

Assuring the Quality of Mentoring in Malawi's 1+1 Model of Initial Primary Teacher Education Programme: Implications for Teacher Development

Alnord L.D. Mwanza, George Moyo and Cosmas Maphosa

University of Fort Hare, South Africa

KEYWORDS Bureaucratic-management. Bureaucratic-technicist. Mentoring. Quality Assurance. Teacher Training

ABSTRACT This study assessed the structures and processes of quality monitoring of mentoring in the 1+1 Initial Primary Teacher Education model in Malawi. Data was collected from a sequential mixed methods design comprising a survey followed by a case study which employed document analysis and face to face interviews. 666 respondents (94% response rate) consisting 579 student teachers, 92 mentors, 91 headteachers and 4 lecturers at teacher training college participated in a drop-and-pick census survey. The Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient (α) for the student teachers', school mentors' and headteachers' questionnaires were 0.971, 0.827, and 0.858 respectively. In the case study phase, 6 purposively sampled participants from two case schools participated in the face to face interviews. Descriptive analysis, anchored in Statistical Package for Social Science, 20.0, was employed on the quantitative data; and qualitative data was analysed by using content analysis. The results revealed that mentoring schools had no structures, policies, practice codes and standards for monitoring mentoring practices and depended on bureaucratic-management or bureaucratic-technicist approach with more emphasis on accountability to the teacher training college than self improvement. Schools also had inadequate scope of what was monitored; lacked uniformity in the frequency of monitoring activities; and lacked collegial approach to monitoring quality of mentoring. The results show a shortfall in the monitoring of the quality of mentoring in primary schools. Hence, recommendations aimed at conceptualising the policies, structures and processes of internal monitoring in primary schools in the 1+1 IPTE model are made.

INTRODUCTION

Teacher education and development has been the focus of numerous debates across the world. The debates revolve around what models or approaches to teacher education and development produce high quality teachers as measured by their ability to promote student learning. The models of teacher education and development, however, have grappled with the perennial problem of how to balance between theory and practice. This has given rise to a continuum of teacher education and development models (Allen and Wright 2014; Day 2004; Heeralal 2014; Heeralal and Bayaga 2011; Korthagen 2010; Kunje et al. 2003; Mattson 2006; Zeichner 2010). On the one extreme there are those which say practice first and theory later; on the other, they say theory first and then practice. In between there is a combination of a variety of approaches

In Malawi, the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) and Malawi Institute of Education (MIE 2006) came up with what they see as a balance between theory and practice when they introduced in 2005 the 1 year of theory and 1 year of practice, thus a model

referred to as the 1+1. In this model, student teachers spend a whole year of practical teaching in schools under the guidance of a school mentor. The quality of mentoring at school level has also generated debates (Badenhorst and Badenhorst 2011; Goldner and Mayseless 2009; Hudson 2013a, b, 2014; Maphosa, Shumba and Shumba 2007). This study, therefore, focused on how the quality of mentoring was assured in the practising primary schools of the 1+1 model in Malawi.

Teacher education in Malawi, like most countries in the world, is situated in international and regional contexts which exert demands on the quality of its provision. At the international and regional level, the demands for quality teacher education originate from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (UN 2000), Education For All (EFA) goals (UNESCO 2000), The African Charter on Human Rights (OAU 1986), globalisation and internationalization (Machingambi 2014; Bates 2008; Dzvimbo and Moloi 2013); the World Declaration on Higher Education (UNESCO 1998); and the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) protocol on education and training (SADC 1997), just to mention but a few. As a signatory to these conven-

tions, Malawi shoulders the responsibility to improve the quality of education at all levels.

Literature indicates that Malawi is one of the poorest countries in the world. According to UNDP (2013), Malawi has a GNI per capita of US\$320; 61.6 percent of her population of over 15 million live below the poverty line of US\$1.25 per day; and the country ranks 170 out of 186 countries on the Human Development Index. As such, the overarching agenda of the Government of Malawi is to reduce poverty through socio-economic growth and infrastructural development (Government of Malawi (GoM) 2011). GoM points out that the provision of quality and relevant education in general and preservice primary teacher education in particular is one of the lynchpins to catalyse the achievement of the broad objective.

The Constitution of Malawi (GoM 1994) is the main legal instrument for the provision of education and teacher education in Malawi. It is operationalized in the Vision 2020, Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS II) (GoM 2011), the Education Bill 2012 (MoEST, 2013a), Education Policy statement (MoEST, 2013), the National Education Sector Plan (NESP) (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST 2008a) and National Strategy for Teacher Education (NSTED) (MoEST 2008b). According to Chapter IV, subsection 25 (1) of the Constitution, quality and relevant education is a fundamental human right of every Malawian. As such, the policy objective of the education sector is to provide quality and relevant education at all levels including preservice teacher education (MoEST 2013a, 2008a, 2008b). Despite a variety of strategies to improve the quality and relevance of education, government reports reveal that the war against poor quality of education is far from being won (MoEST 2012a; GoM 2012; Ng'ambi 2010). Thus, assuring the quality of education in general and preservice primary teacher education in particular is one of the priority areas of focus for the education sector.

