

Translation of the Mentoring Conception Scale and the Mentoring Motivation Scale into Turkish: Validity and Reliability Study

Arife Şahin^a and Fatma Aslan-Tutak^b

Abstract

This study aims to translate the Mentoring Conception Scale and Mentoring Motivation Scale into Turkish, to conduct reliability and validity analyses of the instruments, and to descriptively examine mentor teachers' mentoring conceptions and motivations in the Turkish context. The instruments were translated from Dutch to Turkish using a backward translation design and conducted with 141 mentor teachers in Istanbul. For reliability analysis, internal consistency coefficients and corrected item-total correlations were calculated. Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to determine construct validity and discriminant validity was checked. Validity results confirmed the original structure of the instruments, which consists of two factors: developmental and instrumental conceptions, personal learning, and generative outcome motives. While internal consistency coefficients of conception factors were calculated as 0.96 and 0.94, internal consistency coefficients of motivation factors were calculated as 0.87 and 0.89. Descriptive findings showed that mentor teachers tended to give high scores for each conception and motivation factor.

Keywords: mentoring in practicum, mentoring conceptions, mentoring motivations, reliability, validity

Article info

Received: 12.11.2023

Revised: 11.12.2024

Accepted: 26.01.2025

Published online: 30.04.2025

Introduction

The quality of education has always been a critical factor for countries to raise qualified generations who can overcome challenges and make their countries much better places (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Therefore, countries have focused on the education of teachers as one of the most essential components of the education system to enhance the quality of education. Because "the quality of teacher determines the quality of education" (Jan, 2017, p.50), one factor that affects the quality of teachers is the quality of teacher education. Teacher education is a life-long learning process, and it contains different components. The first step of teacher education is preservice teacher education (PSTE). Though PSTE programs have differences in countries, it has mainly two aspects: i) the theoretical part, which contains subject matter and teaching method courses; ii) the practical part, which contains teaching practices in practicum school (NCATE, 2008; OECD, 2011).

Each aspect is necessary to raise qualified teachers. In favor of the theoretical part of PSTE, preservice teachers (PSTs) gain the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge. Even if gaining theoretical knowledge is a required aspect of being a teacher, it is not sufficient to be an effective teacher (Tanisli & Kose, 2013). Theoretical knowledge should be supported and can be enhanced by PSTs' teaching practice (Munby et al., 2001). Therefore, the practical part of PSTE has a crucial role that provides opportunities for PSTs to transform their theoretical knowledge into practice (Azkiyah & Mukminin, 2017; Nyguen, 2020; Zeichner, 2009) by building a bridge between theory and practice. Strengthening the connection between theory and practice, PSTs should conduct field experiences and teaching practices at practicum schools (NCATE, 2008).

During the process of teaching practices at practicum schools, PSTs need guidance and support (Sağ, 2008). Mentor teachers (MTs) are responsible for providing such guidance (Blackwell, 1989; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Zey, 1984) and support (Blackwell, 1989; Kram, 1985; Levinson et al., 1978; Philips-Jones, 1982) to increase the efficiency of the teaching practices of PSTs. Mentoring has been used for years in many fields,

^a Corresponding author, Boğaziçi University, Faculty of Education, arife.sahin@bogazici.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-8900-5200

^b Boğaziçi University, Faculty of Education, fatma.tutak@bogazici.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9078-6144

including education, management, business, and psychology (Nganga et al., 2020). Mentoring can be defined as a supportive process in which novices get guidance from experts to be experts in a specific field (Flaxman et al., 1968). During this process, MTs have different roles and responsibilities: support/guidance (Kram, 1985), role model (Blackwell, 1989), coaching (Burke, 1984), and training (Kanter, 1977).

Since the mentoring process has a complex structure (Leshem, 2012), it is difficult to develop models that generalize it and the roles and responsibilities of MTs (Gay, 1994). There are four most frequently used mentoring models: the Kram Mentoring Model (Kram, 1983), the Clinical Supervision Model (Cogan, 1973), the Mentor Roles in Dialogues Model (MERID) (Hennissen et al., 2008), and the Five-Factor Model (Hudson & Skamp, 2001, 2002). The Kram Mentoring Model focuses on how mentoring relationships are shaped within four phases: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition (Kram, 1983). This model is not specific to teacher education; it can be used to explain mentoring relationships in any field. The Clinical Supervision Model, a specific model for teacher education, aims to provide professional development for MTs by evaluating the data gathered from systematic observation of the process (Gürsoy et al., 2013; Reilkoff, 1981). Even if this model is more specific than the Kram Mentoring Model, it is not specific to PSTE. Additionally, both models emphasize the mentoring relationship and how it is shaped without emphasizing the content of mentoring and practices. To fill a gap, the MERID Model was developed by Hennissen et al. (2008) to explain the social position of MTs and their dialogues with PSTs during the mentoring process. There are two dimensions in the MERID model: input and directiveness. Combining these two dimensions, four MTs' roles emerge: initiator, imperator, encourager, and advisor (Hennissen et al., 2008). The MERID Model defines a mentoring process by focusing on the roles and responsibilities of MTs; the model does not identify MTs' roles based on pedagogical content knowledge for area-specialized teaching. It provides a more general approach to understanding the mentoring process.

