Teaching and Teacher Education 43 (2014) 154–164

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Teaching and Teacher Education

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/tate

Mentoring of new teachers as a contested practice: Supervision, support and collaborative self-development

Stephen Kemmis [a], Hannu L.T. Heikkinen [b, *], Göran Fransson [c], Jessica Aspfors [d], Christine Edwards-Groves [a]

[a] Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education (RIPPLE), Charles Sturt University, Australia
[b] Finnish Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
[c] Faculty of Education and Business Studies, University of Gävle, Sweden
[d] Faculty of Professional Studies, University of Nordland, Norway

HIGHLIGHTS

- Mentoring of new teachers is studied in terms of practice architectures.
- Three archetypes of mentoring are identified.
- Supervision: assisting new teachers to pass through probation.
- Support: traditional mentoring where a more experienced teacher assists a mentee.
- Collaborative self-development: professional growth through collegial mentoring.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 28 October 2013
Received in revised form
15 May 2014
Accepted 4 July 2014
Available online 2 August 2014

Keywords:
Mentoring
Professional development
Teacher induction
Newly qualified teachers
Early career teachers
Practice theory

ABSTRACT

This article examines contested practices of mentoring of newly qualified teachers within and between Australia (New South Wales), Finland and Sweden. Drawing on empirical evidence from a variety of studies, we demonstrate three archetypes of mentoring: supervision, support and collaborative self-development. Using the theory of practice architectures, we show that (1) these three forms of mentoring represent three different projects: (a) assisting new teachers to pass through probation, (b) traditional mentoring as support, and (c) peer-group mentoring; and (2) these different projects involve and imply quite different practice architectures in the form of different material-economic, social-political and cultural-discursive arrangements.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

1.1. Mentoring as a contested practice

The induction of new teachers in and across workplaces is a global challenge. In the last two decades, knowledge about early career teachers' difficulties in the transition to teaching has increased as empirical research has revealed the importance of workplace mentoring as a supportive strategy for beginning a new job (e.g., Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, & Tomlinson, 2009; Howe, 2006; Ulvik, Smith, & Helleve, 2009; Wang, Odell, & Schwille, 2008). Mentoring, whether it occurs formally or informally, is commonly practiced to assist early career teachers to situate themselves within the school community and the demands of their new position in the induction phase of the teaching career. However, there are different understandings about what mentoring is. Colley (2003, p.13) claimed that mentoring is 'a practice which is ill-defined, poorly conceptualized and weakly theorized'.

In our view, this confusion is not so much about a lack of theories but rather about a plurality of theories. Dominguez and Hager (2013) have identified three primary theoretical frameworks within

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: hannu.l.t.heikkinen@jyu.fi (H.L.T. Heikkinen).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.07.001
0742-051X/© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

mentoring research: developmental, learning and, social. Wang and Odell (2007) found 16 types of mentor–novice relationships which they categorized, using critical constructivist and social cultural perspectives on learning, into three main conceptions of mentoring: humanistic, situated apprenticeship, and critical constructivist perspectives. Mentoring has also been described, for example, in psychological terms (e.g. American Psychological Association, 2014), within the traditions of social psychology (e.g. Hu, Thomas, & Lance, 2008), from the theoretical views of business management (e.g. Higgins & Kram, 2001) or human resource development (e.g. D'Abate, Eddy & Tannenbaum, 2003), and from the perspective of social cognitive career theory (Yang, Hu, Baranik, & Lin, 2013).

In short, 'mentoring' is a contested concept. The term is used differently in different settings and for different purposes (Sundli, 2007; Tynjälä & Heikkinen, 2011). Understood as a social practice, mentoring is a specific kind of cooperative human activity in which characteristic actions and activities (doings) are comprehensible in terms of relevant ideas in characteristic discourses (sayings), and in which the people and objects involved are distributed in characteristic relationships (relatings). As evidence of the contestation over mentoring, we will show that mentoring is understood and conceptualized in different ways (sayings), enacted in different ways (doings), and that people relate to one another differently (relatings) in different forms of mentoring. In this article, we explore these differences, and the contestation over mentoring, by conceptualizing mentoring as a specific kind of social practice in terms of a theory of practice architectures (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008; Kemmis & Heikkinen, 2012; Kemmis, Wilkinson, Edward-Groves, Hardy, Grootenboer & Bristol, 2014; following Schatzki, 2010, 2012). By 'practice architectures' we mean the specific cultural-discursive, material-economic and social-political arrangements found in or brought to a site that enable and constrain a practice: arrangements that make the practice possible.

According to this theory, practices of mentoring are enabled and constrained by particular practice architectures that, on the one hand, have much in common internationally, but, on the other hand, are bundled with other national or local practices that sometimes make mentoring practices in different countries rather different from each other. The theory of practice architectures thus steers our analyses toward the identification of local conditions that foster the particular kinds of mentoring practices that are in the ascendant in a given society at some particular historical moment.

Our view of mentoring is based on our longstanding mentoring research in three countries: Australia (in the state of New South Wales), Finland and Sweden. Based on a meta-analysis of our own and others' previous research, and of national (or state) policy documents, we will describe and analyze the contestation over practices of mentoring within and between these countries. The practices of mentoring in these countries share similarities and differences that are of broad international interest. Some of the differences are the consequence of varying attrition levels of new teachers in the countries concerned, and the ways various educational 'crises' are refracted through cultural lenses and political agendas specific to each country.

It is interesting that the neighboring Nordic countries of Finland and Sweden, though sharing some similar cultural issues and influences, have reached quite different solutions about how to improve new teachers' professional learning. In Finland, a nationwide program has been implemented, through which new teachers experience mentoring in peer groups where dialogue is emphasized and without formal assessment. In Sweden, mentoring has largely followed the classical arrangement of 'mentoring as support' in which individual mentors work with individual mentees. This is based on a political agreement from 1995 between teachers' unions and municipal authorities stating that teachers have 'a right' to mentoring. However, this view was recently challenged by the implementation of a Swedish teacher registration reform that proposed to retain some elements of mentoring as support, while also imposing the evaluation of new teachers' competence against established teaching standards. This multiplicity, or conflict, of purposes is evident in the Australian state of New South Wales (NSW), in which a long-standing program of mentoring as support of new teachers has persisted alongside new arrangements for probation and registration of new teachers. The new arrangements include 'mentoring' of new teachers by supervisors, who at the same time assess the performance of the new teachers against mandated professional standards. Within and across these three countries, then, we see tensions and contestation between different versions of mentoring.

The aim of this article is to demonstrate how three different archetypes of mentoring persist and contest in literature and in mentoring practice within and between nations. We will show, first, that there are contested purposes between (a) assisting newly qualified teachers to pass through the formal juridical requirements for probation, which we describe as mentoring as supervision, and/or (b) supporting new teachers in the development of their professional practices by more experienced teachers, which we describe as mentoring as support, and/or (c) assisting new teachers collectively to develop their professional identities, which we describe as mentoring as collaborative self-development. As already shown, these can be identified in different policies regarding mentoring in Australia (NSW), Sweden and Finland. Second, we will show that these contested practices of mentoring are made possible and held in place by different kinds of practice architectures. We will show that

- the meanings of 'mentoring' are contested, because mentoring is interpreted and justified in different kinds of discourses (cultural-discursive arrangements);
- the material arrangements for mentoring are contested, because mentoring is enacted in different kinds of activities and places (material-economic arrangements); and
- the social relations of mentoring are contested, because mentoring is organized in different kinds of arrays of roles and relationships between the people involved (social political arrangements).

Finally, as we shall also see, these different practices of mentoring are likely to produce very different kinds of dispositions in mentees, that is, different orientations towards themselves and others, and towards their professional work, grounded in different kinds of knowledge, capabilities and values.