Initial Primary Teacher Education (IPTE) in Malawi is a two year teacher preparation programme (MIE 2006; MoEST 2013b). There are two delivery models of IPTE. These are the 1+1 and Open and Distance Learning (ODL) model (MoEST 2011; MIE 2006). This study focussed on the 1+1 IPTE model. The 1+1 IPTE entails a programme in which the first year is college-

based and the second year is school based (MIE 2006); hence, 1+1 (One plus One) model. It is therefore an example of the IN-OUT model of teacher education (Mattson 2006). The model, however, gives primary schools a critical role in the professional development of their teachers.

The school-based phase of the 1+1 IPTE model places great weight on mentoring. The student teacher is attached to a school mentor; defined as a school teacher who supports and gives advice to the student teachers to help them develop and consolidate the skills, knowledge and expertise in teaching at school level (MIE, 2006). This indicates that within the 1+1 IPTE model, mentoring is therefore a year-long activity. The teacher training colleges, school headteacher and other government organisations shoulder the responsibility of monitoring the mentoring in schools (MIE 2006).

Many research studies have been conducted on the 1+1 IPTE model. MIE (2008) evaluated the IPTE Instructional materials for terms one and two from the perspectives of College lecturers and found that there were inadequate instructional materials in Colleges; not all lecturers were competent in the IPTE curriculum; and there was minimal supervision and monitoring in the implementation of IPTE curriculum in Colleges. Findings from a study by DeStefano (2012) revealed that the 1+1 IPTE model was less cost effective as an average of 14 percent fails to complete their training and become certified; an average of 4.1 percent of students drop out during the school based training; and had an attrition rate of 41 percent of its certified teachers. An evaluation of the second year of the 1+1 IPTE model revealed that there were seriously inadequate support and virtually no mentoring for most student teachers (Ndalama and Chidalengwa 2010). MoEST's (2014) study on the second year of the 1+1 IPTE model revealed that 41 percent of school mentors and headteachers were not mentoring their student teachers; 34.4 percent of school mentors and headteachers still not competent to mentor student teachers and write reports; and headteachers rarely provided support student teachers. Thus, despite the mode being rated as a fast track model of teacher training, the findings from the research studies raise concerns over the quality of mentoring and the quality assurance practices in the second year of the 1+1 IPTE model.

Conceptual Framework

Mentoring is used by many people, organization and disciplines. There is, however, no consensus on a single definition of mentoring. Its definitions are largely contextual. In this study, the working definition is that mentoring is the process or practice through which student teachers learn how to teach in schools during a practicum under the guidance of a practicing and experienced teacher (Tomlinson 1995). Sergiovanni and Starrat (2002: 265) concurs that in the context of teacher education, mentoring is a process that is intended to help new teachers successfully learn their roles, establish their self-images as teachers, figure out the school and its culture, understand how teaching unfolds in real classrooms, and achieve other goals that are important to the teachers being mentored. It is therefore an acculturation or a socialization process of student teachers into the demands of the teaching profession. Despite the benefits of mentoring linked primarily to professional growth of student teachers, research studies consistently reveal that mentoring also the mentors, the school as an organization and the education system as a whole (Ghosh and Reio Jr. 2013; Hansford et al. 2003; Hobson et al. 2009; Phillips and Fragoulis 2007). They contend that its benefits include professional development of mentors and teachers; reduced teacher attrition rate and contributes to organizational linkages or networks. It is therefore important that the quality of mentoring of student teachers is assured for the benefit of all stakeholders.

Quality has many definitions (Harvey 2007; Martin and Stella 2007; Materu 2007; Nicholson 2011). However, for the purposes of this study, quality is defined as fitness for purpose and fitness of purpose. According to Harvey (2007: 7), fitness for purpose and of purpose refer to meeting generally accepted standards as defined by the institution, nation, government, discipline, and professional or other (threshold) expectations. The main distinction between fitness for and fitness of is that the former focuses on compliance to internal standards while the later is about compliance to external standards. There are three rationales for the inclusion of this double barrelled definition in this study. First, optimal quality is generally a combination of the two dimensions (Kolowski 2006 in Nicholson 2011). Secondly, this is the most common definition of

quality among higher education institutions (Nicholson 2011). Finally, Hobson et al. (2009) contends that mentoring is most effective where it is both fit for purpose and fit of purpose. It is therefore important to have in place to assure the quality of any programme that offers services to the public (Harvey 2007).

Quality Assurance (QA) refers to 'an ongoing, continuous process of evaluating (assessing, monitoring, guaranteeing, maintaining and improving) the quality of higher education system, institutions or programmes (Martin and Stella 2007: 34). QA serves four main rationales: accountability for fitness for purpose, control, compliance and improvement or enhancement (Harvey and Newton 2004; Kaur 2012; Biggs 2001; Barnett 1994). It is divided into two main components: Internal and External (Martin and Stella 2007; Materu 2007). Quality Assurance is internal when the practices are implemented by the institutions, and external when external bodies carry out the practices. Research studies, however, indicate that optimal quality assurance is however derived from the simultaneous combination of the two forms (Biggs 2001; Jonathan 2000; Law 2010). Jonathan (2000) and the World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century (UNESCO 1998) also alluded to the importance of the simultaneous use of internal and external evaluations of quality for any service programmes such as education.

