

# BRIDGING EXPECTATIONS: COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MENTORS AND STUDENT TEACHERS IN INDONESIAN EFL TEACHING PRACTICUMS

Deni Asrida<sup>a</sup>, Susan Ledger<sup>b</sup>, Helena Sit<sup>c</sup>

(<sup>a</sup>deniasrida@uinmybatusangkar.ac.id; <sup>b</sup>susan.ledger@newcastle.edu.au;

<sup>c</sup>helena.sit@newcastle.edu.au)

<sup>a</sup> *Universitas Islam Negeri Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar, Indonesia*

<sup>b,c</sup> *University of Newcastle, Australia*

**Abstract:** This study examines how mentor teachers and student teachers negotiate expectations during the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching practicum in Indonesian secondary schools. Adopting a qualitative design, data were collected from twelve mentor teachers and twelve student teachers through semi-structured interviews and classroom observations conducted during the practicum period. The data were analysed using thematic analysis, involving initial coding, theme development, and refinement. To ensure trustworthiness, member checking was employed. The findings reveal both alignment and divergence in expectations. Mentor teachers and student teachers shared expectations regarding professional responsibility, lesson preparation, classroom management, and active participation in school life, indicating a common understanding of the practicum as preparation for authentic teaching practice. However, significant divergence emerged in how mentoring support was conceptualized. Mentor teachers primarily emphasized observable teaching competence, independence, and adaptation to school routine, whereas student teachers expected mentoring to involve ongoing dialogue, constructive feedback, emotional support, collaborative problem solving and opportunities for professional learning. This study argues that the central challenge in EFL practicum mentoring is not the absence of support but the limited visibility and negotiation of expectations. It highlights the need for more dialogic mentoring practices, structured expectation and sustained reflective dialogue to foster mutual understanding and enhance the quality of practicum experiences.

**Keywords:** expectation, Indonesian EFL teacher education, mentor teachers, mentoring relationship, student teachers, teaching practicum

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v37i1/25-47>

Effective communication between mentor teachers (MTs) and student teachers (STs) plays a crucial role in shaping the outcomes of EFL teaching practicum. These practicums are an integral component of teacher education programs, offering STs the opportunity to bridge theoretical knowledge with practical classroom experience (Ellis et al., 2020; Goldshaft, 2024; Jeno et al., 2026; Varol et al., 2024). Within this context, mentoring relationship becomes a key factor in the professional growth and confidence-building of future educators. However, the process is often complicated by varying expectations, as MTs and STs may approach their roles with differing priorities, perspectives, and assumptions. Mentors typically focus on guiding STs

toward meeting professional standards, emphasizing areas such as lesson planning, classroom management, and adherence to institutional expectations. Meanwhile, STs often seek emotional support, constructive feedback, and opportunities for collaborative engagement.

A substantial body of literature has examined mentoring roles, feedback practices, and supervisory models in teacher education. Studies have documented the importance of structured guidance, constructive feedback, and collaborative reflection in promoting professional growth (Bjørndal et al., 2024; Chea, 2024; Hudson, 2016; Kuswandono, 2014). Other research has highlighted tensions within mentoring relationships, including power imbalances, unclear role boundaries, and institutional pressures (Bjørndal et al., 2024; Chea, 2024). In the Indonesian context, for example, Kuswandono (2014) illustrates how mentoring practices are shaped by local school cultures and systemic expectations. Collectively, these studies underscore that mentoring is complex, relational, and deeply contextual.

However, while prior research has explored mentoring effectiveness and supervisory strategies, comparatively less attention has been given to how expectations are explicitly communicated and negotiated between MTs and STs particularly in EFL settings (Carmi & Tamir, 2023). Many studies implicitly assume shared understandings of roles and responsibilities, yet evidence suggests that MTs and STs often enter the practicum with different priorities and assumptions (Izadinia, 2016; Matsko et al., 2024). Mentors may emphasize professional standards, curriculum alignment, classroom management, and institutional accountability (Carmi & Tamir, 2023). STs, on the other hand, frequently prioritize emotional support, dialogic feedback, affirmation, and opportunities for meaningful participation (Hagenauer et al., 2023). When such expectations remain unspoken or are only partially articulated, misalignment can occur. These gaps may manifest in frustration, reduced confidence, limited autonomy, or missed opportunities for deeper professional learning (Hagenauer et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2024).

In addition, much of the existing scholarship has focused either on mentors' perspectives or on student teachers' experiences in isolation. There is a relative scarcity of research that examines both sides simultaneously in order to understand how expectations intersect, overlap, or diverge in real mentoring interactions. This gap is particularly evident in EFL practicum contexts in Indonesia, where sociocultural norms, hierarchical relationships, and institutional constraints may shape communication patterns in distinctive ways. Without a clearer understanding of how expectations are expressed and interpreted within these contexts, efforts to improve mentoring risk remaining abstract or overly generalized.

Given these gaps, there is a need for research that moves beyond evaluating mentoring outcomes to closely examine the communicative processes that underpin them. Understanding how mentors articulate their pedagogical and professional expectations and how student teachers voice their learning needs, concerns, and aspirations can illuminate the dynamics that either facilitate or hinder effective collaboration. By focusing on the dialogic dimension of mentoring, it becomes possible to identify where expectations align, where they diverge, and how such differences are managed in practice. This study responds to that need by exploring how MTs and STs express and negotiate their expectations during EFL teaching practicums in Indonesian secondary schools. Rather than assuming alignment or conflict, the research seeks to make these expectations visible and analysable. Through this lens, the study aims to uncover recurring

themes in both mentor and student teacher perspectives, highlight areas of convergence and tension, and consider how structured communication might bridge identified gaps.

The significance of this current study lies in its potential to inform more intentional mentoring practices. If expectation gaps are a source of misunderstanding and reduced practicum effectiveness, then creating spaces for open, reciprocal dialogue becomes not merely desirable but necessary. By making expectations explicit and mutually negotiated, mentoring relationships can shift from hierarchical supervision toward collaborative professional learning. Ultimately, fostering transparent communication during the practicum is not only about improving short-term teaching performance; it is about preparing future EFL teachers to engage reflectively, adaptively, and confidently in the complex realities of their professional lives.

### **Mentoring in Teaching Practicum**

Mentoring is widely regarded as a central component of the teaching practicum because it provides STs with opportunities to connect university-based learning with the realities of classroom practice (Hobson et al., 2009; Kemmis et al., 2014; Prakasha & Kenneth, 2023). Through interactions with MTs, STs receive guidance on lesson planning, classroom management, instructional decision-making, and professional conduct. Research consistently shows that mentoring relationships characterized by trust, mutual respect, and open communication support professional learning, confidence development, and reflective practice (Kemmis et al., 2014; Martinez Agudo, 2016).