The Five-Factor Model was developed for preservice mathematics and science teacher education by emphasizing MTs' roles, practices, and attributes in terms of five key aspects to providing effective mentoring to PSTs: personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge, modeling, and feedback (Hudson & Skamp, 2001, 2002). Although the Model is specific and considers pedagogical content knowledge in preservice mathematics and science teacher education, there is a need for a more holistic approach to understanding MTs' practices and the reasons behind them. In the Five-Factor Mentoring Model, mentoring practices are generally identified and evaluated based on PSTs' needs and perceptions. However, the model does not consider how MTs embrace expected mentoring practices and which factors might shape their mentoring practices. Though these expected roles and practices of MTs are stated by the Faculty-Practice School Partnership Program based on PSTs' needs and practices, MTs' beliefs and perceptions about what mentoring is and which mentoring practices are required are critical for shaping their practices (Kroeze, 2014). Since beliefs and perceptions underlie conception and motivation, MTs' mentoring conceptions and motivations should be considered to understand their mentoring practices (Korthagen, 2004), which means understanding the mentoring process well (van Ginkel et al., 2016).

Mentoring Conception

Conception, as a term, has a subjective nature; therefore, it is difficult to provide an operational definition for it. However, generally, it can be explained as a person's set of beliefs and ideas about a specific object, and it has a subjective nature (Furinghetti, 1998). Based on this explanation, mentoring conception is defined as "beliefs about goals, sources, and nature of mentored learning to teach" (van Ginkel et al., 2016, p. 104). Mentoring conceptions are differentiated from MTs' mentoring styles and approaches. Mentoring styles and approaches refer to MTs' typical behaviors during the mentoring process; however, mentoring conceptions refer to MTs' mental models and beliefs about mentoring, which shapes mentoring practices (Aguirre & Speer, 1999; Donche & Van Petegem, 2011; Evans & Kozhevnikova, 2011; Fang, 1996; van Ginkel et al., 2016).

When the related literature is examined, there is a restricted number of studies examining mentoring conceptions in PSTE. One of the oldest studies was conducted by Franke and Dahlgren (1996). They conducted a phenomenographic study with MTs and PSTs to identify their conceptions by asking them what and how questions about mentoring. The study results showed that MTs' mentoring conceptions were gathered under three domains, one of which is the function of mentoring (Franke & Dahlgren, 1996). The function of the mentoring domain has two outstanding conceptions. According to the first, a reflecting perspective of the teachers' professional knowledge, MTs are seen as creative facilitators who give PSTs opportunities to create their understanding of learning to teach. The second one, a taken-for-granted perspective of the teachers' professional knowledge, sees MTs as role models who present the correct ways to PSTs.

Orland-Barak and Klein (2005) conducted a study with 12 MTs to describe their mentoring conceptions by collecting data through visual texts, verbal annotations, and conversations. The study result showed that MTs have two kinds of dominant mentoring conceptions: developmental and instrumental mentoring conceptions. MTs with developmental mentoring conception see themselves as creative people who offer a practical and collaborative atmosphere for PSTs to discuss learning and teaching principles. They also believe a reciprocal relationship exists between themselves and PSTs (Orland-Barak & Klein, 2005). MTs with instrumental mentoring conception see themselves as maestro (Graham, 2006) and a model of correct practice for PSTs to improve their teaching profession. Mentoring is seen as a performance improvement process in which PSTs imitate MTs' practices; therefore, MTs with instrumental mentoring conception believe an asymmetrical relationship exists between themselves and PSTs (Orland-Barak & Klein, 2005).

Similar to the results of Orland-Barak and Klein's study (2005), other studies grouped mentoring conceptions under two dominant types: developmental and instrumental mentoring conceptions (Crasborn et al., 2008; Kroeze, 2014; van Ginkel et al., 2016; Wang & Odell, 2002). The review study conducted by Wang and Odell (2002) focused on studies about MTs' practices in learning to teach in Anglo-Saxon countries. As regards the results of the study, MTs generally show a tendency to have instrumental mentoring conceptions rather than developmental mentoring conceptions (Wang & Odell, 2002). Crasborn et al. (2008) conducted a qualitative study with 30 Dutch MTs by focusing on their mentoring dialogues. The study showed that Dutch MTs held instrumental mentoring rather than developmental mentoring conceptions (Crasborn et al., 2008). Kroeze (2014) also found the same result: Dutch MTs agree more on instrumental mentoring conceptions when they state their mentoring roles.

Unlike the studies above, van Ginkel et al. (2016) conducted a quantitative study to determine MTs' conceptions with 726 Dutch MTs by developing and applying the Mentoring Conception Scale (MCS). The scale was developed by adopting two dominant mentoring conceptions: developmental and instrumental mentoring conceptions based on the literature (Franke & Dahlgren, 1996; Orland-Barak & Klein, 2005). According to the result of the study, MTs showed more agreement on developmental mentoring conception ($M = 5.48$, $SD = 0.53$) than instrumental mentoring conception ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 0.55$) with large effect size ($r = 0.51$) (van Ginkel et al., 2016). Even if MTs showed more agreement on developmental mentoring conception, their scores in instrumental mentoring conception were also high because MTs do not have to have only one type of conception (Franke & Dahlgren, 1996). van Ginkel et al. (2016) explained that the reasons they found different results from the literature could be related to sociocultural differences between participants, reform movements over the years, the use of different method types in studies, and the lack of a common standard for measuring mentoring conceptions.