In this study, the focus was on Quality Monitoring. Quality Monitoring (QM) is one of the many forms of quality assurance. According to Vlăsceanu et al. (2007), Quality Monitoring (QM) refers to the process of collecting and analyzing data and taking actions at intervals about ongoing quality assurance practices. It is therefore a formative form of evaluation focused on routine data management for purposes of checking status of achieving planned results and correcting any deviations before a product is released (Lange and Luescher 2003). UNICEF (2002: 3) concurs that monitoring is the periodic oversight of the implementation of an activity which seeks to establish the extent to which input deliveries, work schedules, other required actions and targeted outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct deficiencies detected. It is evident from the definition that quality monitoring is a cyclic process in the management of quality as it involves that have norms and standards, data col-

lection on practices, analysis of information as well as feedback and action and all these feed again into policies, codes, norms and standards (UNESCO 2007).

Quality monitoring aims to pre-empt flaws and weaknesses in the work-processes and ensure quality (Wong 2012: 40). As such, it is best operationalized within a quality monitoring system. According to Wong (2012), the system consists of three main ingredients: practitioners; infrastructure; and policies, practice codes and standards. He argues that the system needs quality practitioners; resources; communication system regarding control and feedback; an organisational culture of team spirit, responsiveness and innovativeness. Quality monitoring, therefore, centres on these elements and need not be a responsibility of one individual in an organisation; but rather structures such as committees (Wong 2012). As pointed out by Lakshmi and Rama (2007), quality assurance in teacher education demands institutional wide thinking and involvement of all staff (academic and administrative). Although quality monitoring is contextual, the fundamental questions in trying to understand quality monitoring practices are: who are the monitors?; what do they monitor?; why do they monitor?; and how do they monitor? (Harvey 2006; Wong 2012). Perhaps, a related question, though, is: what is the relative weight of the internal and external quality monitoring practices?

Quality monitoring serves four main purposes of compliance, control, accountability and improvement (Harvey and Newton 2004). They claim that the most common purposes are accountability and compliance to predetermined policies, code of practice and standards; its scope includes curriculum implementation, learning experiences, delivery of services and administrative support to learners; and the main methods are through documents (reports) analysis, stakeholder surveys and direct intervention. Researchers (Barnett 1994; Biggs 2001; Harvey 2007) have, however, argued that quality monitoring needs to tilt more towards internal-monitoring than external monitoring) if enhancement in learning experiences is to be achieved. Perhaps, as pointed out by Harvey (2002), this is because external monitoring is too bureaucratic and inflexible, obsessed with accountability and does not improve student learning.

Quality monitoring is subdivided into internal and external monitoring. The focus in this study was on internal quality monitoring. Internal monitoring or self study, refers to monitoring by the institutions themselves (Martin and Stella 2007; Selesho 2008). This suggests that the agenda in internal monitoring is on maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the institution's delivery of its services. Literature indicates that internal monitoring is accomplished through such methods as quality circles, student feedback, assessment of teaching competences, peer evaluation, student boards and a variety of staff committees (Ellis 1993; Nyathi et al. 2011).

Studies on mentoring in preservice teacher education are voluminous. Researchers (Ambrosetti and Dekkers 2010; Heeralal 2014; Leshem 2014; Makura and Zireva 2013; Tillema et al. 2011) have conducted studies on various dimensions of mentoring such as models of mentoring, roles of mentors, benefits and dark side of mentoring. In their literature reviews, Allen et al. (2008) and Hobson et al. (2009), however, found that despite a plethora of studies on mentoring there were generally few studies on preservice teacher mentoring in non-western and non American contexts. Further analysis of literature also revealed that there were more studies on mentoring of student teachers in secondary schools than in primary schools. In addition, Hansford et al. (2003) and Wang (2001) also asserted that mentoring practices are contextual as they vary from one programme, discipline and country to another. This suggests that findings in one mentoring programme may not be generalizable to another in a different context such as the 1+1 IPTE model in Malawi. Literature also revealed that there were indeed few studies conducted on the monitoring of quality of mentoring in preservice teacher education programmes in Malawi in general and the 1+1 Initial Primary Teacher Education model in particular. This study was therefore conducted to fill this gap in literature.

Theoretical Framework

Barnett (1994) provides a theoretical framework for understanding and analyzing quality assurance practices in institutions. Barnett argues that debates about Quality Assurance are generally debates about power relations in Quality Assurance and the use of the practices. As

noted by Luckett (2007), the framework is hinged on the following set of questions: Who decides what counts as quality?; Who decides what the criteria or measures of quality should be?; Who owns the quality system?; For whom is the evaluation done?; and What is the purpose of the evaluation process? According to Barnett (1994), Quality Assurances fall on four quadrants of a cartesian plane in which the horizontal axis represents power and control of the practices (bureaucratic or collegial). The vertical axis plots QA practices with respect to their purposes and user of the results (emancipatory or technicist).

Barnett's (1994) model has four broad categories of quality evaluation or monitoring practices: practices owned and controlled by external agents (bureaucratic) for purposes of their enlightenment (Quadrant 1); practices owned by external agents for purposes of surveillance-conformity to their prescribed standards (Quadrant 2); practices owned and controlled by the academe for purposes of demonstrating conformity to technical standards of external bodies (Quadrant 3); and practices owned and controlled by the academe for purposes of their enlightenment (Quadrant 4).