Contemporary scholarship increasingly conceptualizes mentoring as a collaborative and relational process rather than a one-way transmission of knowledge from expert to novice. Professional learning occurs through dialogue, shared reflection, and participation in authentic teaching practices, allowing STs to develop both pedagogical competence and professional identity (Ploj Vrtič et al., 2023). Effective mentors therefore provide not only technical guidance but also emotional support, constructive feedback, and opportunities for meaningful participation in school life (Ellis et al., 2020; Hagenauer et al., 2023).

Despite the acknowledged importance of mentoring, research has shown that mentoring relationships are not always experienced positively. Differences in expectations, limited communication, power imbalances, and contextual constraints can influence how mentoring support is interpreted and enacted (Hagenauer et al., 2023; Izadinia, 2016). While mentors may focus primarily on teaching performance and professional responsibilities, student teachers often seek more dialogic, individualized, and supportive forms of engagement (Carmi & Tamir, 2023; Izadinia, 2016). Such differences may create misunderstandings that affect feedback processes, professional learning opportunities, and the overall practicum experience.

A growing body of research suggests that expectations play a crucial role in shaping mentoring relationships because they influence how roles, responsibilities, and support are understood by both mentors and mentees (Brodeur et al., 2024; Matsko et al., 2023). However, these expectations often remain implicit and are rarely discussed openly. As a result, mentors and student teachers may assume a shared understanding when, in fact, their expectations diverge. Although studies have examined mentoring practices extensively, less attention has been given to how MTs and STs negotiate expectations during the practicum, particularly in

EFL contexts and within hierarchical educational cultures such as Indonesia. Addressing this gap, the present study explores how mentor teachers and student teachers express, interpret, and negotiate their expectations during the EFL teaching practicum.

## **Roles and Expectations in the Mentor- teacher-Student-teacher Relationship**

### ***Mentor Teachers' Roles and Expectations***

The relationship between MTs and STs is often described in the literature in normative terms, emphasizing what mentors should do rather than what actually happens in practice. While mentoring is typically framed as supportive, collaborative, and developmental, empirical studies increasingly show that the MT–ST relationship is shaped by inequality, ambiguity, and uneven communication. Mentors engage dual roles as both supporters and evaluators, which can create tension in interactions and limit open dialogue, particularly when expectations are not made explicit.

Plenty of the existing literature presents an ideal image of mentoring, portraying mentors as guides, counselor, role models, and facilitators who provide both pedagogical and emotional support (Garcia & Badia, 2023; Gutierrez & Nailer, 2021; Hudson & Hudson, 2010; Wang & Odell, 2002). However, this “list of roles” approach tends to obscure an important issue: the extent to which these roles are actually enacted, negotiated, or even understood in the same way by both mentors and student teachers. In practice, mentors often prioritize observable teaching performance such as lesson planning, classroom control, and adherence to school routines. While relational and dialogic aspects of mentoring receive less attention. This creates a gap between the *roles* of mentoring and the *enacted practices* within practicum settings.

A further limitation in the literature is the assumption that expectations between mentors and student teachers are either shared or can be easily aligned. Although studies acknowledge the importance of establishing mutual understanding (Brodeur et al., 2024), there is limited empirical attention to how such expectations are actually communicated, negotiated, or, in many cases, left unspoken. As a result, expectation-setting is often treated as a preliminary step rather than an ongoing, interactional process. This is problematic because unarticulated expectations can lead to misinterpretation of feedback, uncertainty about roles, and uneven learning opportunities for student teachers.

In addition, the majority of studies tend to focus on mentors' intended roles or STs perceived needs in isolation (Hagenauer et al., 2023; Izadinia, 2016; Matsko et al., 2024). There is relatively little research that examines both perspectives simultaneously in order to identify where they meet. This lack of comparative analysis makes it difficult to understand how mismatches in expectations are produced and sustained in real mentoring interactions. It also limits the field's ability to move beyond descriptive accounts toward a more process-oriented understanding of mentoring. The issue becomes even more complex in contexts where communication is shaped by cultural norms and institutional hierarchies. In settings such as Indonesia, where respect for authority and seniority is strongly emphasized, STs may be less likely to question mentors, seek clarification, or express disagreement. This can result in a form of surface compliance where expectations appear to be met but are not fully understood (Izadinia, 2016). Despite this, relatively few studies have examined how such sociocultural

factors influence the way expectations are communicated and interpreted within EFL practicum contexts.

These gaps point to a need for a more critical and empirically grounded understanding of mentoring. Rather than adding to existing descriptions of mentor roles, the present study shifts the focus toward the communication of expectations as a central, yet underexplored, dimension of the mentoring process. It contributes to the literature in three ways. First, it offers an empirical reason of how expectations are formed, expressed, and negotiated between mentors and STs, rather than assuming alignment. Second, it adopts a comparative perspective by examining both MT and ST viewpoints simultaneously, making visible areas of tension that are often overlooked. Third, it situates these interactions within the Indonesian EFL context, highlighting how cultural and institutional factors shape communication practices.

### ***Student Teachers' Roles and Expectations***

STs gain significant advantages from the personal support offered by their mentors, as it enhances their teaching skills and strengthens their confidence. The connection between professional and personal support is deeply interwoven, meaning that the emotional and practical assistance mentors provide plays a vital role in shaping the professional growth of their mentees (Achinstein & Davis, 2014). In this capacity, mentors act as emotional supporters, offering personalized guidance through counseling, motivation, problem-solving assistance, and information sharing. Such support is essential in fostering strong, positive mentor-mentee relationships that create valuable opportunities for learning, self-improvement, and knowledge expansion during key developmental stages (Hu et al., 2021). When mentors and mentees share a common interest in professional development, they can engage in meaningful discussions and collaborative exchanges of ideas, which greatly contribute to their growth (Heeralal, 2014; Helgevold et al., 2015). Through this interactive process, both parties benefit from shared experiences, collective problem-solving, and insightful reflections on teaching challenges. This dynamic engagement not only builds a sense of security and encouragement for mentees but also enables them to refine their teaching practices and further develop their expertise.

Mentors play an essential role in helping mentees adjust their teaching practices and beliefs to fit the specific school environment and pedagogical standards, ultimately leading to improved learning outcomes. By acting as facilitators, mentors encourage novice teachers to refine their instructional skills. They support mentees in crafting lesson plans and teaching strategies while also offering opportunities to observe high-quality teaching examples. These efforts align with the cultural and institutional norms of the school (Heeralal, 2014). Wang and Odell (2002) describe this type of academic support as a situated approach, emphasizing that mentoring should focus on guiding new teachers to understand and apply the institution's educational standards and principles in their own practices. This process helps transform novice educators into competent teachers with the pedagogical expertise necessary for their professional growth. In essence, mentoring can be seen as the transfer of knowledge and experience from seasoned educators to less experienced ones, fostering success in education and contributing to the development of teaching excellence.