1.2. Understanding mentoring through the theory of practice architectures

Mentoring of new teachers is a social practice. We define a practice as a form of socially established cooperative human activity that involves characteristic forms of understanding (sayings), modes of action (doings), and ways in which people relate to one another and the world (relatings), that 'hang together' in a distinctive project. The project of a practice is what people say when they sincerely answer the question 'What are you doing?' while they are engaged in the practice. The project of a practice encompasses (a) the intention (aim) that motivates the practice, (b) the actions (sayings, doings and relatings) undertaken in the conduct of the practice, and (c) the ends the actor aims to achieve through the practice (although it might turn out that these ends are not attained). Practices exist on many scales, with bigger,

superordinate practices (like mentoring a newly qualified teacher) being formed out of constellations of smaller, subordinate practices (like answering a question asked by a newly qualified teacher).

In terms of our practice theory, practices are constituted within specific conditions and arrangements that we call practice architectures (Kemmis et al., 2014). A particular practice of mentoring, in a particular school or municipality or country, say, is enmeshed with and shaped by local and more general practice architectures that exist in that school or municipality or country. These practice architectures function as particular preconditions for mentoring as it occurs there. Practice architectures thus prefigure (Schatzki, 2002), though they do not determine, people's practices, in the way that a path offers an easier way through a forest; similarly, practice architectures change in response to changing conditions, as a path changes its course when a fallen tree causes walkers to make a new path around it (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008).

We take an ontological approach to practices (Schatzki, 2002, 2010) that emphasizes that practices do not occur in a vacuum; they are enmeshed with particular kinds of arrangements to be found at specific sites. Following Schatzki, we regard practices as sites of 'human coexistence' (Schatzki, 2002), and aim to understand them not as abstract entities but in concrete detail, 'as they happen' (Schatzki, 2006). Adopting his 'new societist ontology' (Schatzki, 2003), we thus investigate the 'site ontologies' (Schatzki, 2005) in which practices happen; for example, as a particular practice of mentoring as support unfolds in a setting like a school staffroom, for example. What is most significant about this new view of practices is that it aims to understand practices as shaped not by hypostatized entities like 'social structures' (like Bourdieu's, 1990, notion of cultural, symbolic, economic or social 'fields', for example), but rather in terms of actual arrangements that either already exist in particular sites (like the arrangements of physical objects encountered by a newly qualified teacher arriving at the site) or are brought to the site (like new objects or equipment, or specific new ideas brought to a site by a newly qualified teacher).

Schatzki (2012) understood practices as occurring in 'practice-arrangement bundles' in which practices are prefigured, but not determined, by the arrangements amidst which they occur. In similar vein, Kemmis and Grootenboer (2008) and Kemmis et al. (2014) developed the theory of practice architectures, according to which the sayings, doings and relatings of a practice are enmeshed with the particular practice architectures in the site in which they unfold. Practices thus partly take their form from the practice architectures at a site, varying in a dialectical interplay of action and interaction with the affordances of the site. Practice architectures enable and constrain what can be said and done in the practice, and how people can relate to one another. They prefigure what people do in a practice by furnishing particular kinds of resources for the sayings, the doings, and the relatings of the practice: a particular language that can be used, a particular location in physical space-time, particular arrays of objects that enable and constrain what can be done, and particular social conditions that enable and constrain how participants relate to one another. The practice architectures that enable and constrain practices exist in three dimensions of intersubjective space, that is, the space in which human beings encounter one another. In this article, therefore we have set out to show how different kinds of practices of mentoring are prefigured differently

1. in semantic space (the space constituted in the medium of language), in different kinds of cultural-discursive arrangements (like Foucault's, 1980, 'regimes of truth'[1]) that prefigure different ways in which mentoring is understood and discussed; for example, the different things people say in and about mentoring (sayings) when they understand mentoring within a discourse of supervision, or a discourse of support, or a discourse of collaborative self-development;
2. in physical space-time (the space constituted in the medium of activity and work), in different kinds of material-economic arrangements that prefigure different ways in which mentoring is enacted; for example, the different things people do (doings) in mentoring if it takes place in a supervisor's office, or in a quiet corner in a school staff room, or in a meeting room away from the school over coffee and cake; and
3. in social space (the space constituted in the medium of power and solidarity), in different kinds of social-political arrangements that prefigure different ways that people relate to one another (relatings) in mentoring; for example, if the mentor is the mentee's supervisor, or an experienced colleague who is not in a supervisory relationship with the mentee, or if the mentors are other new teachers who meet regularly as both co-mentors and co-mentees to help one another think through and address issues they encounter in their working lives.

In semantic space, mentoring is conceptualized differently under different circumstances. For example, new teachers are named in different ways: Beginning Teachers, Early Career Teachers (ECTs), Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs), or New Scheme Teachers; these different conceptualizations enable and constrain different ways of regarding and interacting with new teachers. Similarly, mentoring is construed very differently if it is framed in a language of 'supervision', 'professional support' or 'collaborative self-development'. In physical space-time, we may empirically observe different kinds of activities taking place in different kinds of mentoring; these different activities enable and constrain different ways of doing mentoring. And in social space, we may observe people occupying different kinds of relationships in these different kinds of mentoring, for example in different kinds of role relationships between mentors and mentees, that also enable and constrain different kinds of identity formation for the people involved.

Just as 'mentoring' does not have one fixed and final meaning, there is not just one aim or purpose for mentoring. On the contrary, 'mentoring' is a contested notion: people have different ideas about what 'mentoring' means, how it should be done, and how people should relate to one another. Thus, different versions of mentoring are distinguished by their distinctive projects: they are motivated by different intentions, involve different patterns of actions, and seek to attain different ends. In the 'classical' view of mentoring, the project of mentoring is to guide and support a new teacher as they develop their professional knowledge, skills and values. On another, more instrumental view, the project of mentoring is to supervise new teachers as they pass through a probationary phase *en route* to full registration as teachers. On still another view, the project of mentoring is to help new teachers to enter the community of the profession. Using the theory of practice architectures, we will show, in our three countries, how one or more of these different projects have been realized in different discourses about mentoring, within different kinds of activities and actions of mentoring, and different kinds of relatings between mentors and mentees and others.

[1] Foucault (1980: 131) said: 'Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true'.

Our analysis suggests that different versions of mentoring not only produce different kinds of learning for the individuals involved, they also develop different kinds of dispositions in mentees and in mentors. They invoke different kinds of shared worlds in which people encounter one another: different views of society and different ways of being in society. Mentoring can thus be understood as an educational or pedagogical encounter like any other: an encounter that forms both the individuals who participate in it, and the world we share.

On the side of the individuals involved, what seems most important for the future of mentoring and for the future of the new teachers is the kinds of dispositions that new teachers develop when they participate in different kinds of mentoring designed to realize the three different projects of mentoring we described. Bourdieu (1990) described the habitus as a set of dispositions: capacities to practice in particular kinds of cultural, economic and social fields. We use the term 'dispositions' to encompass not only what we think of in a relatively static way as knowledge, skills and values, but also, more dynamically, people's capacities and commitments, that is, capacities and commitments that they express in practice by saying and doing particular things, and by relating to others and the world in particular ways. Participation in practices always produces, reproduces and transforms aspects of participants' dispositions.