One of the variables related to mentoring conceptions is MTs' reason for working with PSTs, which is their mentoring motivations (van Ginkel et al., 2016). MTs' mentoring motivations correlate with how they see the functioning of mentoring for themselves and PSTs.

Mentoring Motivation

Motivation is usually defined as why humans initiate, maintain, and end a particular act at a specific time (Graham & Weiner, 1996); therefore, mentoring motivations are essential in shaping mentoring practices. Mentoring motivations are "the reasons mentor teachers give for engaging in the mentor role; why they consider it important to become a mentor for novice teachers" (van Ginkel et al., 2016, p. 103). Because being an MT is voluntary, revealing MTs' motivations to work with PSTs is required to understand their mentoring practice.

The study conducted by Stout (1982) aimed to understand the reasons why MTs accept working with PSTs. The result of the study showed that the most stated reason is a professional obligation. As the second most stated reason, MTs believed that working with PSTs provides them opportunities to improve their professional development (Stout, 1982). Allen et al. (1997) conducted a similar study to determine MTs' motivations. According to the study, there are two primary sources of MTs: other-focused and self-focused factors. While the other-focused factors are related to a desire to relay information to novices and help them and a desire to construct an effective work environment, the self-focused factors are related to a desire to work with novices to support personal learning and to feel honored (Allen et al., 1997). Sinclair et al. (2006) came through similar grouping of mentoring motivations. MTs stated that their dominant mentoring motivation was sharing their experiences with novices to help them learn to teach. As the second dominant mentoring motivation, they remarked a desire to support their teaching profession.

The Mentoring Motivation Scale (MCS) was developed by van Ginkel et al. (2016) to determine MTs' mentoring motivations in the same study in which MCS was developed. The scale was developed by adopting two dominant mentoring motivations that stem from other-focused and self-focused factors: personal learning and generative outcome motives. Personal learning motives contain MTs' desires to be MTs, such as supporting their professional development and feeling enjoyment, satisfaction, and honor (Sinclair et al., 2006; van Ginkel et al., 2016). MTs with personal learning motives indicate a reciprocal relationship between themselves and PSTs because they believe PSTs can also support their professional development. General outcome motives contain MTs' other-focused desires to be MTs, such as guiding the next generation of teachers by sharing experience and knowledge (Merriam, 1983). MTs with general outcome motives indicate a one-way relationship between themselves and PSTs, and MTs transfer their experience and knowledge to PSTs. The results of the study showed that MTs showed more agreement on generative outcome motives ($M = 5.53$, $SD = 0.71$) than personal learning motives ($M = 5.45$, $SD = 0.89$) but with a small effect size ($r = 0.09$). Since the effect size is so small, it was stated that Dutch MTs had both types of mentoring motivations (van Ginkel et al., 2016). Because MTs might have more than one reason to be a MT (Sinclair et al., 2006).

The Purpose and the Significance of the Study

Understanding and executing the mentoring process is essential to increase its effectiveness on PSTs. This process is usually evaluated by considering mentoring practices as it provides a concrete evaluation criterion (Aydın & Ok, 2019). MTs' roles and practices are defined in line with the needs and expectations of PSTs, but each MT shapes their mentoring practices based on their beliefs about what mentoring is and how it should be done. Revealing MTs' mentoring conceptions and motivations might meet this need to understand the reasons behind mentoring practices. Therefore, the current study aims to translate the MCS and the MMS, developed by van Ginkel et al. (2016), into Turkish to conduct the reliability and validity analyses of the instruments and to examine Turkish MTs' mentoring conceptions and motivations descriptively. It is thought that the instruments translated into Turkish will contribute to the national literature and PSTE by describing Turkish MTs' conceptions and motivations about mentoring. Describing mentoring conceptions and motivations might also provide insight into improving the mentor training program.

Methodology

Method

Since one of the study's aims is to descriptively examine Turkish MTs' mentoring conceptions and motivations, the survey research design was conducted. Survey research is conducted to address the specific questions that have been asked, solve problems that have been stated, create a baseline for future comparisons, examine trends within a specific context and timeline, and define what exists and in what amount in the specific context. (Isaac & Michael, 1997).

Instruments

Before applying the MCS and the MMS to the participants, demographic information was collected using the Demographic Survey. This survey includes information about participants' age, gender, years of teaching experience, years of mentoring experience, school level, subject areas, and school type.

Mentoring Conception Scale (MCS)

In 2016, van Ginkel et al. developed the MCS in the Netherlands to evaluate MTs' conceptions of mentoring by conducting a literature review and pilot study. The instrument was developed by considering two mentoring conceptions: developmental and instrumental mentoring conception. The instrument consists of 48 seven-point Likert-type items (strongly disagree, disagree, disagree more than agree, disagree as much as agree, agree more than disagree, agree, strongly agree). Three sub-instruments under the MCS focus on assessing different dimensions of mentoring conceptions. The first sub-instrument, with eight items, focuses on mentoring goals and intentions. The second sub-instrument, with 14 items, focuses on beliefs about sources of teacher knowledge and learning, and the third sub-instrument, with 16 items, focuses on beliefs about the nature and process of teacher knowledge and learning. Twenty-four items are regarding MTs' developmental mentoring conception; the remaining 24 are regarding instrumental mentoring conception. Items under the developmental mentoring conception see mentoring as a process that contains effective, collaborative, and reciprocal relationships between

MTs and PSTs to discuss the principle of learning to teach. Items about the instrumental mentoring conception see mentoring as a process that contains a one-way relationship between MTs and PSTs. During this process, the role of the MT is to be a model for PSTs to improve their proficiency in teaching. After developing the MCS, van Ginkel et al. (2016) conducted a reliability and validity analysis by applying the instrument to 726 MTs in Dutch. The researchers calculated the Cronbach Alpha coefficients for each conception factor for reliability analysis. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients were found to be 0.85 and 0.82 for the items under developmental and instrumental mentoring conception, respectively (van Ginkel et al., 2016).