## **METHOD**

This study employs a qualitative case study design to explore the dynamic communication between MT and ST during the EFL teaching practicum. Data were collected through interviews and observations and analysed thematically to identify patterns of alignment and mismatch. The study emphasizes the critical role of communication in aligning expectations to foster a supportive and productive learning environment within EFL teaching practicums. To address the research objectives, a qualitative research approach is employed, as outlined below:

1. How do mentor teachers express their expectations to student teachers during EFL teaching practicums?
2. How do student teachers convey their expectations to mentor teachers during EFL teaching practicums?

## **Participants**

This study involved 24 participants, consisting of 12 mentor teachers (MTs) and 12 student teachers (STs) who were engaged in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching practicum in secondary schools in West Sumatera Province. Participants were selected using purposive sampling, with the intention of recruiting individuals who were directly involved in mentoring relationships and therefore able to provide relevant and experience-based insights into the phenomenon under study.

The inclusion of both MTs and STs was deliberate. Since the study focuses on how expectations are formed, expressed, and negotiated, it was important to capture perspectives from both sides of the mentoring relationship rather than relying on a single viewpoint. This allowed for a more balanced understanding of potential alignments and mismatches in expectations. In addition, selecting participants from different schools helped ensure variation in mentoring practices and institutional contexts, which strengthens the analytical depth of the study. The sample size ( $n = 24$ ) is considered appropriate for qualitative inquiry, where the goal is not statistical generalization but in-depth understanding. As noted by Dworkin (2012) qualitative interview studies typically involve between 5 and 50 participants. In this study, the number of participants was also guided by the principle of data sufficiency, where recurring patterns began to emerge across interviews, indicating that the dataset was adequate to address the research questions.

## **Data Collection**

Data were collected primarily through semi-structured interviews and supported by follow-up interactions to clarify emerging points. The use of semi-structured interviews allowed the researcher to explore key themes such as expectations, communication practices, and mentoring experiences while still giving participants the flexibility to express their views in their own terms. Separate interview protocols were developed for MTs and STs to ensure that questions were relevant to their respective roles.

In addition to interviews, classroom observations were conducted during the practicum period to provide contextual insight into mentoring practices and teaching activities. The

observations focused on interactions between mentor and student teachers, classroom teaching practices, and feedback exchanges. Observations data were not intended to evaluate participants' performance but rather to provide a richer understanding of how expectations and mentoring practices were enacted in practice.

Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in several areas of West Sumatera during the data collection period, most interviews were conducted online via Zoom. This approach made it possible to access participants across different locations while maintaining safety and flexibility. At the same time, several face-to-face interviews were conducted where feasible, allowing for more in-depth engagement and richer contextual understanding. All interviews were audio-recorded with participants' consent and later transcribed verbatim to ensure accuracy. Each interview typically ranged from 20-30 minutes with the durations varying according to the flow of the conversation and the level of detail provided by participants. The interviews were carried out in Indonesian to allow participants to communicate their thoughts, experiences, and perspectives in the language with which they were most familiar. All interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim in Indonesian. All excerpts were translated into English by the researcher. To ensure the accuracy of the translated data, the English versions were repeatedly compared with the original transcripts with careful attention given to retaining the intended meanings, contextual nuances and culturally embedded expressions.

To enhance the credibility and dependability of the data, several steps were taken. First, the use of two participant groups (MTs and STs) enabled a form of data triangulation, allowing the researcher to compare and cross-check perspectives. Second, interview questions were designed to probe for examples and clarifications rather than relying on general statements, which helped reduce superficial responses. Third, after transcription, selected participants were consulted to confirm the accuracy of key interpretations (member checking). These procedures were intended to strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings and ensure that the data accurately reflected participants' experiences

## Data Analysis

The interview data were analysed using an inductive thematic approach, carried out in a step-by-step and data-driven manner (Braun & Clarke, 2022; Nowell et al., 2017). All 24 interviews (12 mentor teachers and 12 student teachers) were first transcribed verbatim. Each transcript was then read several times while brief notes were written in the margins to capture initial impressions, such as "mentor correction," or "limited discussion time." These early notes helped guide the analysis without fixing categories too early.

Coding began manually on the transcripts before being organized in NVivo 12. At this stage, the codes remained close to participants' actual words. For example, statements such as "*I check their lesson plan before teaching*" was coded as *correcting lesson plans*. Coding was conducted line-by-line, and new codes were created whenever a different idea appeared, rather than forcing the data into pre-existing labels.

After all transcripts were coded, similar codes were compared and grouped into broader categories. For instance, codes such as *unclear expectations*, *different instructions*,

and *confusing standards* were grouped under *expectation mismatch*. Likewise, codes such as *giving advice*, *correcting teaching*, and *providing feedback* were grouped into *mentor support practices*. NVivo was used to cluster these codes and to visualize relationships between them using the “Mind Map” feature.

The next step involved developing themes by examining what these categories suggested about the mentoring process. Categories related to expectation mismatch were combined into the theme *Unarticulated and Misaligned Expectations*. Categories related to feedback and supervision informed the theme *Mentor-Centered Support and Evaluation*, while issues such as limited meeting time and mentor workload were grouped into *Structural Barriers to Communication*. These themes emerged gradually through repeated comparison of mentor and student teacher responses, rather than being determined in advance.

An important part of the analysis was the handling of emerging data that did not fit neatly into the initial coding patterns. These data were coded separately and revisited throughout the process. For example, several student teachers mentioned *lack of teaching facilities* and *limited school support*, which were not part of the initial analytical focus. These were first coded as *infrastructure constraints* and later examined across transcripts. As similar concerns appeared in multiple interviews, they were retained and incorporated into the broader theme of *structural barriers*.

Throughout the analysis, codes and categories were continuously refined. The researcher repeatedly returned to the original transcripts to check whether each theme was supported by multiple participants. Some early groupings were revised or merged when they overlapped. For example, codes related to *busy mentor* and *lack of discussion time* were combined into a single theme to better reflect communication constraints. Attention was also given to differences between mentor and student teacher perspectives, particularly in cases where mentors described expectations as clear while student teachers experienced them as unclear (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Overall, the analysis progressed through three main stages: identifying initial codes from participants’ statements, grouping these codes into categories based on similarity, and developing themes that captured broader patterns across cases. This process ensured that the findings remained grounded in participants’ experiences while allowing space for unexpected insights to emerge.