In the case of mentoring, the way mentoring is practiced produces, reproduces and transforms the dispositions of both mentors and mentees. By practicing mentoring as supervision, then, a mentor is likely to develop the disposition of a supervisor and perhaps an agent of the state, and a mentee is likely to develop a disposition of compliance to state authority. By practicing mentoring as support, a mentor is likely to develop a disposition to be a helpful professional colleague and guide, and a mentee is likely to develop a disposition towards continuing professional development. By practicing mentoring as collaborative self-development, mentor-mentees are likely to develop dispositions towards engagement in a professional community committed to individual and collective self-development. Arguably, new teachers developing these qualitatively different kinds of dispositions, are developing very different ways of enacting the profession and the practice of teaching, and very different ways of being and becoming in the profession. If this is so, then it follows that the profession needs to consider closely what forms of mentoring are most appropriate, when, for whom, and under what circumstances. What are at stake in these decisions are the dispositions that new teachers will form in the first years of their careers, not only as individuals but also as members of the profession. What is at stake is whether and to what extent they will be (a) teachers compliant to professional standards, and/or (b) teachers responsive to professional guides and who, in time, will take their turn at being guides for others, and/or (c) members of a professional community committed to individual and collective self-development in the profession.

Different projects of mentoring, then, foster the development of different kinds of dispositions in new teachers and those who mentor them. Whether or not they are successful in developing these kinds of dispositions is not the focus of concern in this article. Here, our aim is more modest: we aim to show only that the different archetypes of mentoring are manifested differently in different countries. By doing so, we hope to invite continuing discussion and debate about the theory, policies and practices of mentoring, and about what kinds of theories, policies and practices of mentoring are best justified to meet the needs of new teachers and the profession, under different national circumstances, in the years ahead.

The theory of practice architectures we have described is depicted in Box 1.

The theory of practice architectures provides a way to analyze practices and to discover the conditions that make particular kinds of practice possible. An analysis of the practice architectures that prefigure different kinds of mentoring practices of new teachers allows us to identify the conditions of possibility for those practices, that is, what arrangements currently condition make possible mentoring of particular kinds. Such an analysis, in turn, can indicate what other or different arrangements it might be necessary to bring into a site to make new, other, or transformed practices of mentoring possible, and thus develop new or different kinds of dispositions in new teachers being mentored.

2. Methodology: the evidentiary basis for this study

Our general research approach in this study has been the dialectical approach of *philosophical-empirical enquiry*; that is, we have used contemporary practice philosophy and theory (for example, Schatzki, 2002, 2010) to interrogate cases of practice as they happen in the field, and we have used empirical cases of practices as they happen to interrogate contemporary issues in practice theory.

More specifically, the empirical work in this study has been conducted employing a *multiple case study approach* (Stake, 2006) with an explicitly ontological focus. Our approach to case study differs from other approaches that focus chiefly on people and their perspectives on organizations or issues. Instead, the cases we study are practices of mentoring as they happen, and as they are enmeshed with the practice architectures in the site that make

Box 1
The theory of practice architectures.

Practices are secured in	Intersubjective space/medium	Practice architectures (arrangements) enable and constrain interaction via
Practitioners' '*sayings*' and '*thinking*' (the 'cognitive')	*Semantic space* in the medium of *language*	*Cultural-discursive arrangements* found in or brought to a site (e.g., ideas)
Practitioners' '*doings*' (the 'psychomotor')	*Physical space-time* in the medium of *activity* and *work*	*Material-economic arrangements* found in or brought to a site (e.g., space, time, resources)
Practitioners' '*relatings*' (the 'affective')	*Social space* in the medium of *power* and *solidarity*	*Social-political arrangements*found in or brought to the site (e.g., role relationships)
which are bundled together in the *projects* of practices, and the *dispositions* (*habitus*) of practitioners.		which are bundled together in characteristic ways in *practice landscapes* and *practice traditions*.

Box 2
The kinds of evidence collected and the kinds of analyses undertaken in our studies of mentoring.

Practices	Practice architectures	Accessed via (a) key data gathering techniques and (b) forms of analysis:
Sayings (and *projects*)	*Cultural-discursive arrangements* (in *semantic space*)	(a) Documents, interviews (participants' interpretations of sayings, and the projects of practices), observation (what is said), debriefing interviews (sometimes using photographs for stimulated recall), field notes, audio- and video-records. (b) Micro interaction analysis, conversation analysis, document analysis, discourse analysis, historical analysis
Doings	*Material-economic arrangements* (in *physical space-time*)	(a) Documents, interviews (participants' interpretations of doings), observation (what is done), spatial maps (of classrooms or meeting spaces), photographs, audio- and video-records. (b) Micro interaction analysis, activity system analysis (actants, sequences, artefacts, etc.), historical analysis.
Relatings	*Social-political arrangements* (in *social space*)	(a) Documents, interviews (participants' interpretations of relatings), observation (how people and things relate), field notes, audio- and video-records (e.g. speaker-hearer and role relationships), spatial maps. (b) Micro interaction analysis, conversation analysis, historical analysis.

those particular practices possible. Box 2 gives an indication of the kinds of evidence collected in our case studies of practices.

The evidence accessed for this study includes field notes, transcripts of interviews (including focus group interviews) and written, audio and video records of observations of mentoring sessions. The evidence also includes documents collected in each country: policy documents, reviews of national research literature, teachers' reflections and other texts. Together, these have permitted us to construct a meta-analysis of empirical observations and findings made in many studies we have conducted. Wherever it was necessary, the authors obtained appropriate institutional ethics approvals to conduct the research studies upon which we draw in the analyses presented here.

In Australia, practices concerning the induction or mentoring of newly qualified teachers are governed by policies from the different states and territories. The Australian case presented in this article is based largely on evidence collected in action research projects in mentoring programs in rural New South Wales (Edward-Groves, 2012), supplemented by some additional interviews and analysis of policy documents. Mentoring practices in New South Wales have been analyzed using a range of qualitative methods including document and policy analysis from the three kinds of providers of education in NSW (the State school system, the Catholic school system, and Independent schools), interviews with NQTs and their mentors, and a collection of artefacts.

In Sweden, the evidence has also been collected in multiple ways over a long period. Most of the evidence has been collected by members of the Induction Research Group at the University of Gävle that have followed the development of mentoring in Sweden in different research-projects since 1999 (e.g., Fransson, 2010, 2012; Fransson & Morberg, 2001; Fransson & Gustafsson, 2008; Gustafsson & Fransson, 2012; Morberg, 2002; Morberg & Gustafsson, 2007). Other Swedish evidence has also been used in the meta-analysis in this article (e.g., Lindgren, 2003). In 2005, an international network *Newly Qualified Teachers in Northern Europe* (NQTNE) was established, followed by a project *Supporting Newly Qualified Teachers through Collaborative Mentoring* (NQT-COME). These networks initiated a number of comparative research projects and publications about mentoring of new teachers in the Nordic countries, including Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Norway and Sweden (e.g., Fransson & Gustafsson, 2008). The induction practices in Sweden and in the Nordic countries have also been discussed in a number of conferences and symposia organized by the networks (e.g., Fransson, Jokinen & Klages, 2011; Jokinen, Heikkinen, Eisenschmidt & Fransson, 2010).

In Finland, the Finnish Network for Teacher Induction 'Osaava Verme', coordinated by the Finnish Institute for Educational Research (FIER), has collected empirical material on Finnish mentoring practices since 2006. This qualitative material has been analyzed and reported in a number of publications (e.g., Aspfors, 2012; Aspfors & Hansén, 2011; Fransson & Gustafsson, 2008; Heikkinen, Jokinen & Tynjälä, 2012). The Peer-Group Mentoring model has lately been applied and further developed by PAEDEIA peoject ('Pedagogical Action for a European Dimension in Educators' Induction Approaches') which is funded by the European Commission.

The empirical material we collected in these cases has been re-analyzed, for the purposes of this article, using the theory of practice architectures. As will become clear, these analyses produced some new insights about how different approaches to mentoring are constructed in terms of different discourses (cultural-discursive arrangements), different material conditions (material-economic arrangements) and different relationships between people and organizations in the networks that stretch beyond the people immediately involved in a local practice of mentoring (social-political arrangements).