Mentoring Motivation Scale (MMS)

In 2016, van Ginkel et al. developed the MMS in the Netherlands to evaluate MTs' motivations for mentoring by conducting a pilot study. The instrument was developed by considering two mentoring motivations: personal learning motives and generative outcome motives. The instrument consists of 19 seven-point Likert-type items (strongly disagree, disagree, disagree more than agree, disagree as much as agree, agree more than disagree, agree, strongly agree), focusing on MTs' reasons for wanting to work with PSTs. There are eight items related to MTs' personal learning motives, such as personal development in the teaching profession and enjoyment. There are 11 items related to MTs' generative outcome motives, such as a desire to transfer knowledge and experience to the next generation of teachers. After developing the MMS, van Ginkel et al. (2016) conducted a reliability and validity analysis by applying the instrument to 726 MTs in the Netherlands. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated for each motivation factor for the reliability analysis. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients were found to be 0.86 and 0.83 for the items under personal learning and generative outcome motives, respectively (van Ginkel et al., 2016).

The Translation of the Instruments

In the current study, the backward translation design was used to translate the instruments. There are three steps to translating an instrument through the backward translation design: translating the instrument into the target language, translating the instrument translated target language into the source language by a different translator (or group of translators), and comparing the original version of the instrument and the back-translated version of it to ensure the language equivalence (ITC, 2018). Before the translation process of the instruments, the required permission was obtained from van Ginkel et al. (2016) via e-mail. Then, the translation process of the instruments started. The instruments were translated into Turkish by the expert, who is a native Turkish speaker and fluent in Dutch. Then, items of the instruments translated into Turkish were translated back into Dutch. In the sequel, the experts evaluate the language equivalence by comparing the original version of the instrument and the back-translated version.

To strengthen the linguistic and cultural aspects of the instruments, the researchers consulted with MTs and teacher educators' opinions. Firstly, the researchers interviewed eight MTs to determine their understanding of the translated instruments. According to MTs' opinions, it was observed that some words and items of the instruments were misunderstood or understood differently. Therefore, the researchers consulted teacher educators' opinions to evaluate items regarding socio-cultural context and PSTE practices in Turkey. The teacher educators made recommendations about some words by considering the possible meanings of the words in the Turkish context, such as teach, teaching, and lesson. After these changes, another teacher educator and an experienced MT took control of the final version of the Turkish instruments. Thus, the translation of the instruments was completed, and Turkish versions of them are given in Appendix.

Sampling and Participants

The instruments were administered to participants in the 2021 fall semester of teaching practicum. The instruments were prepared to be administered online (due to the COVID-19 outbreak) via Google Forms. The highest number of universities providing PSTE in Turkey is in Istanbul; therefore, the target population of this study was chosen secondary school MTs in Istanbul. Using the purposive sampling method for survey research design requires a representative sample for the target population. Even though significant teacher education institutions are in Istanbul, they tend to work with the same internship schools and MTs. This means having a small pool of MTs working with PSTs yearly. Universities prefer to work with the same schools and mentors to maintain collaboration. This means that the target population of this study is not all the teachers in Istanbul; it is a small portion of it. Thus, the total number of participants may seem low, but it should be considered regarding the target population. In Turkey, teachers must get a mentoring certification to be MTs by taking a three-day mentor training

program provided by the Ministry of Education. Since there is a limited number of certificated secondary school area specialized MTs, the target population of the study was narrow.

The study sample included 141 secondary school MTs of ten branches: mathematics, science, physics, chemistry, biology, Turkish, English, history, geography, and social science. The demographic information of participating MTs is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Information for The Participating Mentor Teachers

Gender		<i>N</i>	
Female		94	
Male		47	
School Type			
Public		86	
Private		55	
School Level			
High		79	
Middle		62	
Mentoring Experience Year			
1-3 year		43	
4-7 year		47	
8-11 year		21	
More than 12 years		30	
Subject Areas			
Mathematics		28	Total: 49
		21	
Science	Science	19	Total: 44
	Physics	5	
	Chemistry	13	
	Biology	7	
Language and Social Science	Turkish	6	Total: 48
	English	37	
	History	1	
	Geography	0	
	Social Science	4	

The ages of the participant MTs were between 24 and 61 ($M = 42.3$, $SD = 4.96$). Additionally, the participant MTs' teaching experience years ranged from 2 to 35 ($M = 18.66$, $SD = 7.48$), and their mentoring experience years ranged from 1 to 25 ($M = 7.23$, $SD = 5.89$).