A summary of the specific steps involved in the data analysis process is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Research Procedure

| No | Phases                      | Process                                                                                              |
|----|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Familiarising with the data | The researcher transcribed, read and double check the data and jot down initial ideas                |
| 2  | Generating initial codes    | Key features and patterns within the data were systematically identified to develop emerging themes. |
| 3  | Searching for themes        | The researcher categorized the data and formulated potential themes based on recurring patterns.     |

| No | Phases                         | Process                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|----|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4  | Reviewing themes               | The researcher double-checked the theme coded and matched it with the whole data set to generate a map for the analysis                                                                                                              |
| 5  | Defining and naming the themes | Each theme was carefully refined and assigned a clear, descriptive label.                                                                                                                                                            |
| 6  | Writing report                 | In the final stage, compelling excerpts were selected, and a detailed analysis was conducted. The findings were then connected to the research questions and existing literature, culminating in a well-structured scholarly report. |

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Findings

The findings of this study show that expectations between MTs and STs are extensive but unevenly aligned and are often communicated implicitly rather than explicitly. Instead of forming a shared framework, expectations are distributed across different domains of pedagogical competence, professional behaviour, and relational support. However, these domains are prioritized differently by each group. The analysis revealed two broad but interconnected elements: (1) mentor teachers' expectations of student teachers, and (2) student teachers' expectations of mentors. Across both components, a recurring issue is not the absence of expectations, but the lack of mutual articulation and negotiation.

### *Mentor-teacher Expectations of Student-teacher during Teaching Practicum*

Mentor teachers' expectations were strongly oriented toward observable teaching performance and professional readiness, with emphasis on competence, discipline, and alignment with school practices. These expectations, however, were rarely communicated explicitly and were often embedded in routine practices.

### *Emphasis on Linguistic and Instructional Competence*

A central expectation expressed by mentor teachers concerns STs English proficiency, particularly their ability to speak confidently and fluently in classroom contexts. For many mentors, language proficiency is not simply one component of teaching, but a foundational requirement that underpins all instructional practices. STs are expected to use English consistently, both during instruction and in informal interaction, as a way of modelling appropriate language use for students. As one mentor explained,

limited speaking ability can lead to hesitation and anxiety, especially when STs are placed in classrooms where learners are perceived to have relatively strong English skills (MT2).

Similarly, another mentor explicitly framed fluency as a minimum expectation, noting that difficulties in speaking English were closely linked to challenges in delivering content effectively (MT11). However, the data reveal a clear tension between expectation and practice. STs were frequently described as lacking confidence and relying on Indonesian, particularly when explaining complex material or managing the classroom. This suggests that language proficiency is treated less as a developmental area and more as a pre-existing competence that STs are assumed to possess before entering the practicum. In this sense, linguistic ability functions as an implicit gatekeeping criterion, shaping how mentors evaluate readiness for teaching.

This expectation extends beyond language use to include instructional competence, particularly lesson preparation and classroom delivery. Mentors consistently emphasized that STs should enter the classroom fully prepared, with detailed lesson plans, clearly sequenced activities, and appropriate teaching media. As one mentor noted,

being “ready to teach” involves not only knowing the content but also anticipating what students will do during each stage of the lesson (MT3).

Another mentor framed this expectation more broadly,

Student teachers should already be able to “act like a real teacher,” including preparing materials, managing lessons, and using English as the primary medium of instruction (MT12).

Taken together, these suggest that mentor teachers construct competence as a combination of linguistic ability, pedagogical preparation, and professional performance. However, these expectations are rarely broken down into explicit learning steps. Instead, readiness is largely assumed, and STs are expected to demonstrate competence from the outset. This creates a situation in which gaps in performance such as limited fluency or incomplete lesson preparation are interpreted as deficiencies, rather than as part of a developmental process.

### *Classroom Management and Professional Behaviour*

In addition to instructional competence, STs are also expected to demonstrate effective classroom management and appropriate professional behaviour. MTs consistently identified the ability to control classroom dynamics, manage student behaviour, and organize lesson time as key indicators of teaching competence. In many cases, classroom management was described not as a skill to be gradually developed, but as an essential capability that student teachers should acquire quickly during the practicum. This expectation is closely tied to broader notions of professionalism. STs are expected to move beyond the role of observers and take on the identity of a “real teacher,” which includes demonstrating confidence, authority, and emotional control in the classroom. For example, one mentor described how student teachers often hesitate to move around the classroom, interact with students, or take initiative, and emphasized the need for them to become more active and engaged during teaching (MT2). Another mentor highlighted that managing the classroom also involves managing one’s own emotions, particularly overcoming nervousness and building confidence when facing students (MT5).

So, she can handle the classroom well and then she can manage the classroom well. That's my expectation. And I hope that after she finished her practice here, she can at least know how to handle the classroom and treat the student in the classroom. How to handle her feeling to not be nervous in the classroom. That's it (MT5).

Despite this emphasis, the findings suggest that classroom management is not always systematically supported. While some mentors mentioned opportunities for discussion and feedback, much of the learning appears to rely on observation and informal guidance. STs are expected to internalize professional behaviours such as how to speak, move, and interact in the classroom without always receiving explicit instruction on how to develop these skills. This creates a gap between expectation and support, where student teachers are evaluated based on their ability to perform as teachers, even as they are still learning how to do so.

In addition, classroom management is often framed in relation to specific student characteristics. Some mentors emphasized the need to "control" students, particularly in contexts where learners are perceived as having low motivation or challenging behaviour.

How to control the class, how to make the students feel comfortable in the class, and also how to teach very well. How to especially control the class (MT4)

I hope that she can learn more about how to manage all the classes, especially in second-grade Senior High School students. Yeah. Yeah, so I hope she can manage the students about it (MT7).

This places additional pressure on student teachers, who must navigate not only their own inexperience but also the complexities of the classroom environment. As reflected in several accounts, difficulties in managing students were quickly linked to overall teaching effectiveness, reinforcing the idea that control is a prerequisite for successful instruction.

These findings indicate that classroom management and professional behaviour are treated as central markers of teaching competence but are embedded within a set of expectations that are both high and only partially articulated. Student teachers are expected to demonstrate confidence, authority, and adaptability, yet the pathways for developing these qualities remain largely implicit.