3. Mentoring archetypes viewed through the theory of practice architectures

Our meta-analysis revealed three main archetypes of mentoring: mentoring as supervision, mentoring as support, and mentoring as collaborative self-development. These archetypes might alternatively have been described as three 'ideal types' of mentoring, but we prefer the term 'archetypes' because we describe and discuss them with particular empirical material in mind. The three versions of mentoring we describe are not conceptual abstractions (as ideal types frequently are); on the contrary, they are based on the evidence of our observations in our different countries, as described earlier. We have also grounded these descriptions in specific cases: mentoring as supervision as observed in New South Wales, Australia; mentoring as support as observed in Sweden; and mentoring as collaborative self-development as observed in Finland. It is important to note that these are *not* necessarily the only or most prevalent forms of mentoring in each of these countries; we have chosen to describe each archetype of mentoring practice as it exists in the country we have selected, in order to show how it is enmeshed with particular kinds of local practice architectures that make this or that archetype possible in that country.

In what follows, we present concise descriptions of each of the archetypes of mentoring practice, and then present examples of the

Box 3
Examples of evidence of mentoring as supervision.

Practices of mentoring as supervision	Practice architectures of mentoring as supervision
Examples of sayings (specialized discourses) *Mentee*: using specialist discourses of state professional standards policies; subjecting oneself to this language to document one's own performance. *Mentor*: using specialist discourses to discipline the mentee towards (a) meeting professional standards for their performance, (b) documenting evidence of performance, and (c) complying with the procedural requirements of the state registration body.	***Examples of cultural-discursive arrangements*** State policy discourses legislating requirements for teacher probation and registration (e.g., naming principals or heads of department as 'mentors'); discourses of teacher professional standards; discourses of teacher effectiveness; and New Public Management discourses of productivity and performativity.[a]
Examples of doings *Mentee*: enacting the professional standards in teaching and other activities; collecting data and documenting own performances in required portfolio; discussing evidence with supervisor; following supervisor directions; sending portfolio to state registration body for summative assessment. *Mentor*: observing and reflecting on performance and evidence with mentee; formatively assessing the developing portfolio; reporting summative assessments of the mentee's performance to the state registration body.	***Examples of material-economic arrangements*** Supervisors' offices as sites for mentoring meetings; formal documents outlining requirements for registration of teachers passing through probation; material set-ups and resources of classrooms where teachers enact and document prescribed standards of performance; offices of the state registration body where portfolios are assessed, and where registration of teachers is officially recorded.
Examples of relatings *Mentee and mentor*: complying (or not) with state registration body requirements about the conduct of the mentor/supervisor-mentee relationship; complying (or not) with state professional standards about teaching, implementing curricula, and relationships with students, other teachers, parents and communities; complying (or not) with state registration body requirements about documentation of evidence of performance, and submitting to the body's assessment of that evidence.	***Examples of social-political arrangements*** *In the state*: legislative arrangements for schools and teacher employment; juridical relationships between teachers, supervisors and state registration body based on legislation. *In the school*: some collegial and some hierarchical relationships between new teachers and students, colleagues, supervisors and others. *In the classroom*: relationships between new teacher, students, observers and others that comply (or not) with requirements of the professional standards.
Project *For the mentee and the mentor/supervisor*: to enable the mentee to meet all the probation and registration requirements of the state registration body: substantive (in their performance), procedural (in their documentation of evidence of their performance), and legal (in their meeting the requirements for full registration and being registered).	***Practice landscapes*** Local landscapes composed of places and paths including classrooms, offices and meeting rooms in schools; communication and information media that are places and pathways for exchanges between new teachers, supervisors and the state registration body; and offices in the registration body where standards are determined and performance is adjudicated.
Dispositions *For the mentee*: Knowledge, skills and values that allow the mentee to meet the required professional standards substantively, procedurally and legally. *For the mentor*: Knowledge, skills and values to assist the mentee to meet the substantive, procedural and legal requirements for registration, and to act as the local agent of the state registration body.	***Practice traditions*** The practice of mentoring as supervision is partly framed by practice traditions of education and pedagogy, and partly by practice traditions of public sector management and administration that are hierarchically dispersed like a capillary system throughout the sector to be administered – in this case, NSW schools.

[a] As many readers will know, New Public Management (NPM) is a political view that assumes that market oriented management of the public sector leads to greater efficiency of administration. The foundations of this view were laid by economist and political philosopher Friedrich von Hayek (1899–1992) who is perhaps the most influential theorist to shape what is now understood as neo-liberalism, which is associated with policies of privatization of public sector agencies wherever the work of such agencies could be conducted instead by business organizations in a market. NPM is characterized by marketization, competitiveness, managerialism, performance measurement, productivity, and accountability (Leicht, Walter, Sainsaulieu, & Davies, 2009; Tolofari, 2005).

evidence that shows how these different archetypes of mentoring practice are made possible by different kinds of practice architectures. Examples of the evidence are presented in Box 3 (for mentoring as supervision), Box 4 (for mentoring as support), and Box 5 (for mentoring as collaborative self-development). Each of these Boxes is arranged in a form similar to the depiction of theory of practice architectures presented in Box 1. The evidence shows that these different mentoring practices do not exist in a vacuum: they depend for their existence on the presence of particular kinds of cultural-discursive, material-economic and social-political arrangements that (a) provide the resources that make possible the sayings, doings and relatings of the practice, (b) allow this form of mentoring to pursue its distinctive project, and (c) help to form distinctive kinds of dispositions in new teachers that this form of mentoring anticipates, advocates and nurtures.

3.1. Mentoring as supervision

As already indicated, one version of mentoring sees the process as one of preparing new teachers during a process of probation so that they can meet the requirements for registration as fully qualified, autonomous members of the profession. Box 3 sets out some of the features of mentoring as supervision as they exist in the public school system of the state of New South Wales in Australia, specifically in the requirements of the New South Wales Institute of Teachers (NSWIT) for the probation and registration of new teachers. New teachers are described by the NSWIT as 'New Scheme Teachers' because only those teachers graduating since October 1, 2004 have been obliged to undergo this registration process.[2]

3.2. Mentoring as support

A second view of mentoring sees it as a process of professional support and guidance for a new teacher, in which a mentor, who is not usually in a supervisory relationship with the mentee, assists the mentee in the development of their professional practice in the

[2] At the time of writing, the NSW Government is considering requiring all NSW teachers to be registered by NSWIT, including those who were registered as teachers by the NSW Department of Education (under various names) before the NSWIT started registering teachers in 2004.

Box 4
Examples of evidence of mentoring as support.[a]