Data Analysis

After the data collection process, the reliability and validity analyses were conducted for each instrument. The Cronbach alpha coefficients for overall instruments and each conception and motivation factor were calculated using SPSS (version 25) for the reliability analysis. Also, the corrected item-total correlations for each item of the instruments were calculated.

Both theory-driven and data-driven perspectives were used for the validity analysis of the two instruments. A theory-driven perspective was supported by reviewing related literature. According to the related literature, mentoring conception is a two-factor construct, developmental mentoring conception, and instrumental mentoring conception (Crasborn et al., 2008; Franke & Dahlgren, 1996; Kroeze, 2014; van Ginkel et al., 2016; Orland-Barak & Klein, 2005; Wang & Odell, 2002). Mentoring motivation is a two-factor construct with a personal learning and a generative outcome motive (Allen et al., 1997; Sinclair et al., 2006; Stout, 1982; van Ginkel et al., 2016). Since the literature supports a two-factor construct of mentoring conception and motivation, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted for each instrument to check the construct validity. When the structure of the factor model is determined by previous studies and theories, CFA is more appropriate in the later stages of construct validation (Brown, 2015). Before performing CFA, required assumptions, such as sample size, normality, outliers, and missing data, were checked.

Although there is no consensus about the required sample size for conducting CFA, the number of participants should be sufficient to discern the relationship between the observed variables and constructs (Brown, 2015). Kline (1994) asserted that 200 participants are sufficient to conduct CFA. Additionally, the number of participants can be reduced by up to 100 if the construct structure is clear and its number is small (Kline, 1994). The ratio of $N:p$ (N : sample size, p : number of observed variables) should be considered while determining an acceptable sample size for CFA. The ratio of 10:1 is preferable; however, Kline (1994) states that it can be as low as 2:1 depending on the structure and number of constructs. In addition to considering the $N:p$ ratio, the $p:f$ ratio may also be considered when determining sample size (f : the number of construct factors). Having more observed variables per factor is preferable when the sample size is limited (Marsh, 1998). In this study, considering the small size of the target population, which is MTs in Istanbul, the sample size can be considered representative. There are 58 universities in Istanbul, almost a fourth of the total in Turkey, and just 17 have a Faculty of Education. Among these universities, only two have a department for high school teaching. This causes the need for a small number of MTs in Istanbul and the number of MTs in Istanbul to be low. Given these circumstances, the sample size of the study might be considered limited but representative.

After collecting data, skewness values were calculated for each factor under two instruments to check the normality assumption. Additionally, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was conducted to get more accurate results. Since data is ordinal and the sample size is relatively small, the estimator means and variance adjusted weighted least square (WLSMV) was considered to conduct CFA. To interpret the results of CFA, fit indices such as the ratio of chi-square and degree of freedom (χ^2/df), the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) and the Weighted Root Mean Residual (WRMR) were checked. The values of model fit indices are affected by the sample size and the number of items in an instrument (Shi et al., 2018). When the sample size is small, and the number of items is high, RMSEA, CFI, and TLI values are likely to be biased and tend to give a worse model fit than the population values (Shi et al., 2018). Since the sample size of the study was relatively small, more caution is needed to interpret the values of model fit indices. In addition to the interpretation of fit indices, factor loadings for each item under two instruments were checked.

Descriptive statistics of mentoring conceptions and motivations were achieved by using SPSS. To examine both conception and motivation factors among themselves, a non-parametric alternative of the Paired-Sample t-test, which is the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, was used.

Results

The results of the study are given under three headings: reliability results of the instruments, validity results of the instruments, and descriptive results regarding mentoring conception and motivation.

Reliability Analysis Results

Mentoring Conception Scale (MCS)

In the reliability analysis of the MCS, the Cronbach alpha coefficient for the overall instrument with 48 items was 0.96. The reliability of the instrument was considered excellent (George & Mallery, 2003). Then, the same calculation was conducted for each conception factor, and Cronbach's alpha values of the two factors are as follows: developmental mentoring conception (24 items) is 0.96, and instrumental mentoring conception (24 items) is 0.94. Thus, the reliability of each conception factor was also considered excellent (George & Mallery,

2003). Additionally, the corrected item-total correlations for all items, which are given in Table 2, were higher than 0.30 and considered acceptable (De Vaus, 2004).

Table 2

The Corrected Item-Total Correlations of the MCS items

Item Number	MCS Item Code	The corrected item-total correlations	Item Number	MCS Item Code	The corrected item-total correlations
Item1	DMC1	0.58	Item10	IMC1	0.53
Item2	DMC2	0.59	Item11	IMC2	0.80
Item3	DMC3	0.65	Item12	IMC3	0.61
Item4	DMC4	0.60	Item13	IMC4	0.64
Item5	DMC5	0.62	Item14	IMC5	0.70
Item6	DMC6	0.62	Item15	IMC6	0.67
Item7	DMC7	0.62	Item16	IMC7	0.61
Item8	DMC8	0.56	Item17	IMC8	0.50
Item9	DMC9	0.52	Item18	IMC9	0.49
Item19	DMC10	0.63	Item26	IMC10	0.64
Item20	DMC11	0.73	Item27	IMC11	0.62
Item21	DMC12	0.65	Item28	IMC12	0.61
Item22	DMC13	0.67	Item29	IMC13	0.63
Item23	DMC14	0.72	Item30	IMC14	0.57
Item24	DMC15	0.59	Item31	IMC15	0.61
Item25	DMC16	0.52	Item32	IMC16	0.66
Item33	DMC17	0.53	Item41	IMC17	0.61
Item34	DMC18	0.58	Item42	IMC18	0.68
Item35	DMC19	0.51	Item43	IMC19	0.60
Item36	DMC20	0.54	Item44	IMC20	0.69
Item37	DMC21	0.55	Item45	IMC21	0.51
Item38	DMC22	0.59	Item46	IMC22	0.67
Item39	DMC23	0.52	Item47	IMC23	0.57
Item40	DMC24	0.63	Item48	IMC24	0.52