### *Alignment with School Context and Curriculum*

Another important expectation expressed by MTs concerns student teachers' ability to adapt to the school context. This includes understanding student characteristics, engaging with the broader school culture, and aligning instructional practices with the national curriculum. For mentors, effective teaching is not limited to classroom delivery but involves navigating the social and institutional realities of the school environment. The data suggest that this process of adaptation is often more complex than anticipated. Several mentors noted that student teachers struggled to adjust, particularly when dealing with the diverse behaviours of secondary school students. As one mentor explained, students at this level display a wide range of attitudes, from highly engaged to disruptive, which can be difficult for novice teachers to manage (MT9). Similarly, another mentor emphasized that understanding students' individual differences is

essential for effective teaching, yet this is something student teachers are expected to grasp quickly in practice (MT2).

Some students are focused, while others may be inattentive, lazy, or disruptive. My expectation is for them to learn how to handle these varying behaviours and to realize what it takes to be a good teacher (MT2).

However, it can sometimes be challenging for them to adapt quickly to the school environment, especially when dealing with the students. Senior high school students are at a transitional phase, so they exhibit a wide range of behaviours. Some of the student teachers might be surprised by certain attitudes they encounter, which they haven't dealt with before (MT9).

In addition, adaptation extends beyond classroom interaction to include alignment with institutional expectations. Some mentors pointed out that STs faced challenges in implementing the 2013 curriculum, particularly in designing lesson plans and assessments that met school standards. This indicates that curriculum knowledge, while introduced at the university level, is not always easily translated into practice within specific school contexts. Expectations also extend to participation in non-teaching activities, such as school events, administrative responsibilities, and extracurricular programs. These demands reflect a holistic view of teaching as a multifaceted professional role. However, the breadth of these expectations requires STs to navigate multiple responsibilities simultaneously, often within a limited timeframe. As a result, adaptation becomes not only a matter of learning the school context but also of managing competing demands across different aspects of professional practice.

#### *Time Constraint and Practicum Duration*

Concerns about the duration of the practicum emerged as a recurring issue across mentor reports. Many mentors argued that the existing timeframe typically around three months was insufficient for STs to develop the wide range of competencies expected of them. As one mentor noted, STs require time not only to practice teaching but also to observe, reflect, and gradually build confidence (MT2). Another mentor similarly suggested that a short practicum limits opportunities for meaningful professional growth (MT10).

I believe they require more time to develop. During the initial months, they should at least observe my teaching in the classroom. However, with the current three-month timeframe provided by the university, I think it would be more beneficial if the practicum were extended. (Mt2, Sep 2021).

Regarding the duration, I hope student teachers can have an extended practicum period to further their professional development. If they only have two months for their practicum, they won't be able to gain much experience or grow professionally during that time (Mt10, Sep 2021).

The data showed there are mismatch between the scope of expectations and the time available to meet them. STs are expected to demonstrate competence in teaching, classroom management, curriculum implementation, and professional engagement, yet these are compressed into a relatively short period. In some cases, this challenge is further compounded

by additional academic responsibilities, such as completing a thesis, which reduces the time they can fully engage in the practicum.

MT also highlighted the importance of an initial observation phase, suggesting that STs should spend time learning from experienced teachers before taking full responsibility for the classroom. However, within the current structure, this phase is often limited or rushed. As a result, STs may be required to perform teaching roles before they have had sufficient time to understand classroom dynamics and school expectations.

### *Understand Students' Character*

Beyond technical teaching skills, MTs placed strong emphasis on student teachers' ability to understand students' character and contribute to their moral development. This expectation reflects a broader view of teaching, where the role of the teacher is not limited to delivering content but also involves shaping students' attitudes and behaviour. As one mentor noted,

Teaching is not only about "sharing material" but also about "forming the students' character" (MT4).

Similarly, another mentor highlighted the importance of "acting like a teacher" and embodying appropriate professional conduct in the classroom (MT2).

What is important here is that this expectation operates at two levels. First, STs are expected to understand the diverse personalities and needs of their students as a basis for effective classroom management. Second, they are expected to model and cultivate desirable character traits, positioning them as moral agents rather than novice practitioners. However, this expectation is rarely accompanied by explicit guidance on how such understanding should be developed in practice. Instead, it appears to be assumed that student teachers will acquire this sensitivity through observation and experience.

This creates tensions. While mentors emphasize the importance of understanding students' individuality, STs are simultaneously expected to manage classrooms effectively from the outset. The ability to read classroom dynamics and respond to diverse learners is treated as a prerequisite rather than a developmental outcome. As a result, understanding students' character becomes less of a clearly supported learning goal and more of an implicit benchmark against which student teachers are evaluated.

### *Pedagogical Innovations in EFL Teaching*

MTs also expressed clear expectations regarding the use of effective and engaging strategies for teaching English. In particular, they emphasized the need for STs to move beyond traditional, teacher-centered approaches and introduce more interactive, student-centered methods. One mentor, for example, stated

that student teachers should apply "new strategies" that make learning English enjoyable and reduce students' perception of the subject as difficult (MT7).

This expectation reflects an interesting contradiction. On the one hand, mentors assume that STs bring updated pedagogical knowledge from university coursework, including familiarity with communicative and student-centered approaches. On the other hand, the responsibility for introducing innovation is largely placed on the STs themselves, even though they are still in the early stages of professional development. In this sense, student teachers are positioned as agents of pedagogical change within existing school environments.

At the same time, the data suggest that this expectation is shaped by contextual constraints. Mentors acknowledged that teaching English in contemporary classrooms requires creativity and adaptability, particularly given students' increasing engagement with digital technologies. However, as noted elsewhere in the findings, limited resources and infrastructure can restrict the extent to which such innovative strategies can be implemented. This creates a gap between what is expected (engaging, technology-enhanced, student-centered teaching) and what is practically feasible in the classroom.

### ***Student Teacher Expectations of Mentor Teachers during EFL Teaching Practicum***

In contrast to mentor teachers' performance-oriented expectations, student teachers' reveal a strong emphasis on relational, dialogic, and supportive dimensions of mentoring. Their expectations extend beyond technical guidance to include emotional reassurance, accessibility, and opportunities for meaningful engagement. What emerges is not simply a list of desired mentor qualities, but a broader orientation toward mentoring as a collaborative and supportive relationship. However, these expectations are not always realized in practice, resulting in varying experiences across participants.

#### ***Positive Interpersonal Relationship***

A prominent expectation among STs is the development of a positive interpersonal relationship with their MTs. Many participants described their ideal mentor not only as a professional guide but also as a "parent-like" figure who provides care, patience, and emotional support. Mentors were explicitly compared to family members, with one ST referring to her mentor as a "second mother" who guided her through the practicum with encouragement and understanding (ST1).

I hoped my mentor teacher would be kind and treat me like her own child, guiding me so I could make significant progress and meet my expectations. She taught me how to confidently deliver lessons, and she was never angry with me. I consider her my second mother at school (ST1).