Barnett (1994) points out that the global trend is that dominant methodologies of quality evaluation are becoming bureaucratic/technicist in nature. Barnett (1994: 178), however, argues that quality evaluation gains its greatest justification when, as a result, the actors centrally involved in offering programmes in higher education learn about themselves and, as a result, change and improve the quality of their own professional activities and services to society. This stance is supported by Harvey and Newton (2004: 149) who posit that 'if quality evaluation is to be transformed to make it transforming it is time to reclaim quality evaluation from opportunistic politicians, re-establish trust in higher education and focus attention on internal processes and motivators. Effectiveness of academics in this endeavour, however, demands that institutions and external quality bodies created favourable conditions and contexts of their work. Barnett's (1994) model of Quality Evaluation was therefore, useful in this study as it provided a language and a way of analysing, classifying or categorising quality monitoring practices in the 1+1 IPTE mentoring programme.

Statement of Problem

Teacher development programmes continue to grapple with the problem of how, during the practical training, the quality of the teaching practicum is assured in terms of fitness for purpose and fitness of purpose (Cohen (Sayag) et al. 2013; Eric and Cheng 2013; Mashava and Chingombe 2013; Mathews et al. 2004; Mtetwa and Thompson 2000; Tshuma 2009). Kiggundu and Nayimuli (2009) contend that the quality of preservice teaching practicum is a component of preservice teacher education that has received minimal attention. More specifically, preservice teacher mentoring programmes during practicum are often focused not on norms and standards but on emotional and technical support (Wang and Odell 2002). As such, it was important to determine what mechanisms are put in place in terms of predetermined monitoring structures and processes designed to manage quality in the 1+1 IPTE model. The study was therefore conducted against a background of quality concerns in the mentoring of student teachers in the 1+1 IPTE model (DeStefano 2012; MIE 2008; MoEST 2014). As pointed out by Ragins, Cotton and Miller (2000) marginal or bad mentoring is worse than no mentoring and often detrimental to the quality of the outcomes of the mentoring programme.

Objective of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine and understand how the quality of mentoring in the 1+1 IPTE model in Malawi was assured from the monitoring perspectives.

Main Research Question

- o How is the quality of mentoring in the Malawi's 1+1 IPTE model of preservice teacher education assured by primary schools?

Research Sub-questions

- o What are the internal structures of monitoring mentoring in schools?
- o What are the internal processes of monitoring mentoring in schools?
- o What are the implications of the findings for developing a new internal monitoring framework for the 1+1 IPTE model?

METHODOLOGY

This descriptive study was anchored in Post-positivism paradigm whose methodology used a sequential mixed methods design. In the first phase, 666 respondents consisting 579 student teachers, 92 mentors, 91 headteachers and 4 lecturers of one teacher training college in one of the education divisions participated in a census survey, representing a response rate of 94%. The semi-structured questionnaires, grounded in Dillman's Tailored Design Matrix, included demographic data and multiple choice questions on the structures and processes of monitoring mentoring in the 1+1 IPTE mode. The Chronbach's Alpha Coefficient of Reliability (α) for the student teachers', school mentors' and headteachers' questionnaires were 0.971, 0.827, and 0.858 respectively. The questionnaires were pilot tested and administered through a drop-and-pick method. The second phase employed a case study design in which document analysis and structured interviews were used to collect data from two schools and 6 participants comprising 2 mentors, 2 student teachers and 2 headteachers. Descriptive analysis anchored in SPSS 20.0 package was employed to analyse quantitative data; and the qualitative data was analysed by using content analysis. As a mixed methods study, some of the qualitative and quantitative data were quantitized and qualitized respectively.

RESULTS

Structures and Processes of Monitoring Mentoring in the 1+1 IPTE Model

Policy on Monitoring of Mentoring in the 1+1 IPTE Model

It was investigated whether there was a policy guiding monitoring of mentoring in schools. Document analysis revealed that the Handbook on Partnership Agreement between Teacher Training College and Teaching Practice schools (MoEST 2013) stipulated that monitoring of mentoring was one of the core activities in the IPTE programme. The policy stated that 'The two parties (schools and Teacher Training Colleges) shall work together in the monitoring and evaluation of School Experience Year' (MoEST 2013b: 2). Hence, there was a policy on the internal and external monitoring of the mentoring programme. However, further analysis of the data revealed

that there were no implementation guidelines detailing the activities and responsibilities of the primary schools in the actualization of the policy. Data from face to face interviews with headteachers confirmed that schools did not have policies, code of practice (norms) and standards for monitoring mentoring practices. This suggests that schools did not have a quality monitoring culture.

Internal Structures for Monitoring Mentoring in the 1+1 IPTE Model

In a survey questionnaire, student teachers, school mentors, headteachers and coordinators were asked to indicate the monitors at school level on a Yes or No scale. The question required them to indicate as many internal monitors as applicable to their schools. Table 1 gives the findings on the internal monitors of mentoring.

Table 1 shows that 63 percent of the stakeholders identified the headteachers as the internal monitor of mentoring at school level. This was indicated by the majority student teachers (55%), headteachers (88%), school mentors (82%) and Coordinators (100%). This suggests that schools relied on bureaucratic management approach. Face to face interviews and document analysis revealed that indeed schools had no internal structures (committees) for monitoring mentoring and relied wholly on headteachers. For instance, when school mentors (SM1 and SM2) were asked in an interview to name the internal monitors, their remarks were:

'The headteacher always'. [SM1]

'The headteacher does the monitoring. [SM2]

The Partnership Agreement Handbook (MoEST 2013b) and IPTE handbook (MIE 2006) were silent on the structures such as committees for internal monitoring.

It can, however, be seen that 37 percent of the participants (mostly student teachers (45%)) indicated that headteachers were not monitoring mentoring. This suggests that not all headteachers were monitoring in their schools.