Note. DMC = Developmental Mentoring Conception; IMC = Instrumental Mentoring Conception

Mentoring Motivation Scale (MMS)

In the reliability analysis of the MMS, the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the instrument was found to be 0.92, which is considered excellent (George & Mallery, 2003). For the factors, personal learning motives and generative outcome motives, under the instrument, the Cronbach alpha coefficients were 0.87 and 0.89, respectively. Thus, the reliability of each conception factor was also considered excellent (George & Mallery, 2003). Moreover, the corrected item-total correlations for all items were calculated, and it was seen that all values, which are given in Table 3, were higher than 0.30 and considered acceptable (De Vaus, 2004).

Table 3

The Corrected Item-Total Correlations of the MMS items

Item Numbers	MMS Item Codes	The corrected item-total correlations
Item 1	PLM1	0.56
Item 2	GOM1	0.62
Item 3	GOM2	0.53
Item 4	PLM2	0.38
Item 5	PLM3	0.80

Item Numbers	MMS Item Codes	The corrected item-total correlations
Item 6	GOM3	0.63
Item 7	PLM4	0.77
Item 8	GOM4	0.66
Item 9	PLM5	0.74
Item10	GOM5	0.53
Item 11	PLM6	0.66
Item 12	PLM7	0.72
Item 13	PLM8	0.75
Item 14	GOM6	0.57
Item 15	GOM7	0.64
Item 16	GOM8	0.74
Item 17	GOM9	0.64
Item 18	GOM10	0.61
Item 19	GOM11	0.66

Note. PLM = Personal Learning Motives; GOM = Generative Outcome Motives

Validity Analysis Results

Mentoring Conception Scale (MCS)

To check the construct validity of the MCS instrument, CFA was performed by using MPlus 7 with the WLSMV estimator. Before performing the CFA, the required assumptions were controlled. The number of participants is 141, the number of items is 48, and the number of factors is two. While the ratio of sample size and observed variable is 2.94:1, the ratio of observed variable and factors is 24:1. For the normality assumption, the skewness value was calculated as -0.81. For the normality assumption, the skewness value was calculated as -0.81. It was seen that the skewness value is in an acceptable range, from -1 to 1 (Hair et al., 2014). Since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was found significant ($p = 0.00$), it was accepted that the data is not normally distributed.

The results of the CFA were evaluated by considering model fit indices and factor loadings of each item. The values of χ^2 , χ^2/df , RMSEA, CFI, TLI, and the WRMR are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of the MCS

2-Factor Model	Model Fit Indices						
	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	RMSEA	CFI	TLI	WRMR
	2841.01	1079	2.63	0.11	0.9	0.89	1.945

The values of model fit indices obtained from the CFA are acceptable for the two-factor model except for the values of RMSEA and WRMR, which are slightly higher than the cut-off point. As a further step, factor loadings were checked. It was seen that all factor loadings, which are presented in Table 5, are statistically significant and higher than 0.5, even though the values of RMSEA and WRMR are a little higher than an acceptable value. Therefore, it was accepted that the construct validity of the MCS instrument was provided, which indicates that the instrument measures the mentoring conception (the construct) that it is intended to measure.

Table 5

The Factor Loadings of the MCS items

Item Number	MCS Item Code	Factor Loadings	Item Number	MCS Item Code	Factor Loadings
Item1	DMC1	1.000	Item10	IMC1	1.000
Item2	DMC2	0.990	Item11	IMC2	0.908

Item Number	MCS Item Code	Factor Loadings	Item Number	MCS Item Code	Factor Loadings
Item3	DMC3	1.036	Item12	IMC3	0.830
Item4	DMC4	1.007	Item13	IMC4	0.955
Item5	DMC5	0.971	Item14	IMC5	0.816
Item6	DMC6	0.912	Item15	IMC6	0.915
Item7	DMC7	0.939	Item16	IMC7	0.707
Item8	DMC8	1.016	Item17	IMC8	0.987
Item9	DMC9	0.903	Item18	IMC9	0.995
Item19	DMC10	1.001	Item26	IMC10	0.998
Item20	DMC11	1.038	Item27	IMC11	1.072
Item21	DMC12	1.011	Item28	IMC12	1.028
Item22	DMC13	1.043	Item29	IMC13	1.009
Item23	DMC14	1.078	Item30	IMC14	1.063
Item24	DMC15	0.887	Item31	IMC15	1.022
Item25	DMC16	0.796	Item32	IMC16	1.020
Item33	DMC17	0.946	Item41	IMC17	0.794
Item34	DMC18	1.003	Item42	IMC18	0.867
Item35	DMC19	0.871	Item43	IMC19	0.742
Item36	DMC20	0.946	Item44	IMC20	0.849
Item37	DMC21	0.997	Item45	IMC21	0.629
Item38	DMC22	1.050	Item46	IMC22	0.762
Item39	DMC23	0.932	Item47	IMC23	0.632
Item40	DMC24	1.114	Item48	IMC24	0.602