As my mentor teacher, she performed her duties with professionalism and expertise, treating me with the care of a mother. She is always patient with me, never angry, and her approach to teaching is something I deeply admire (ST1).

This expectation reflects the importance of relational trust in shaping the practicum experience. When such relationships were present, STs reported feeling more comfortable, confident, and willing to take risks in their teaching. However, this also suggests that professional learning is closely tied to affective conditions. Rather than viewing mentoring as a

purely instructional process, STs experience it as relational work, where emotional safety becomes a prerequisite for engagement and development.

### *Openmindedness*

STs also emphasized the importance of mentors being open-minded, particularly in relation to new teaching approaches. They expected mentors to be receptive to ideas brought from university coursework and to provide space for experimentation in the classroom. For instance, one student teacher expressed frustration when her mentor resisted the use of a genre-based approach and insisted on maintaining traditional methods (ST4).

I expect my mentor teacher to be open-minded with their student teachers. When I taught at that school, my mentor teacher was resistant to using new techniques. For instance, I wanted to implement a genre-based approach (GBA), which I had learned at my university, but the mentor insisted on sticking to traditional methods. My main expectation is that mentor teachers provide student teachers the opportunity to try new methods or strategies in the classroom (ST4).

This highlights a tension between innovation and continuity within the practicum setting. While STs are encouraged to apply contemporary pedagogical approaches, their ability to do so is often mediated by mentors' preferences and beliefs. In some cases, differences in teaching philosophy limited opportunities for experimentation, suggesting that mentoring can function not only as support but also as a form of constraint.

Because of my mentor teacher's conservative beliefs and the fact that I am a woman, he was unwilling to provide guidance throughout the semester. He seemed uncomfortable in my presence (ST6).

The excerpt showed that some STs pointed to deeper relational barriers. One participant described how her mentor's personal beliefs affected the level of support she received, particularly in cross-gender interactions. Such experiences indicate that openness is not only about pedagogy, but also about the mentor's willingness to engage with student teachers as individuals. When this openness is absent, it can significantly shape the quality of the mentoring relationship.

### *Problem Solver*

Another recurring expectation is that mentors act as active problem solvers who support STs in navigating challenges during the practicum. STs frequently described moments of uncertainty, such as dealing with classroom difficulties or a lack of confidence, where they relied on their mentors for guidance. For example, one participant explained how her mentor helped her "get through the practicum" by offering practical advice when she felt stuck (ST1).

I expect her to be present with me during my teaching sessions, offering constructive criticism when I make mistakes, and helping me resolve any issues I face, whether they are with the students or teaching in general (ST1).

This expectation reflects a view of mentoring as an ongoing, responsive process rather than a series of isolated feedback moments. Student teachers do not simply expect evaluation after teaching, but continuous support during the process itself. In particular, they value mentors who are present, observe their teaching, and provide immediate guidance when difficulties arise. The absence of such support can leave student teachers feeling isolated, especially when they are expected to manage classroom challenges independently.

### *Advice and Feedback*

Feedback emerged as one of the most significant expectations across participants. STs consistently highlighted the need for detailed, constructive, and ongoing feedback to support their development. However, the data suggest that feedback practices were often limited in scope. Several participants reported receiving minimal or infrequent feedback, leaving them uncertain about how to improve their teaching (ST4; ST6).

my mentor teacher only gave limited feedback on my teaching performance during my time at the school" (ST4).

Until now, I haven't received sufficient feedback from my mentor teacher" (ST6).

More importantly, student teachers expected feedback to be dialogic rather than one-directional. They expressed a preference for discussions that allowed them to reflect on their teaching, ask questions, and explore alternative strategies. In practice, however, feedback was often experienced as brief and corrective, focusing on immediate performance rather than deeper learning. This indicates a mismatch between how feedback is delivered and how it is expected to function within the mentoring relationship.

### *Access to Ample Teaching Opportunities*

STs also emphasized the importance of having sufficient opportunities to practice teaching. For many participants, the practicum was seen as a space to apply theoretical knowledge gained at the university. However, some reported limited access to classrooms or restricted teaching responsibilities. For instance, one student teacher noted that she was only assigned a single class, while another mentioned that her mentor rarely accompanied her during teaching sessions (ST7; ST6).

I expected that my mentor teacher will give me some classes and he will guide me and give examples of a good lesson plan, material, and something like that, and how to handle the classroom. Sadly, my mentor teacher, when I come to the school, he just said to me "I will give you one class (ST7).

I rarely have the opportunity to teach in class and also my mentor teacher seldom comes to class with me (ST6).

This limited exposure constrains the extent to which student teachers can develop their teaching skills. Without regular practice and observation, opportunities for feedback and reflection are also reduced. This suggests that mentoring is not only about guidance but also

about creating conditions for participation. When access to teaching is restricted, the practicum risks becoming observational rather than experiential

### *Motivators and Emotional Supporters*

Emotional support emerged as a particularly salient aspect of student teachers' expectations. Many participants described their mentors as key sources of motivation, especially during challenging moments such as managing disruptive students or dealing with self-doubt. Simple forms of encouragement such as being told "you can do it" or being reassured that they were capable were reported to have a significant impact on confidence (ST5).

When I feel stuck or down, she gives me a bit of motivation and guidance, helping me to stay stronger than before (ST1).

He always supports me no matter what, which is exactly what I hope for. He motivates me by saying, 'You can do it. You're the real teacher here, don't be shy (ST5).

He always motivates me by saying, 'You can do it' and reminding me that I am the real teacher in the school, encouraging me not to be shy (ST5).

This finding highlights the affective dimension of mentoring, which is often underemphasized in formal descriptions of practicum roles. Student teachers enter the practicum with varying levels of confidence, and emotional support plays a crucial role in helping them persist through difficulties. In this sense, mentoring involves not only the transmission of knowledge but also the management of emotions and the provision of encouragement that helps student teachers navigate challenges and engage more confidently in professional learning.

### *Provision of Infrastructure and Teaching Resources*

An additional expectation that emerged from the data concerns the availability of teaching resources. Several STs expressed the need for adequate facilities, such as projectors, audio equipment, and multimedia tools, to support their teaching strategies. One participant noted that the lack of such resources forced her to rely on traditional methods, even when she intended to use more interactive approaches (ST7).

I expected that we would have equipment like a projector or other resources that could support the teaching strategies we, as student teachers, want to implement. However, the school didn't provide these, so it was difficult for us to apply some of the techniques, and we ended up resorting to more traditional methods, using just books and other basic materials" (ST7).