The Scope of Internal Monitoring of Mentoring in Schools

Student teachers, school mentors, headteachers and coordinators were asked to indicate the aspects of mentoring monitored at

Table 1: Internal monitors identified by respondents

<i>Internal monitor</i>	<i>Student teacher (n=576 for each)</i>	<i>School mentor (n=92 for each)</i>	<i>Headteacher (n=91)</i>	<i>Coordinators (n=4)</i>	<i>Total (n=763)</i>
Headteachers	55%	82%	88%	100%	63%
School mentors	51%	9%	41%	0%	44%
Deputy Headteacher	20%	26%	11%	0%	19%
Senior teachers	0%	8%	0%	0%	8%

% of respondents who indicated 'yes'

school level on a Yes or No scale. They were given five options from which to indicate as many aspects as were applicable to them and they were asked to suggest others. Table 2 gives the percentage of headteachers and school mentors who monitored each of the five aspects of mentoring.

Table 2 shows that slightly over half (56% and 53%) of the participants indicated that student teachers' teaching and professional performance were internally monitored. Alternately, this suggests that student teachers' performance was not monitored at all in some schools. The Table further shows that the least internally monitored activities were performance of school mentors (16%) and resource levels (10%). This suggests that internal monitoring hinged on student teachers' performance and neglected the inputs into the performance. Overall, data in Table 2 reveal a weak monitoring of the scope of mentoring activities at school level.

Methodologies (Processes) of Internal Monitoring of Mentoring in Schools

Headteachers were asked to indicate the methodologies or strategies for internal monitoring which were used in their schools on a Yes or No. The questionnaire gave them space to write any other methodologies. Table 3 gives the summary of the methodologies by percentages of headteachers who indicated Yes.

toring which were used in their schools on a Yes or No. The questionnaire gave them space to write any other methodologies. Table 3 gives the summary of the methodologies by percentages of headteachers who indicated Yes.

Table 3: Methodologies for internal monitoring

<i>Methodology</i>	<i>% of Headteachers (91) who indicated 'Yes'</i>
Classroom observation	100%
Student teacher grade reports	97%
Headteacher/student meetings	95%
Headteachers/Mentor meetings	64%
School staff meetings	63%
Students' satisfaction surveys	62%

It can be seen from Table 3 that six methodologies were used by the headteachers to monitor mentoring. The most commonly used methodology as indicated by headteachers (100%) was classroom observation; and the least was student satisfaction survey (62%). Document analysis, however, revealed that there were also scheduled tripartite meetings involving the headteacher, mentor and student teachers. Overall, the data suggests that monitoring method-

Table 2: The scope of internal monitoring in schools

<i>Internal monitor</i>	<i>Student teacher (n=576 for each)</i>	<i>School mentor (n=92 for each)</i>	<i>Headteacher (n=91)</i>	<i>Coordinators (n=4)</i>	<i>Total (n=763)</i>
Student teacher's teaching performance	55%	45%	73%	100%	56%
Student teacher's professional performance	52%	43%	67%	75%	53%
Achievement of objectives of the programme	10%	28%	40%	0%	16%
School mentor's performance	6%	16%	31%	0%	10%
Resources	5%	13%	23%	0%	8%

% of respondents who indicated 'yes'

ologies tilted towards assessing student teachers' performance in the classroom.

Frequency of Processes of Internal Monitoring of Mentoring in Schools

(a) Frequency of Monitoring Meetings between School Mentors and Headteachers

In a questionnaire survey, school mentors were asked to indicate the frequency of their monitoring meetings with the headteachers. Table 4 gives a summary of the school mentors' responses regarding the frequency of their monitoring meetings with their Headteachers.

It can be seen from Table 4 that the frequency of monitoring meetings between the school mentors and their headteachers ranged from not at all to daily. This indicates variations regarding the frequency of school mentor/headteacher meetings among mentoring schools. Table 4 further shows that the most headteacher/mentor meetings were held on a weekly basis as indicated by 52 percent of the headteachers. Perhaps, this was done to give adequate time for implementing the recommendations. One of the mentors, however, indicated that there were never headteacher/mentor meetings in his/her school. This raises concerns on how schools were being monitored by the teacher training college. Analysis of the IPTE documents also revealed that there were no norms and standards for this activity.

Table 4: Frequency of monitoring between school mentors and headteachers

<i>Frequency of meetings</i>	<i>% of school mentors (n=90)</i>
Daily	11%
Once a week	52%
Fortnightly	24%
Once a month	7%
Once a term	1%
Not at all	1%

Overall, data in the table indicates that there were variations in the frequency of school mentor/headteacher meetings among mentoring schools. The absence of a norm and standard for such type of meetings could have contributed to the present status.

(b) Frequency of Monitoring Meetings between School Mentor, Student Teachers and Headteacher

Analysis of data from IPTE mentoring guides for terms 1, 2 and 3 revealed that it was a requirement for a group meeting comprising school mentor, student teachers and Headteacher to assess progress of the mentoring processes. Such a meeting was referred to as Professional meetings. These were scheduled meetings held at the end of week 2, week 5, week 8 and week 4. Hence, there were a total of four professional meetings during which the assessed the progress being made towards the achievement of the objectives the mentoring programme with respect to successes and challenges that impinged the success of the programme. Analysis of data collected from face to face interviews with headteacher (HT1), school mentor (SM2) and student teacher (ST2) revealed that the professional meetings were conducted as per schedule.