Note. DMC = Developmental Mentoring Conception; IMC = Instrumental Mentoring Conception

The correlation between conception factors is 0.55, which indicates that there is a moderate level of correlation between the two factors. To check the discriminant validity in terms of two factors, the average variance extracted (AVE) values were calculated as 0.96 for the developmental mentoring conception factor and 0.80 for the instrumental mentoring conception factor. The squared correlation of the two factors is found to be 0.30. Since the values of AVE are higher than the squared correlation of two factors, the discriminant validity for the MCS instrument was provided, which indicates two conception factors of the MCS instrument have a unique nature.

Mentoring Motivation Scale (MMS)

After controlling the assumptions, the CFA was performed by using MPlus 7 with the WLSMV estimator to check the construct validity of the MMS instrument. The MMS instrument was filled out by 141 MTs. While the number of items in the instrument is 19, the number of factors is two. Regarding this information, it was calculated that the ratio of sample size and observed variables is 7.42:1, and the ratio of observed variables and factors is 9.5:1, which can be considered acceptable. Regarding the assumption of the CFA, the normality was checked by calculating the skewness value of the MMS instrument as -0.70. It was seen that the skewness value is in an acceptable range, from -1 to 1 (Hair et al., 2014). Since the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was found significant ($p = 0.00$), it was accepted that the data is not normally distributed.

The results of the CFA were evaluated by considering model fit indices and factor loadings of each item. The values of model fit indices are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of the MMS

2-Factor Model	Model Fit Indices			RMSEA	CFI	TLI	WRMR
	χ^2	df	χ^2/df				
	725.649	151	4.8	0.075	0.922	0.912	1.623

The values of model fit indices obtained from the CFA are acceptable for the two-factor motivation model except for the values of WRMR. The value of WRMR is slightly higher than the cut-off point. In addition to model fit indices, factor loadings of each item were considered to evaluate the construct validity of the MMS instrument. Even if the value of WRMR is higher than an acceptable value, it was calculated that all factor loadings, which are presented in Table 7, are statistically significant and higher than 0.5. Therefore, it was accepted that the construct validity of the MMS instrument was provided, which indicates the MMS instrument measures the mentoring motivation (the construct) that it is intended to measure.

Table 7*The Factor Loadings of the MMS items*

Item Numbers	MMS Item Codes	Factor Loadings
Item 1	PLM1	1.000
Item 2	GOM1	1.000
Item 3	GOM2	0.950
Item 4	PLM2	1.001
Item 5	PLM3	1.173
Item 6	GOM3	1.063
Item 7	PLM4	0.861
Item 8	GOM4	1.097
Item 9	PLM5	1.373
Item10	GOM5	1.097
Item 11	PLM6	1.275
Item 12	PLM7	1.308
Item 13	PLM8	1.103
Item 14	GOM6	0.885
Item 15	GOM7	0.906
Item 16	GOM8	0.963
Item 17	GOM9	0.844
Item 18	GOM10	0.828
Item 19	GOM11	0.846

Note. PLM = Personal Learning Motives; GOM = Generative Outcome Motives

The correlation between the two motivation factors was also calculated, and it was seen that there is a moderate level of correlation between the two motivation factors. Moreover, discriminant validity was controlled by calculating the values of AVE for two motivation factors. The AVE values were 1.32 and 0.92 for the personal learning motives factor and the generative outcome motives factor, respectively. The squared correlation of two mentoring motivation factors was calculated as 0.26. Since the AVE values are higher than the squared correlation of two mentoring motivation factors, it was accepted that discriminant validity of the MMS instrument was provided, which indicates that the motivation factors of the MMS instrument have a unique nature.

Descriptive Results of Mentoring Conceptions and Motivations

After revealing the reliability and validity results of the instruments, descriptive statistics were also presented to describe the participant MTs' mentoring conceptions and mentoring motivations.

Mentoring Conception Factors

The descriptive statistics from the MCS are presented in Table 8. When the mean values of both conception factors are considered, it is seen that MTs tended to give high scores for conception factors, developmental ($M = 6.29$), and instrumental mentoring conception ($M = 5.67$).

Table 8*Descriptive Statistics for Conception Factors*

Factors	M	SD	Min.	Max.
Developmental Mentoring Conception	6.29	0.66	3.63	7.00
Instrumental Mentoring Conception	5.67	0.91	3.25	7.00

The Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used to examine two conception factors. According to the results of the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test, there was a statistically significant difference among MTs' conception factors ($z = -9.02, p < 0.001$), with a large effect size ($r = 0.54$) (Cohen, 1988). MTs reported stronger agreement with a developmental mentoring conception ($M = 6.29, SD = 0.66$) than with an instrumental mentoring conception ($M = 5.67, SD = 0.91$).

Mentoring Motivation Factors

The MMS is a 7-Likert-type instrument with 19 items under personal learning motive ($N = 8$) and generative outcome motive ($N = 11$). The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 9 as in the conception factors, MTs tended to give high scores for both motivation factors, personal learning motive ($M = 5.94$) and generative outcome motive ($M = 5.88$).