Although this issue may appear simple, it has direct implications for pedagogical practice. The absence of infrastructure limits the extent to which student teachers can implement the strategies they have learned, particularly those involving technology or multimodal learning. This creates a disconnect between university-based preparation and classroom realities, where innovation is encouraged but not always supported by the available resources

## **Discussion**

The findings of this study point to a more complex picture of mentoring in EFL practicums than is often assumed in the literature. Rather than functioning as a consistently supportive and developmental space, the mentoring relationship appears to be shaped by uneven expectations, partial communication, and context-specific constraints. What emerges is not simply a gap between mentors and student teachers, but a patterned misalignment in how each group understands the purpose and practice of mentoring.

A central issue concerns the different ways in which expectations are constructed and enacted. MTs in this study tended to frame their role in terms of observable teaching performance lesson planning, classroom management, and adherence to school routines. These expectations were often implicit, embedded in daily practices rather than explicitly articulated. This finding is consistent with previous research suggesting that mentors frequently prioritize the socialization of student teachers into established school practices and professional norms (Ambrosetti & Dekkers, 2010; Lindqvist et al., 2023). The findings further revealed that many MTs expected STs to act as “real teachers” from the beginning of the practicum, demonstrating professionalism, initiative, responsibility and the ability to manage classrooms with limited supervision. Such expectations reflect an understanding of the practicum as a process of induction into the teaching profession, where STs are expected to participate in authentic teaching practice and assume responsibilities similar to those of experienced teachers. This expectation is consistent with sociocultural perspectives that view learning to teach as increasing participation in a community of practice (Johnson, 2009). STs, however, approached the practicum with a broader set of expectations that extended beyond technical competence. They looked for ongoing dialogue, emotional reassurance, and individualized feedback that could help them make sense of their developing professional identity. These findings align with research showing that STs often view mentoring not only as a source of practical guidance but also as a relational process that support confidence building, reflection and professional growth (Izadinia, 2016; Le Cornu, 2016). The tension, therefore, is not simply a difference in expectations, but a difference in what counts as support in the first place.

This finding complicates earlier work that tends to present mentoring as a relatively coherent process centered on feedback and skill development (Hobson et al., 2009; Lindqvist et al., 2026; Tyrer, 2023). While such functions are clearly present, the data suggest that they are interpreted differently by MTs and STs. Feedback, for instance, was often experienced by MT as sufficient guidance, whereas student teachers sometimes perceived it as one-directional or limited in scope. In this sense, the issue is less about the absence of mentoring practices and more about how those practices are understood and taken up by different actors.

The problem is further intensified by the way expectations remain largely unspoken. Consistent with several studies (Bjørndal et al., 2024; Brodeur et al., 2024; Izadinia, 2016; Weiss et al., 2024), the findings of this study show that expectations are rarely negotiated explicitly. Instead, they are assumed to be shared, which creates space for misunderstanding. Importantly, this is not merely an interpersonal issue but also a structural one. In the Indonesian context, hierarchical norms appear to shape communication patterns in ways that make open negotiation difficult. STs often hesitate to ask questions or seek clarification, not because they lack interest,

but because doing so may be perceived as inappropriate. As a result, silence or compliance can mask underlying confusion, allowing misalignment to persist throughout the practicum.

What is particularly notable is that mentors themselves were not always fully aware of this misalignment. Several mentors described their expectations as clear, yet corresponding ST suggested otherwise. This points to a gap not only in communication, but in perception. Mentoring, in this sense, operates within what might be described as an illusion of clarity, where expectations are assumed to be understood simply because they have not been questioned. Such a condition limits the possibility of genuine dialogue and reduces mentoring to a largely unidirectional process.

These findings suggest that improving mentoring cannot be reduced to adding more feedback or increasing interaction time alone. Research has consistently shown that feedback is most effective when it is situated within relationships characterized by mutual understanding and open dialogue (Boud & Dawson, 2023; Ellis et al., 2020; Larsen et al., 2025). Therefore, there is a need to reconsider how expectations are made visible and negotiable within the practicum. Structured interventions such as initial expectation and written mentoring agreements may help create spaces where assumptions can be surfaced, clarified and discussed.

## CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine how expectations between mentor teachers and student teachers are formed, communicated, and negotiated during the EFL teaching practicum. The findings suggest that the core issue is not simply a lack of mentoring support, but a persistent misalignment in how mentoring itself is understood and enacted. Mentors tended to prioritize observable teaching performance and practical competence, while student teachers looked for more dialogic, responsive, and emotionally supportive forms of engagement. These differences were rarely made explicit, resulting in expectations that remained assumed rather than negotiated.

A key contribution of this study lies in showing that communication in mentoring is often characterized by what might be described as *partial visibility*. While feedback and guidance were present, they were not always interpreted in the same way by both parties. In several cases, mentors believed their expectations were clear, yet student teachers experienced uncertainty. This indicates that the issue is not merely the presence or absence of communication, but how that communication is framed, delivered, and understood within the relationship.

The findings also highlight the role of contextual factors, particularly hierarchical norms within the Indonesian educational setting. These norms appear to shape interaction patterns in ways that limit open dialogue, making it less likely for student teachers to question, clarify, or negotiate expectations. As a result, misalignment is not easily corrected once it emerges, and mentoring risks becoming a one-directional process rather than a collaborative one. These dynamics may have broader implications for teacher preparation. Student teachers may complete their practicum having met procedural requirements yet still feel uncertain about their professional readiness. At the same time, mentors may continue to operate within established routines without fully recognizing how their expectations are received. In this sense, the

practicum risks reinforcing, rather than resolving, the well-documented gap between theoretical preparation and classroom realities.

Based on these findings, this study argues that improving mentoring requires more than increasing feedback or supervision. What is needed is a more deliberate effort to make expectations visible and negotiable. This could involve structured conversations at the beginning of the practicum, ongoing reflective dialogue, and clearer articulation of roles from both sides. However, such efforts must also consider the cultural and relational dynamics that shape communication, particularly issues of hierarchy and authority.

In conclusion, mentoring should not be treated as an inherently effective component of teacher education. Its value depends on how relationships are constructed and how expectations are communicated in practice. This study contributes to a more grounded understanding of mentoring in EFL contexts and points to the need for more intentional, dialogic approaches in practicum design. Future research could build on these findings by examining how expectations evolve over the teaching practicum rather than at a single point in time. Longitudinal studies may provide deeper insight into how mentor and student teachers negotiate expectations as their relationships develop. Additionally, comparative studies across different institutional, cultural or national contexts could also help determine whether the pattern identified in this study are specified to Indonesian EFL settings or reflect broader features of mentoring in teacher education.

### **Declaration of Generative AI Use in the Writing Process**

During the preparation of this manuscript, the author utilized ChatGPT-5 to support language refinement, improve clarity, and enhance overall writing style. All outputs generated by the tool were carefully reviewed and revised by the author, who assumes full responsibility for the final content of the manuscript.