Practices of mentoring as support	Practice architectures of mentoring as support
Examples of sayings	***Examples of cultural-discursive arrangements***
For the mentee: Understanding mentoring as a process of professional development in which mentees develop their professional practice through experience and experimentation, assisted by observation, reflection and guidance from the mentor.	In Sweden, a 1995 agreement between municipalities and unions established that new teachers have a right to support by a mentor. Official discourses from the period 1995–2008 described mentoring as 'informal', the mentor as an 'advisor', and the mentor's role as facilitation of the mentee's professional learning, including learning from experience.
For the mentor: Understanding mentoring as sensitively and tactfully observing, supporting, challenging and (sometimes) advising new colleagues.	
Examples of doings	***Examples of material-economic arrangements***
For the mentee: Reflecting on teaching; collecting evidence about one's own practice, sometimes by being observed by the mentor, and reflecting on the evidence individually and with the mentor; discussing professional concerns with the mentor.	Mentoring as support occurs in meetings at times and in places agreed by the mentor and mentee, sometimes in the classroom of one or the other, or an office, or a staffroom. Where the mentee has been collecting evidence about their teaching, the classroom is another site involved in mentoring. If the mentor observes the mentee teaching, this occurs at times when the mentor is not involved in teaching or other work; similarly, the mentee may observe the mentor teaching and time must be found to allow this to happen.
For the mentor: Meeting with the mentee on an agreed basis; offering reflections and guidance where appropriate; supporting the mentee in their professional development on the job. Sometimes, a mentor also observes the mentee teaching or working in other settings in the school.	
Examples of relatings	***Examples of social-political arrangements***
For the mentee and mentor: Mentoring as support – perhaps the classical view of mentoring – envisages a wise and experienced mentor supporting a less experienced mentee – in this case, a new teacher. While the relationship is asymmetrical, it also envisages a future time when the mentee will have attained expertise and wisdom in the practices of the profession, and thus be in a position to mentor others.	Swedish municipalities formally agreed the right of new teachers to mentoring as support, and agreed to facilitate mentoring as part of the post-initial, continuing professional education of new teachers. In schools, mentors were normally experienced colleagues with a commitment to the profession and to helping new teachers find their feet in the job. Mentors were not normally direct supervisors of mentees, but disinterested observers, colleagues and confidantes for new teachers.
Project	***Practice landscapes***
For the mentee and the mentor, the project of mentoring as support is to assist the mentee to adjust into the role and professional practice of teaching, into the workplace, and into the profession. There is a focus on well-being, professional development and classroom management. The mentor might also act as advisor for the mentee.	The practice of mentoring as support occurs over a variety of settings: places (like classrooms and meeting rooms) and paths (journeys of planned experimentation, observation and reflection, for example) that are enmeshed in activities that unfold as a process of supporting a new teacher in their practice 'on the job' and in the profession.
Dispositions	***Practice traditions***
For the mentee, the aim is to develop the dispositions of an experienced teacher and member of the profession – to develop as a teacher, as a participant in the workplace, and as a member of the profession.	The practice of mentoring as support is framed largely by practice traditions of education and pedagogy, especially adult education pedagogies and pedagogies for continuing professional development in working life.
For the mentor, the aim is to act wisely and prudently to support the new teacher in their work, as a colleague in the workplace, and as a developing member of the profession	

[a] See Fransson and Gustafsson (2008), where examples of mentoring as support are identified in Estonia, Denmark and Norway, as well as in Sweden. It must be noted, however, that this view has been found in these countries, and others, at a particular moment in history. As can be seen elsewhere in this article, mentoring as support is also found in New South Wales in Australia, via the NSW Mentoring Program.

job. Even though mentoring as support was under challenge in Sweden between 2011 and 2013, the practice of mentoring as support has had a firm place in Swedish working life in education for at least 40 years (Government Inquiry, 1978:86). Since those beginnings, a more widespread and structured form of mentoring emerged with the 1995 national agreement between the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and the two teachers' unions (the National Union of Teachers in Sweden and the Swedish Teachers' Union) that gave new teachers the *right* to participate in an induction program and to be supported by a mentor. However, this agreement was not implemented everywhere and, in 2004, just 59% of teachers employed *on a probationary* basis were allocated a mentor by their school (Lärarnas Riksförbund, 2005). That is, many new teachers hired either on a provisional basis or permanently did not have any mentor. Thus, although not universal, a norm had developed in Sweden that new teachers would have a mentor, and that the form of the mentoring would be what we have described as mentoring as support. As we shall see later, however, this widespread view and practice of mentoring came under challenge in Sweden, partly because the professionalization of mentors resulted in a greater emphasis on 'mentoring as professional development' (Morberg & Gustafsson, 2007), and partly because the 2011–2013 implementation of a system of teacher evaluation and registration turned some aspects of the mentoring process into a practice of mentoring as supervision in addition to, or perhaps instead of, mentoring as support (Government Inquiry (1978:86). Box 4 presents examples of evidence about how the practice of mentoring as support is made possible by particular kinds of local practice architectures.

3.3. Mentoring as collaborative self-development

A third view of mentoring sees it as a process to assist a new teacher to become a member of a professional community in which members participate as equals in professional dialogue aimed at their individual and collective self-development. In Finland in recent years, mentoring as collaborative self-development has become the most common form of mentoring practice. An experienced teacher (confusingly described as a 'mentor,' perhaps on the model of mentoring as support) acts as facilitator for meetings of groups of new teachers from a municipality. The intention is that

Box 5
Examples of evidence of mentoring as collaborative self-development.

Practices of mentoring as collaborative self-development	Practice architectures of mentoring as collaborative self-development
Examples of sayings	***Examples of cultural-discursive arrangements***
For the mentees and mentor: Peer-group mentoring builds on sharing professional experiences (sayings). The group acts as a forum for collective reflection that includes dialogical giving and receiving of support and help. Authentic problems are discussed, analyzed and solved together. The meetings function as a sounding board where the teachers dare to ask "silly" questions without performance pressure.	Peer-group mentoring is rooted in the high professional autonomy of Finnish teachers and schools. Discourses of autonomy as collective meaning making and will-formation prefigure both educational practice and the practice of peer-group mentoring. Since the 1970s, Finnish teachers have a five-year, master degree in teacher education, earning status and respect for the teaching profession.
Examples of doings	***Examples of material-economic arrangements***
For the mentees and mentor: The activities in peer mentoring groups are rather informal and flexible. Often meetings start with coffee and a snack so the teachers can unwind and change focus to peer-group mentoring. Groups decide the aims and issues for discussion collectively and govern their own proceedings. No documentation or reporting is required. Meetings thus offer confidential time and space for discussion, problem solving, sharing of experiences, and discussing professional literature.	Since Finnish teachers are fully qualified immediately after having received the Master level diploma, no elements of assessment, registration or control are required in mentoring. New teachers' participation in mentoring groups is voluntary. Usually, groups of four to ten teachers meet outside school with a mentor (facilitator) once a month for one and a half to three hours. Municipalities organize peer-mentoring groups and pay group facilitators (mentors); the Ministry of Education and Culture funds the education of mentors.
Examples of relatings	***Examples of social-political arrangements***
For the mentees and mentor: The relationships in peer-mentoring groups aim to be symmetrical, above all in the *existential dimension* (as human beings) new teachers are regarded as equal with their more experienced colleagues. In the *epistemic dimension*, the relationships are asymmetrical regarding knowledge and expertise: usually group facilitators have more experience of the profession, while young teachers may have more epistemic capital (know-how, experience) on some other issues. This diversity enhances learning and development in the groups as the teachers share experience and expertise from different fields. In the *juridical dimension,* the relationship is also asymmetrical: the facilitator has greater responsibility for leading the meetings and responsibilities to the employer.	*In Finland*: Induction of new teachers is not based on legislation, but a number of policy reports have encouraged development of induction models. The PGM model has been implemented nationwide by the national program for teacher development, *Osaava–ohjelma*, in 2010–16.
Peer-group mentoring decreases new teachers' feelings of being alone and offers them new contacts from other schools.	*In the universities*: all universities offering teacher education and all vocational teacher education colleges are members of the Finnish Network for Teacher Induction which offers an education module for mentors, lasting one academic year (8–10 ECTS credits).
	In municipalities: municipalities are responsible for the continuing professional development of teachers, for offering peer-group mentoring to new teachers, and for paying mentors for their work.
	In schools: A variety of different arrangements and relationships support new teachers.
Project	***Practice landscapes***
For the mentees and mentor: To promote professional well-being and learning about professional practice. To become a member of a professional community.	The participants decide themselves where to meet, normally in places that enable private and confidential discussions. Participants can also visit each other's schools. The practice landscapes are thus rather informal settings conducive to sharing experiences.
Dispositions	***Practice traditions***
By practicing peer-group mentoring as a form of collaborative self-development, mentors and mentees are likely to develop dispositions towards engagement in a professional community committed to individual and collective self-development.	Mentoring as collaborative self-development is framed by practice traditions of education and pedagogy, especially adult education pedagogies for continuing professional development in working life. It is also informed by Nordic traditions of folk enlightenment, and traditions of collaborative action research in education.
This form of mentoring is likely to enhance teachers' sense of professional autonomy.	

the new teachers will be able to discuss their teaching and their work in a 'safe' environment of peers, all of whom aim to act as co-mentors and co-mentees for one another in their mutual professional development. Because, in practice, the participants in this form of mentoring in fact act as co-mentors and co-mentees for one another, we have described this archetype of mentoring as 'mentoring as collaborative self-development'. In these meetings, the proceedings of the group are confidential; participants agree not to discuss what goes on in the group with non-members. The facilitator is not supposed to act as an expert with the task of 'tuning' the performances of the other participants, but rather helps to manage the flow of discussions and reflections, and may occasionally offer advice if it seems appropriate. Box 5 outlines the kinds of practice architectures that make possible the practice of mentoring as collaborative self-development.