(c) Frequency of Receiving Feedback from a Monitoring Methodology

Student teachers were asked to indicate the frequency with which they received feedback from each of the monitoring methodology on a three Point Likert scale in which 3 = Always, 2 = Sometimes, and 1 = Never. The scores for Always and Sometimes were added as they simply indicated the presence of the activity. Table 5 gives a summary of the findings.

Table 5 shows that the majority of the student teachers (96%) indicated that they received feedback from meetings with headteachers and classroom observation; and the least number of student teachers (57%) indicated that they re-

Table 5: Student teachers' responses on frequency of receiving feedback from monitoring methodology

<i>Monitoring methodology</i>	<i>% of student teachers who indicated feedback was given</i>
Meeting with headteacher (n=559)	96%
Classroom observation (n=557)	96%
Meeting with mentors (n=577)	86%
Student satisfaction surveys (n=551)	58%
Student feedback survey (n=561)	57%

Note: n is not the same for each methodology due to item non-response error

ceived feedback from student feedback surveys. This indicates that feedback was received by student teachers from all the five methodologies.

DISCUSSION

The first section of the study investigated internal quality monitoring in primary schools quality in terms of structures such as policies, guidelines and participants involved in mentoring mentoring. It has been revealed that there were no structures set up to monitor the practices of mentoring in the primary schools. This was evidenced by the absence of policies, guidelines or standards and quality monitoring committees for monitoring mentoring practices. It can be argued that such schools, therefore, lacked some of the important ingredients of an effective monitoring system (NAAC 2006; Wong 2012). Quality of mentoring could not be maintained nor enhanced in the absence of structures (Harvey 2002; Harvey and Newton 2004). It was also revealed that where headteachers took up the responsibility to monitor mentoring, they did it single-handedly and that no all headteachers monitored mentoring practices in schools. In this case schools lacked a culture of team spirit. An organisational culture of a whole staff responsibility in mentoring was needed for effective quality monitoring of student teachers (Harvey 2006; NAAC 2006; Nyathi et al. 2011; Wong 2012). Such a culture could also be needed to enhance ownership and democratisation of the mentoring programme. It can be argued that such a responsibility require adequate guidelines and training of all the participants.

The Scope of Internal Monitoring of Mentoring in Schools

The study revealed that monitoring of mentoring by headteachers centred mainly on student teachers' performance and the least monitored were the mentor's performance and resources for mentoring. The scope of monitoring practice could be regarded inadequate as it focussed on the product and neglected the inputs (mentor and resources). Harvey and Newton (2004) claimed that other critical areas which needed to be monitored, in this case, were delivery of mentoring services by mentors and administrative support to student teachers such as material resources. Perhaps, the lack of guide-

lines on what, who and how to monitor could have contributed to this status. Guidelines are generally a key component of an effective quality monitoring system as they serve as benchmarks for practices (Wong 2012).

Methodologies (Processes) of Internal Monitoring of Mentoring in Schools

The investigation on the methodologies of internal monitoring in primary schools sought to find out the methods which were used in schools to monitor mentoring. The most common method as indicated by headteachers (100%) was classroom observation and the least was student satisfaction surveys. The list of methodologies is consistent with methodologies in the quality monitoring literature (Ellis 1993; Nyathi et al. 2011). Perhaps the emphasis on classroom observation was because student teachers were being trained how to teach. There was however room to include more methodologies such as peer evaluation, student teachers' boards and quality circles (Elli 1993; Nyathi et al. 2011). More methodologies were needed for purposes of collecting a broad range of data.

The study has revealed that the monitoring processes took the form of meetings, reports and classroom observation. Such a practice was consistent with practices in other institutions (Lakshmi and Rama 2007; Nyathi et al. 2011). The study further revealed that the frequencies of using the monitoring processes, however, were not uniform among schools. This indicates that different students received different amounts of support. Perhaps, the lack of guidelines for monitoring quality contributed to the differential support to student teachers. The status also raises concerns over the quality of external monitoring by the teacher training college. As asserted by Harvey and Newton (2004), external monitoring would serve to even out mentoring practices among practicing institutions by checking on compliance to rules and regulations.

The results of the study revealed six methodologies for monitoring mentoring in schools. These were classroom observation, student teacher grade reports, Headteacher/students meetings, Headteachers/Mentor meetings, school staff meetings, and students' satisfaction surveys in order of decreasing use. Figure 3 gives a plot of these quality monitoring practic-

es on a cartesian grid developed Barnett's (1994). Barnett's (1994) model shows that most of the quality monitoring practices fell into the bureaucratic/technicist quadrant. This indicates that the practices of quality monitoring adopted a bureaucratic-management approach for purposes of accountability to the teacher training college. Thus, the dominant practices were bureaucratic/technicist in nature. This is consistent with the findings of a study by Harrison (2006) which revealed that the ideal mentoring scenario for beginning teacher training tilted towards the school-led bureaucratic-management approach. The results also confirm Barnett's (1994) observation that currently the dominant practices of quality monitoring in higher education take the bureaucratic-technicist approach. Barnett (1994) and Harvey and Newton (2004), however, asserted that quality evaluation gains its greatest justification when the practices are collegial and emancipatory. It was therefore imperative for schools to adopt alternate emancipatory quality monitoring practices which involved all members of staff.

