikkinen, H.L.T (2015) 'What is 'good' mentoring? Understanding mentoring practices of teacher induction through case studies of Finland and Australia' *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 24:1, 27-53

Porter, A., Youngs, P. & Odden, A. (2001) 'Advances in teacher assessments and their uses', in Richardson V. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.), American Educational Research Association, Washington (2001)

Savage, M., Warde, A., & Devine, F. (2005) 'Capitals, Assets, and Resources: Some Critical Issues.' *British Journal of Sociology* 56: 31-47.

Smith, K. (2010) 'Assessing the practicum in teacher education – do we want candidates and mentors to agree?' *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 36, pp. 36–41

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stîngu, M. (2013) 'Induction of Newly Qualified Teachers: limits, needs and opportunities' *Journal of Education Culture and Society* No. 1: 148-157

Talilina Ülikool (2008). *Implementation of induction year programme in educational institutions in Estonia*. Retrieved from http://e-ait.tlulib.ee/103/1/eisenschmidt_eve2.pdf

Tedder, M. & Lawy, R. (2009) 'The pursuit of 'excellence': Mentoring in further education initial teacher training in England' *Journal of Vocational Education and Training* 61(4): 413–29

Twiselton, S. (2000) 'Seeing the Wood for the Trees: the National Literacy Strategy and Initial Teacher Education; pedagogical content knowledge and the structure of subjects' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 391-403

Wood, M.B. & Turner, T.J. (2015) 'Bringing the teacher into teacher preparation: learning from mentor teachers in joint methods activities' *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education* 18:27–51

Väljäärvi, J. & Heikkinen H.L.T. (2012) 'Peer-Group Mentoring and the Culture of Teacher Education in Finland' In: Heikkinen H.L.T., Jokinen, H., & Tynjälä, P., (2012) *Peer-Group Mentoring for Teacher Development* New York, Routledge

van Ginkel, G., Verloop, N., & Denessen E. (2016) 'Why mentor? Linking mentor teachers' motivations to their mentoring conceptions' *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* Vol 22. Issue 1, 101-116

Yin, R.K. (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2nd Ed) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Zuljan, M.V. & Požarnik, B.M. (2014) 'Induction and Early-career Support of Teachers in Europe' *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 49, No. 2