4. Discussion: mentoring as contested

It is evident from the brief descriptions of the evidence concerning the different sayings, doings and relatings of the practices associated with these three different archetypes of mentoring, and the evidence of the kinds of practice architectures that hold them in place, that there is contestation over how mentoring is understood, how it is enacted, and how it creates different kinds of social relationships that support different kinds of professional identities and different kinds of relationships between new teachers and others in the profession. This contestation over archetypes of mentoring plays out in different ways in the different countries we have studied.

4.1. Contestation about mentoring in NSW, Australia

Since the 1990s, the New South Wales Department of Education and Communities has offered a Mentoring Program for new teachers based largely on the view of mentoring as support. After 2004, that program was somewhat overshadowed by the imposition of a probation process for new teachers who must seek registration with the New South Wales Institute of Teachers (NSWIT) via a process that includes mentoring as supervision.

These two approaches to mentoring jostle confusingly alongside one another, at least for some new teachers. All New Scheme Teachers (teachers appointed to permanent positions since October 1, 2004) are required to be part of the probation and mentoring as supervision process, and some have also taken the opportunity to participate in the NSW Department of Education and Communities Mentoring Program based on the archetype of mentoring as support. Further, while not usually labeled as 'mentoring', some other initiatives for new teachers in NSW also offer opportunities that hint at aspirations towards the archetype of mentoring as collaborative self-development. These include professional development sessions constructed specifically for groups of new teachers offered in different regions (which are not as well-formed or as sustained as the Finnish peer-mentoring arrangements), and collaborative action research projects in which new teachers participate together, although sometimes also alongside other more experienced teachers.

4.2. Contestation about mentoring in Sweden

In Sweden, a 2011 law imposed a probationary process for new teachers that included a process of mentoring as supervision rather similar to that found in NSW, Australia. In Sweden, however, there was a much greater tension within the probation process between the ideal of mentoring as support and the legal requirements for mentoring as supervision because of the proposed requirements for evaluation of the new teachers (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011). Between the proposals of 2011 and a resolution of the issue in late 2013, there was a politically charged tension between past, widespread practices of mentoring as support and professional development and the proposed new additional process of mentoring as supervision.

In Sweden there has also been a mentoring process like mentoring as collaborative self-development, evident in a model modestly used for more than ten years that offers group seminars involving new teachers, teacher educators and municipal officials (Fransson & Morberg, 2001; Morberg & Gustafsson, 2007). This model has in principle been downplayed in favor of the mandatory one-to-one-mentoring. Through Nordic networks, the Swedish model to some extent influenced the development of the Finnish peer-group mentoring. While some Swedish researchers envisaged a development towards the kind of mentoring as collaborative self-development found in Finland, the debates occasioned by the 2011 law re-focused attention on the professional pros and cons of mentoring as support as compared with mentoring as supervision which entangled mentoring with the evaluation of new teachers. Thus, the Swedish National Agency for Education and municipalities had to confront and deal with the realpolitik of the contest between mentoring as supervision and mentoring as support, along with the organizers and participants in mentoring training courses and, especially, those people active in the practices of support and evaluation of new teachers in schools. This debate concluded with changes to the reform from July 1, 2014, including the abolition of the evaluation of new teachers. Thus, the focus will probably shift back to mentoring as support and professional development, and perhaps in the years ahead there might once again be interest in exploring approaches to mentoring like the Finnish approach of mentoring as collaborative self-development.

4.3. Contestation about mentoring in Finland

In Finland, it appears that the contestation between these three alternative views of mentoring is in a period of quiescence. The Education Ministry, the municipalities, the university teacher education faculties, and the profession through its unions have broadly agreed that mentoring for new teachers should be conducted as a process of collaborative self-development. In the past, of course, before the Osaava Verme project introduced and trialed mentoring as collaborative self-development on a relatively large scale, mentoring was seen largely in 'classical' terms; that is, the general approach was to see mentoring for new teachers in terms of support. For many years, however, 'support' was rarely emphasized in the induction of new teachers, since they were regarded as professionally fully qualified, given their five years of teacher education leading to the degree of Master. It appears that the widespread respect for the education profession in Finland helps governments and communities to see mentoring as something that can safely remain within the professional autonomy of teachers; that is, something that can be left to the professional judgment of members of the profession. Perhaps for this reason, there does not appear to be a swelling of support for the idea of mentoring as supervision that has accompanied the spread of principles and practices of New Public Management in other countries, even though Finland has also embraced the New Public Management in other areas of public administration (Sahlberg, 2012).

4.4. Differences in the focus and intensity of contestation about mentoring

In these three settings, then, we see different degrees and foci of contestation over which archetype or archetypes of mentoring are most appropriate to the formation and transformation of the teaching profession at this historical moment. In each setting, we might then consider the extent to which politicians and educational policy-makers, educational researchers and evaluators, members of and spokespersons for the teaching profession, and the wider public are eager to maintain existing practices of mentoring or to establish others, either in addition to established practices of mentoring or as alternatives to them. It seems to us that it is the spread of the discourse of New Public Management in communities of policy-makers and politicians that has prompted moves towards implementation of programs of mentoring as supervision, though the teaching profession, universities and the general public are less convinced of the merits of this approach to mentoring (cf. Devos, 2010). It also seems to us that the teaching profession and universities have for some time been wedded to the 'classical' notion of mentoring as support, and that they retain a commitment to this as a well-justified approach to the continuing professional education of new teachers as they enter the profession. It should nevertheless be said that, in many parts of the world, a variety of advocates for the professional autonomy of teachers and the teaching profession, and for action research by teachers, also see promise in the practice of mentoring as collaborative self-development.

5. Conclusion

We have demonstrated that three different views of mentoring are widespread: mentoring as supervision, mentoring as support, and mentoring as collaborative self-development. They are found in Australia (NSW), Sweden and Finland and, as the literature of mentoring shows, in many other countries as well (cf. Hobson et al., 2009). In Australia and Sweden, practices and traditions of mentoring as support have been contested by the emergence of practices of, and practice architectures for, mentoring as supervision. This change has been prompted by a desire, among policy-makers and politicians, for greater surveillance of teachers and teaching. In turn, this desire has stimulated the construction of elaborate systems of monitoring and governance of the profession (practice architectures) that make mentoring as supervision possible (Fransson, 2012; Devos, 2010). In Finland, in the last decade, by contrast, practices and

traditions of mentoring as support have been supplanted by practices and practice architectures of mentoring as collaborative self-development. In Finland, the teaching profession seems to be held in high regard, and neither greater surveillance of teachers nor reduced autonomy for the teaching profession seem warranted to politicians or policy-makers (Sahlberg, 2012).