CONCLUSION

Primary schools play a pivotal mentoring role in the professional development of student teachers during a teaching practicum. Quality monitoring of mentoring practices by schools themselves is, however, an important ingredient of assuring the quality of mentoring. Schools' effectiveness in monitoring mentoring could depend on the several factors such as adequate monitoring structures and processes. It is therefore imperative that schools that offer mentoring services to student teachers in the 1+1 IPTE model have quality monitoring structures and processes that help to maintain and enhance quality of mentoring. Unless primary schools engage themselves in assuring the quality of their practices in mentoring student teachers, the international, regional and national demands on quality education in general and preservice teacher education in particular teachers cannot be met.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools could be assisted to establish structures and processes of monitoring mentoring. While involvement of all members of staff in

monitoring is required in mentoring schools, training of staff in how to monitor mentoring remains pivotal. The role of the teacher training institution in this endeavour cannot be overemphasized. Further research need to be conducted on developing appropriate policies, structures and processes that schools could use.

REFERENCES

- Allen JM, Wright SE 2014. Integrating theory and practice in the pre-service teacher education practicum. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 20(2): 136-151.
- 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*, 30(6): 42-55.
- Badenhorst J, Badenhorst B 2011. What we have learned: Student teachers' views on the quality of mentoring and teaching practice in township schools. *Journal for New Generation Sciences*, 9(2): 1-18.
- Barnett R 1994. Power, enlightenment and quality evaluation. *European Journal of Education*, 29(2): 165-179.
- Bates R 2008. Teacher education in a global context: Towards a defensible theory of teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 34(4): 277-293.
- Biggs J 2001. The reflective institution: Assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. *Higher Education*, 41(3): 221-238.
- Cohen (Sayag) E, Hoz R, Kaplan HC 2013. The practicum in pre-service teacher education: A review of empirical studies. *Teaching Education*, 24(4): 345-380.
- Day C 2004. *A Passion for Teaching*. London/New York: Routledge-Falmer.
- DeStefano J 2012. *Teacher Training in Malawi: Efficiency and Costs*. Lilongwe: USAID.
- Dzvimbo KP, Moloi KC 2013. Globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(3): 1-15.
- Ellis R 1993. The management of quality in the University of Ulster. Total quality management in higher education. *Higher Education*, 25(3): 239-257.
- Eric CK, Cheng ECK 2013. Enhancing the Quality of Pre-service Teachers' Learning in Teaching Practicum. From <nevelestudomany.elte.hu/.../2013/nevelestudomany_2013_1_6-16.pdf> (Retrieved on 2 June 2014).
- Ghosh R, Reio Jr. TG 2013. Career benefits associated with mentoring for mentors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(1): 106-116.
- Goldner L, Mayseless O 2009. The quality of mentoring relationships and mentoring success. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 38(1): 1339-1350.
- Government of Malawi (GoM) 1994. *The Constitution of the Republic of Malawi*. Lilongwe: Government Press.

- Government of Malawi (GoM) 2011. *The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy. 2012-2017*. Lilongwe: Government Press.
- Hansford B, Tennent L, Ehrich LS 2003. Educational mentoring: Is it worth the effort? *Education, Research and Perspectives*, 30(1): 42-75.
- Harvey L 2002. Evaluation for what? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 7(3): 245-263.
- Harvey L 2007. Epistemology of quality. *Perspectives in Education*, 25(3): 1-13.
- Heeralal PJH 2014. Student teachers' perspectives of qualities of good mentor teachers. *The Anthropologist*, 17(1): 243-249.
- Heeralal PJ, Bayaga A 2011. Pre-service teachers' experiences of teaching practice: Case of South African University. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 28(2): 99-105.
- Hobson AJ, Ashby P, Malderez A, Tomlinson PD 2009. Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(1): 207-216.
- Hudson P 2013a. Strategies for mentoring pedagogical knowledge, *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and practice*, 19(4): 363-381
- Hudson P 2013b. Mentoring as professional development: 'Growth for both' mentor and mentee. *Professional Development in Education*, 39(5): 771-783
- Hudson P 2014. Feedback consistencies and inconsistencies: Eight mentors' observations on one pre-service teacher's lesson. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1): 63-73.
- Jonathan LT 2000. Quality assurance and evaluation in African Universities: Developing a sustainable quality culture in challenging environment. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 14(2): 45-49.
- Kaur A 2012. Quality assurance in teacher education. *International Journal of Research in Education Methodology*, 1(1): 1-6.
- Kiggundu E, Nayimuli S 2009. Teaching practice: A make or break phase for student teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, 29(3): 345-358
- Korthagen FAJ 2010. How teacher education can make a difference? *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 36(4): 407-423.
- Kunje D, Lewin K, Stuart J 2003. Primary Teacher Education in Malawi: Insights into Practice and Policy. Multi-Site Teacher Education Research Project (MUSTER). *Country Report Three*. Sussex: Centre for International Education.
- Lakshmi KTS, Rama S 2007. *Quality Assurance Toolkit for Teacher Education Institutions (QATTEI): Guidelines*. Bangalore: National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC).
- Lange L, Luescher TM 2003. A monitoring and evaluation system for South African higher education: conceptual, methodological and practical concerns. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 17(3): 82-89.
- Law DCS 2010. Quality assurance in post-secondary education. Some common approaches. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13(1): 64-77.
- Leshem S 2014. How do teacher mentors perceive their role, does it matter? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(3): 261-274
- Luckett KL 2007. Methodology matters: Possible methods to improve quality. *Perspectives in Education*, 25(3): 1-11.
- Machingambi S 2014. The impact of globalisation on higher education: A Marxist Critique. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 5(2): 207-215.
- Makura AH, Zireva D 2013. School heads and mentors in cahoots? Challenges to teaching practice in Zimbabwean teacher education programmes. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An International, Interdisciplinary Forum for Research, Theory and practice*, 19(1): 3-16.
- Maphosa C, Shumba J, Shumba A 2007. Mentorship for students on teaching practice in Zimbabwe: Are student teachers getting a raw deal? *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 21(2): 296-307
- Mashava R, Chingombe A 2013. Teaching practice and the quality dilemma: Lessons from experiences of student teachers in Masvingo Province, *Africa Education Review*, 10(1): S134-S148.
- Materu P 2007. *Higher Education Quality Assurance in Sub-Saharan Africa. Status, Challenges, Opportunities and Promising Practices*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Matthews LJ, Hansen JM, Williams EJ 2004. Principal's role in mentoring: Implications not always considered. *The Researcher*, 6-14.
- Mattson E 2006. *Field-based Models of Primary Teacher Training: Case Studies of Student Support Systems from Sub-Saharan Africa*. Cambridge: International Research Foundation for Open Learning (IRFOL)
- Malawi Institute of Education (MIE). 2006. *The Initial Primary Teacher Education Programme*. Zomba: Malawi Institute of Education.
- Malawi Institute of Education (MIE). 2008. Evaluation of IPTE Instructional Materials for Terms One and Two. *Report prepared by The Department of Research, Evaluation and Policy Studies*. Zomba: Malawi Institute of Education.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST). 2008a. *National Education Sector Plan (2008-2017)*. Lilongwe: MoEST.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) 2008b. *National Strategy for Teacher Education and Development (2007-2017)*. Lilongwe: MoEST.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) 2011. *Education Statistics 2011*. Lilongwe: MoEST.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) 2012a. *Education Bill 2012*. Lilongwe: MoEST.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) 2012b. *Education Sector Performance Report*. Lilongwe: MoEST.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) 2013a. *Malawi Education Policy*. Lilongwe: MoEST.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) 2013b. *The Partnership Agreement between Teacher Training Colleges and Teaching Practice Schools*. Lilongwe: MoEST.
- Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) 2014. *Summary of the Report on Monitoring of 2nd year of IPTE Conventional Academic*