### **Ethics Approval**

This study adhered to recognized ethical principles for educational research. All participants were informed of the study's purpose, assured of confidentiality, and made aware of their voluntary participation. Electronic informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection.

### **REFERENCES**

- Achinstein, B., & Davis, E. (2014). The subject of mentoring: Towards a knowledge and practice base for content-focused mentoring of new teachers. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 22(2), 104-126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.902560>
- 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. <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.862492789739766>

- Bjørndal, C., Mathisen, P., Wennergren, A.-C., & Thornberg, F. (2024). Challenges of the supervision process in the teacher education practicum – A qualitative research review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 146, 104619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104619>
- Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2023). What feedback literate teachers do: an empirically-derived competency framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(2), 158-171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
- Brodeur, K., Mrachko, A., Phillips, D., & Compton, B. (2024). Preparing to coach preservice teachers: professional learning of novice coaches. *Teacher Development*, 28(1), 104-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2023.2269904>
- Carmi, T., & Tamir, E. (2023). An emerging taxonomy explaining mentor-teachers' role in student-teachers' practicum: What they do and to what end? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 128, 104121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104121>
- Chea, C. (2024). Mentorship's role in shaping professional identity: insights from Cambodian teaching practicums. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2419710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2419710>
- Dworkin, S. L. (2012). Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(6), 1319-1320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-0016-6>
- Ellis, N. J., Alonzo, D., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2020). Elements of a quality pre-service teacher mentor: A literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 92, 103072. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103072>
- Garcia, C., & Badia, A. (2023). "I as a practicum mentor": Identities of mentors of student teachers. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 31(3), 335-351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2023.2202476>
- Goldshaft, B. (2024). Mentoring in practicum: supporting student teachers' learning to notice with collaborative observational tools. *Professional Development in Education*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2441837>
- Gutierrez, A., & Nailer, S. (2021). Pre-service teachers' professional becoming in an extended professional experience partnership programme. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(5), 517-532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2020.1789911>
- Hagenauer, G., Waber, J., & de Zordo, L. (2023). 'She never actually let you walk into a trap': exploring relational turning point events in the mentor-mentee relationship in the practicum. *Professional Development in Education*, 49(3), 402-415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2021.1876155>
- Heeralal, P. (2014). Mentoring needs of pre-service teachers during teaching practice. A case study at a South African university. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(1), 511. <https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2014.v4n1p511>
- Helgevold, N., Næshheim-Bjorkvik, G., & Ostrem, S. (2015). Key focus areas and use of tools in mentoring conversations during internship in initial teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 49, 128-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.005>

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.09.001>
- Hu, Y., Wang, M., Kwan, H. K., & Yi, J. (2021). Mentorship quality and mentors' work-to-family positive spillover: the mediating role of personal skill development and the moderating role of core self-evaluation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(9), 1899-1922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1579244>
- Hudson, P. (2016). Forming the mentor-mentee relationship. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 24(1), 30-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2016.1163637>
- Hudson, P., & Hudson, S. (2010). Mentor educators' understandings of mentoring preservice primary teachers. *International Journal of Learning*, 17(2), 157. <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/39001/>
- Izadinia, M. (2016). Student teachers' and mentor teachers' perceptions and expectations of a mentoring relationship: Do they match or clash? *Professional Development in Education*, 42(3), 387-402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2014.994136>
- Jeno, L. M., Roness, D., Eide, L., Halvorsen, Ø. W., Kvam, E. K., Pavlovic, Z., Sjøen, M., & Ulvik, M. (2026). The impact of practicum on motivation among student teachers: a semester-long study based on self-determination theory. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2026.2662234>
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203878033>
- Kemmis, S., Heikkinen, H. L. T., 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.07.001>
- Kuswandono, P. (2014). University mentors' views on reflective practice in microteaching: building trust and genuine feedback. *Reflective Practice*, 15(6), 701-717. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.944127>
- Larsen, E., Jensen-Clayton, C., Curtis, E., Loughland, T., & Nguyen, H. T. (2025). Re-imagining teacher mentoring for the future. *Professional Development in Education*, 51(4), 683-697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2023.2178480>
- Le Cornu, R. (2016). Professional experience: Learning from the past to build the future. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(1), 80-101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2015.1102200>
- Lindqvist, H., Wedin, A.-S., & Samuelsson, M. (2026). Mentoring conversations in work-placed education in teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2026.2638147>
- Lindqvist, H., Weurlander, M., Barman, L., Wernerson, A., & Thornberg, R. (2023). Work-based learning partnerships: mentor-teachers' perceptions of student teachers' challenges. *Educational Research*, 65(3), 392-407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2023.2234384>
- Martinez Agudo, J. (2016). What type of feedback do student teachers expect from their school mentors during practicum experience? The case of Spanish EFL student teachers. *The*

- Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(5), 36-51.  
<https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n5.3>
- Matsko, K. K., Ko, E. K., Bressman, S., Mozer, L., & Winter, J. S. (2023). Two sides of a coin: Examining mentor and student teacher relationships during student teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 130, 104139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104139>
- Matsko, K. K., Wallace, J., Feiman-Nemser, S., Hammerness, K., & Kavanagh, S. S. (2024). Host or teacher of teaching? Examining mentors' tacit theories of student teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 138, 104410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104410>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Ploj Vrtič, M., Du Plessis, A., & Šorgo, A. (2023). In the search for the ideal mentor by applying the 'Mentoring for effective teaching practice instrument'. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(4), 688-706. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2021.1957828>
- Prakasha, G. S., & Kenneth, A. (Eds.). (2023). *Introduction to teaching internship: An analytical approach*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003253242-1>
- Tyrer, C. (2023). Untangling the complexity of mentoring feedback practices in post-compulsory initial teacher education in the UK. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 47(1), 31-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2022.2088271>
- Varol, Y. Z., Weiher, G. M., Wenzel, S. F. C., & Horz, H. (2024). Practicum in teacher education: the role of psychological detachment and supervisors' feedback and reflection in student teachers' well-being. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 47(5), 933-950. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2023.2201874>
- Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 481-546. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072003481>
- Weiss, S., Langenohl, S., Braun, A., Schlegel, C. M., & Kiel, E. (2024). How to achieve 'egalitarian' interaction between student teachers and mentor teachers? A study of a one-school-year teacher practicum in Germany. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 47(5), 951-969. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2024.2359708>
- Yuan, K., Yu, S., & Liu, S. (2024). Understanding student teachers' learning from negative experiences of feedback during teaching practicum: A feedback literacy perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688241299030. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241299030>