We have noted that these three versions of mentoring are archetypes. In reality, mentoring practices adopted in an education system may be composed of elements of more than one of the archetypes, as we saw in Sweden in the period 2011–2013 when a proposed procedure for mentoring as supervision appeared in tandem, and in tension, with prior practices of mentoring as support. Moreover, we have also shown that, within countries as well as between them, different versions of mentoring co-exist (as in NSW, Australia, where mentoring as supervision co-exists with mentoring as support, and with weak forms of mentoring as collaborative self-development), in ways that seem confusing, especially for new teachers who experience mentoring in multiple forms. And we have shown how each of these versions of mentoring is made possible by an elaborate machinery of practice architectures, which are, like the different practices of mentoring themselves, also contested. As we have shown, different forms of mentoring require distinctive discourses about mentoring, distinctive procedures and activities for mentors and mentees (among others), and distinctive regimes of power and solidarity that differently discipline the web of social relationships around mentors and mentees. We have also shown that these different practices and practice architectures sometimes compete with one another.

Our aim in this article has been to show that it is not only the practice of mentoring that needs to be understood if we are to make decisions about its continuing appropriateness under changed historical conditions, but also the practice architectures that make the practice possible. We have thrown some light on the kinds of conditions and arrangements that make possible three different archetypes of mentoring. We have also indicated that these practice architectures, in turn, depend upon wider conditions of possibility in the societies and communities in which they exist. These wider conditions include such things as, for example, degrees of trust among politicians and policy-makers in the teaching profession, or degrees of commitment to implementing the principles and practices of the New Public Management as an approach to public administration in some parts of the public sector, and in some parts of the world.

Changing the practice of mentoring, we have argued, requires changing the practice architectures that support it. In this article, we have seen three countries in which, a decade ago, mentoring as support was widespread, and held in place by practice architectures that made that 'classical' view of mentoring seem secure and almost unassailable. In the decade since, however, there have been substantial transformations in those apparently settled arrangements. In Finland, the education profession has debated and accepted mentoring as collaborative self-development as an advance, in some sense, over that 'classical' view, and the new view of mentoring has been secured culturally, discursively, materially, economically, socially and politically. The profession, the wider community, and municipal and national education agencies are broadly agreed that mentoring as collaborative self-development is an appropriate form of mentoring in education as a highly regarded profession with the autonomy to organize such matters as mentoring. The Finnish approach seems to include all the essential elements typical of constructivist-oriented mentoring (Richter et al., 2013). In this model, it is assumed that knowledge of teaching is mutually generated in collaborative relationships between new teachers and more experienced teachers. In NSW, Australia, by contrast, mentoring as supervision has begun to challenge, and perhaps to unseat, mentoring as support. In NSW, governments are bringing education and teaching under closer surveillance and regulation, and increased regulation of the process of induction has been part of that apparatus. In NSW, induction includes a formal probationary period in which new teachers must meet mandated professional requirements for professional practice, and it seemed for a time (2011–2013) that Sweden would follow in the same direction, though the 2014 policy retreat appears to make the rise of mentoring as supervision unlikely.

Earlier in this article, we suggested that these three different archetypes of mentoring form very different dispositions in mentees and mentors. In Finland, we surmise, current practice architectures of mentoring as collaborative self-development seem likely to produce and reproduce teachers who, from the beginning of their careers, understand themselves as responsible professionals able to draw on their own expertise and the expertise of their colleagues in the profession to meet the challenges of their professional work and lives. In NSW in Australia, the practice architectures of mentoring as supervision have become more widespread and more established, and it seems likely that this part of new teachers' life experience will produce and reproduce dispositions of compliance to authority, in both mentees and mentors. This latter development, in NSW at least, made in the name of 'professional standards' might instead be seen as part of the deprofessionalization of the education profession (cf. Devos, 2010; Fransson, 2012; Kemmis, 2013) through the subjugation to external, managerial authority of both the newest members of the profession, namely, the mentees, and some of the most senior staff in schools, namely, the principals and heads of department who act as 'mentors' or supervisors through the probation process. In NSW, however, mentoring as support also continues to exist alongside mentoring as supervision, in a way that must seem confusing for at least some new teachers, though each exists in its own separate program, each with its own set of practice architectures to make its preferred version of mentoring possible. In Sweden, despite the recent attempt to introduce mentoring as supervision, mentoring as support seems once again to have taken its place as the dominant form of mentoring. In these two cases, mentoring as support is likely to produce and reproduce a kind of individualistic professionalism in which new teachers are supported in their first years on the job, and in which wiser and more experienced teachers are sometimes asked to take on the role of inducting their new colleagues into the mysteries of the profession and its practice.

In one of these views of mentoring, the new teacher is required to develop as an employee compliant to 'professional standards'. In another, the new teacher is invited to become a member of a profession whose autonomy is guaranteed by the collegiality of professional discussion and development. In a third, the new teacher is guided and supported to become a wise practitioner in her or his own right. The practices of mentoring that foster these different projects and different dispositions are not the only experiences new teachers have, however, so they may not be decisive in shaping new teachers' identities and their modes of relationship with their profession. Some teachers will experience two or even all three of these forms of mentoring, and perhaps form some kind of view about the relative strengths of the different views of teaching and the profession they imply. But each version of mentoring is made possible by a machinery of practice architectures that evokes its own particular view of teachers and the profession – and, frankly, these three views conflict. Wise educational leaders, wise educational policy-makers, and wise legislators need to choose with care which of these approaches to mentoring ought to be offered, and in what proportion to the others. Their choice is not just a choice of a mode of induction, it is a choice about the kind of world and the kind of profession a new teacher is inducted into: mentoring as supervision leading the inductee into the profession as bureaucracy, mentoring

as support leading the inductee into the profession as autocracy, or mentoring as collaborative self-development leading the inductee towards the profession as democracy.

Acknowledgment

We are grateful to Brooke Scriven, a doctoral candidate at the Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education (RIPPLE), Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, whose bachelor's degree honors research sparked some of the analytic work done in this paper. Data from that research also contributed to the meta-analysis of the Australian data examined in this study. We also want to express our gratitude to the partners of the Finnish Network for Teacher Induction 'Osaava Verme'; to our friends and colleagues in NQTNE-network (Newly Qualified Teachers in Northern Europe – Research and Development network) as well as the Nordic project for teacher induction 'Supporting Newly Qualified Teachers through Collaborative Mentoring' (NQT-COME); and to the members of 'Pedagogical Action for a European Dimension in Educators' Induction Approaches (PAEDEIA) which is a Comenius Multilateral Project funded by the European Commission (Grant Number: 526885-LLP-1-2012-1-TR-COMENIUS-CMP).

References

American Psychological Association. (2014). *Introduction to mentoring: A guide for mentors and mentees*. Downloaded 11.2.2014 in URL address http://www.apa.org/print-this.aspx.

Aspfors, J. (2012). *Induction practices. Experiences of newly qualified teachers*. Åbo Akademi University (Diss.

Aspfors, J., & Hansén, S.-E. (2011). *Gruppmentorskap som stöd för lärares professionella utveckling[Peer-group mentoring for teachers' professional development]*. Helsinki: Söderströms.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice* (trans: Nice, R.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Colley, H. (2003). *Mentoring for social inclusion: A critical approach to nurturing mentoring relationships*. London: Routledge Falmer.

D'Abate, C., Eddy, E., & Tannenbaum, S. (2003). Literature-based approach to understanding mentoring, coaching, and other constructs that describe developmental interactions. *Human Resource Development Review, 2*(4), 360–384.

Devos, A. (2010). New teachers, mentoring and the discursive formation of professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(5), 1219–1223.