- Year 2013/14. Prepared by DTED/GIZ/MIE/DIAS. Lilongwe: MoEST.
- Mtsetwa DKJ, Thompson JJ 2000. Towards decentralised and more school-focused teacher preparation and professional development in Zimbabwe: The role of mentoring. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 26(2): 311-328.
- Ng'ambi F 2010. *Malawi: Effective Delivery of Public Education Services*. Johannesburg: Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa.
- Nicholson K 2011. Quality Assurance in Higher Education. A Review of the literature. From <<http://ccl.mcmaster.ca/COU/pdf/Quality%20Assurance%20Literature%20Review.pdf>> (Retrieved on 15 August 2013).
- Nyathi FS, Kadhila N, Aipanda J 2011. *Quality Assurance Manual. Version 1*. Windhoek: University of Namibia.
- Organisation of African Unity (OAU) 1986. *African Charter on Human Rights*. Nairobi: OAU.
- Phillips N, Fragoulis I 2010. Exploring the beliefs of primary education teachers regarding the contribution of mentoring in schools. *Review of European Studies*, 2(2): 201-213.
- Southern African Development Community (SADC) 1997. *Southern Africa Development Community (SADC). Protocol on Education and Training*. Blantyre: SADC
- Selesho JM 2008. Does self-evaluation assist the university in improving the quality of academic programmes? *Interdisciplinary Journal*, 7(2): 220-230.
- Sergiovanni TJ, Starrat RJ 2002. *Supervision: A Re-definition*. 7th Edition. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Tillema HH, Kari Smith K, Leshem S 2011. Dual roles – conflicting purposes: A comparative study on perceptions on assessment in mentoring relations during practicum. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(2): 139-159
- Tomlinson PD 1995. *Understanding Mentoring*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Tshuma R 2009. *Quality Assurance in Teaching Practice: Investigating the Fitness for Purpose and Fitness of Purpose in Zimbabwe's 2-5-2 Model of Teacher Education*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. South Africa: University of Fort Hare.
- United Nations (UN) 2000. *The Millennium Development Goals*. New York: United Nations.
- UNDP 2013. *The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World*. Human Development Report 2013. New York: UNDP.
- UNESCO 1998. *World Declaration on Higher Education for the 21st Century: Vision and Action*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO 2000. *The Education for All*. New York: United Nations.
- UNICEF 2002. A UNICEF Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation. Making a Difference? From <<http://www.unicef.org/reseval/index.html>> (Retrieved on 3 April 2014).
- Vlăsceanu L, Grünberg L, Pârlea D 2007. *Quality Assurance and Accreditation: A Glossary of Basic Terms and Definitions*. Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES.
- Wang J, Odell SJ 2002. Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3): 481-546.
- Wang J 2001. Contexts of mentoring and opportunities for learning to teach: A comparative study of mentoring practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(1): 51-73
- Wong VYY 2012. An alternative view of quality assurance and enhancement. *Management in Education*, 26(1): 38-42.
- Zeichner K 2010. Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education *Educação. Santa Maria*, 35(3): 479-501.