Dominguez, N., & Hager, M. (2013). Mentoring frameworks: synthesis and critique. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 2*(3), 171–188.

Edward-Groves, C. (2012). Mentoring practices in Australia. In *Invited Keynote Address at Osaava Verme [Peer Group Mentoring] Conference*. University of Jyväskylä. August 31–September 2, Jyväskylä, Finland.

Fransson, G. (2010). Mentors assess mentees? A overview and analyses of the mentorship role concerning newly qualified teachers. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(4), 375–390.

Fransson, G. (2012). Professionalisering eller deprofessionalisering? Positioneringar och sampel i ett dilemmatic space. [Professionalization or deprofessionalization? Positioning and interplay in a dilemmatic space]. In C. Gustafsson, & G. Fransson (Eds.), *Kvalificerad som lärare? Om professionell utveckling, mentorskap och bedömning med sikte mot lärarlegitimation. [Qualified as a teacher? On professional development, mentorship and evaluation for the sake of a teacher registration]*. University of Gävle: Gävle University Press. Teacher education: Research Publication No 5.

Fransson, G., & Gustafsson, C. (2008). Teacher education: Research Publication No 4. In *Newly qualified teachers in northern Europe – Comparative perspectives on promoting professional development*. University of Gävle: Gävle University Press.

Fransson, G., & Morberg, Å. (Eds.). (2001). *De första ljuva åren – lärares första tid i yrket. [The first wonderful years – Newly qualified teachers' first year in the teaching profession]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Fransson, G., Jokinen, H., & Klages, W. (2011). Education of mentors. In *Paper presented in the symposia Practice architecture of teacher education, at the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER) in Berlin, Germany, 13–16 September 2011*.

Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault* (pp. 109–133). Brighton, Sussex: The Harvester Press.

Government Inquiry. (1978:86). *Lärare för skola i utveckling. Betänkande av 1974 års lärarutbildningsutredning (LUT 74)* [Swedish Government Official reports 1978:86 Teachers for a school in transition. Proposal presented by 1974 Swedish commission on Teacher Education]. Stockholm: Ministry of Education and Research.

Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: a developmental network perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 264–288.

Heikkinen, H. L. T., Jokinen, H., & Tynjälä, P. (Eds.). (2012). *Peer-group mentoring for teacher development*. London: Routledge.

Hobson, A., 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.

Howe, E. R. (2006). Exemplary teacher induction: an international review. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(3), 287–297.

Hu, C., Thomas, K. M., & Lance, C. E. (2008). Intentions to initiate mentoring relationships: understanding the impact of race, proactivity, feelings of deprivation, and relationship roles. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 148*(6), 727–744.

Jokinen, H., Heikkinen, H. L. T., Eisenschmidt, E., & Fransson, G. (2010). Mentoring Formally or Informally? Dilemmas and Paradoxes of Mentoring and Education for Mentors. In *Paper presented at European Conference of Educational Research (ECER) in Helsinki, Finland, 25–27 August 2010*.

Kemmis, S. (2013). Education, educational research and the good for humankind. In *A keynote address for the Finnish Educational Research Association Conference on Education 2013, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, November 21–22, 2013*.

Kemmis, S., & Heikkinen, H. L. T. (2012). Practice architectures and teacher induction. In H. L. T. Heikkinne, H. Jokinen, & P. Tynjälä (Eds.), *Peer-group mentoring for teacher development*. London: Routledge.

Kemmis, S., & Grootenboer, P. (2008). Situating praxis in practice: Practice architectures and the cultural, social and material conditions for practice. In S. Kemmis, & T. J. Smith (Eds.), *Enabling praxis: Challenges for education* (pp. 37–64). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kemmis, S., Wilkinson, J., Edward-Groves, C., Hardy, I., Grootenboer, P., & Bristol, L. (2014). *Changing Practices, Changing Education*. Singapore: Springer.

Leicht, K. T., Walter, T., Sainsaulieu, I., & Davies, S. (2009). New public management and new professionalism across nations and contexts. *Current Sociology, 57*(4), 581–605. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011392109104355.

Lindgren, U. (Ed.). (2003). *Mentorship for learning and development. Contributions from an international conference on mentorship for beginner teachers and school pupils. Umeå University 1–4 June 2003*. Department of Swedish and Social Sciences: Umeå University.

Morberg, Å. (2002). Ett dilemma för lärarutbildning och lärare [A dilemma for teacher education and teacher]. In G. Arfwedsson (Ed.), *Mellan praktik och teori – Tio didaktiska berättelser om undervisning i förskola, skola och lärarutbildning. [Between theory and practice – Ten stories about teaching in pre-school, schools and teacher training]* (pp. 113–134). Stockholm: HLS Förlag. Didactica 9.

Morberg, Å., & Gustafsson, L. (2007). *Söderhamnsmodellen – Mentorsstöd för nybörjarlärare i yrkesutveckling och lokal skolutveckling [The model of Söderhamn – mentor support for new teachers in professional development and local school development]*. Gävle: University of Gävle. Teacher Education: Research Publications no 3.

Richter, D., Kunter, M., Lüdtke, O., Klusmann, U., Anders, Y., & Baumert, J. (2013). How different mentoring approaches affect beginning teachers' development in the first years of practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 36*, 166–177.

Riksförbund, L. (2005). *Brist, balans eller överskott? Utmaningar och möjligheter för en effektiv arbetsmarknad och en kvalitetsinriktad skola. Bilaga: Redovisning av statistikmaterial [Shortage, balance or surplus? Challenges and possibilities for an efficient labour market and a quality focused school. Appendix: Report of statistical data]*. Stockholm: National Union of Teachers in Sweden.

Sahlberg, P. (2012). A Model Lesson: Finland shows us what equal opportunities look like. *American Educator*, 20–27 and 40.

Schatzki, T. R. (2002). *The site of the social: A philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park.

Schatzki, T. R. (2003). A new societiest social ontology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 33*(2), 174–202.

Schatzki, T. R. (2005). The sites of organizations. *Organization Studies, 26*(3), 465–484.

Schatzki, T. R. (2006). On organizations as they happen. *Organization Studies, 27*(12), 1863–1873.

Schatzki, T. R. (2010). *The timespace of human activity: On performance, society, and history as indeterminate teleological events*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Schatzki, T. (2012). A primer on practices. In J. Higgs, R. Barnett, S. Billett, M. Hutchings, & F. Trede (Eds.), *Practice based education* (pp. 13–26). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Stake, R. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: The Guildford Press.

Sundli, L. (2007). Mentoring – a new mantra for education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(2), 201–214.

Swedish National Agency for Education. (2011). *Skolverkets föreskrifter om introduktionsperiod och kompetensprofiler för lärare och förskollärare [The Swedish National Agency for Education's regulations on the introduction period and competence profiles of teachers and preschool teachers]*. Stockholm: The Swedish National Agency for Education. Reg.nr. 62–2011:672.

Tolofari, S. (2005). New public management and education. *Policy Futures in Education, 3*(1), 75–89.

Tynjälä, P., & Heikkinen, H. L. T. (2011). Beginning teachers' transition from pre-service education to working life. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 14*(1), 11–34.

Ulvik, M., Smith, K., & Helleve, I. (2009). Novice in secondary school – the coin has two sides. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(6), 835–842.

Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2007). An alternative conception of mentor–novice relationships: learning to teach in reform-minded ways as a context. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(3), 473–489.

Wang, J., Odell, S., & Schwille, S. (2008). Effects of teacher induction on beginning teachers' teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(2), 132–152.

Yang, C., Hu, C., Baranik, L., & Lin, C.-Y. (2013). Can protégés be successfully socialized without socialized mentors? A close look at mentorship formality. *Journal of Career Development, 40*(5), 408–423.