Table 9*Descriptive Statistics for Motivation Factors*

Factors	M	SD	Min.	Max.
Personal Learning Motive	5.94	0.89	2.13	7.00
Generative Outcome Motive	5.88	0.89	3.36	7.00

The Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used to check whether there was a statistically significant difference between the two motivation factors. The results revealed that there was no statistically significant difference among MTs' motivation factors ($z = -1.28, p = 0.22$). MTs reported almost equal agreement on a personal learning motive ($M = 5.94, SD = 0.89$) and a generative outcome motive ($M = 5.88, SD = 0.89$) to be MT.

Discussion and Conclusion

The mentoring process has a complex structure (Leshem, 2012), and it is essential to understand this process to increase its effectiveness on PSTs' learning to teach. To evaluate the mentoring process, MTs' practices, identified based on PSTs' needs, are generally considered; however, the effects of MTs' beliefs about what mentoring is and which mentoring practices are required are ignored. Since these beliefs are the basis of MTs' mentoring conceptions and motivations, it is necessary to consider mentoring conceptions and motivations to understand MTs' mentoring practices and how these practices shape the mentoring process. Nevertheless, no instruments to study MTs' mentoring conceptions and motivations in Turkey could be found. Therefore, the aim of the current study was to translate the MCS, which measures mentoring conceptions, and the MMS, which measures mentoring motivations, into Turkish and report descriptive results.

According to the findings of the reliability analysis of the instruments, while the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the conception factors under the MCS were found to be 0.96 and 0.94, it was found that the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the motivation factors under the MMS were 0.87 and 0.89. When the Cronbach alpha coefficient findings obtained during the development phase of the instruments were examined, they were calculated as 0.85 and 0.82 for conception factors under the MCS and 0.86 and 0.83 (van Ginkel et al., 2016). It can be said that the current study's reliability results are similar to those obtained in the development study.

The construct and discriminant validity were considered for the validity of the instruments. For the MCS instrument, the CFA results indicated that the values of χ^2/df , CFI, and TLI, except for the values of RMSEA and

WRMR, are acceptable for the two-factor model. The values of RMSEA and WRMR were found to be slightly higher than the cut-off point. However, all factor loadings were found to be statistically significant and higher than 0.5. Furthermore, the discriminant validity was provided for the instrument. For the MMS instrument, all model fit indices, χ^2/df , RMSEA, CFI, and TLI, except WRMR, were found to be acceptable for the two-factor model. It was also found that all factor loadings were statistically significant and higher than 0.5, and the discriminant validity was high, as requested. Since the sample size affects model fit indices (Shi et al., 2018), the reason for finding slightly high RMSEA and WRMR values for the two instruments might be related to the relatively small sample size in this current study.

In addition to these test statistics, the two-factor conception and motivation models for the instruments came from the literature, and lots of studies supported these two-factor models (e.g., Crasborn et al., 2008; Kroeze, 2014; Sinclair et al., 2006). Therefore, in the current study, the MCS and the MMS instruments were assumed to provide a good fit with the two-factor conception and motivation models.

When the descriptive statistics of mentoring conception factors were examined, there was a statistically significant difference between developmental and instrumental mentoring conception, and MTs tended to have a developmental mentoring conception as a dominant one. Even if a significant difference was found between conception factors, it is seen that MTs hold more than one mentoring conception to shape their practices in the mentoring process by giving high scores for each conception factor, as stated by Franke and Dahlgren (1996). This means that while MTs see the mentoring process as a collaborative and symmetrical relationship with PSTs, they also see themselves as maestros who provide effective teaching practices to PSTs. In the literature, studies on the mentoring conceptions have revealed different results. Some studies have presented that MTs' dominant mentoring conceptions are instrumental conceptions (e.g., Kroeze, 2014; Wang & Odell, 2002), while some studies have found that MTs' dominant mentoring conceptions are developmental conceptions (e.g., van Ginkel et al., 2016).

In the current study, the reason why MTs hold developmental mentoring conception as a dominant one might be related to similarities between mentoring conception factors and conceptions of teaching (student-centered and teacher-centered conception of teaching) (Donche & Van Petegem, 2011). In the early 2000s, the constructivist approach as an official philosophy of the Turkish Education System was accepted (Under, 2010), and reform movements in curriculums, textbooks, and teaching materials by emphasizing the constructivist approach have been conducted. When the participant MTs' ages ($M = 42.3$, $SD = 4.96$) and years of teaching experience ($M = 18.66$, $SD = 7.48$) are considered, most of them experienced these educational reform movements. With this new approach, teachers' conception of teaching and learning might have changed, and they might have started to emphasize a student-centered conception of teaching (Gencel, 2013) and a constructivist conception of teaching and learning (Aypay, 2011; Ekinici, 2016; Usta, 2019). Since the constructivist approach to teaching and learning shows similarities with the developmental mentoring conception (Chan & Elliot, 2004), the reason why the participant MTs in Turkey held the developmental mentoring conception as a dominant one might come from the tendency of the constructivist conception about learning and teaching.

Even if MTs held developmental mentoring conception as a dominant one, they also showed a tendency to hold instrumental mentoring conception as well. The reasons for this tendency might be related to limited reforms in the content and approach of mentoring in Turkey. In 1998, the most essential reform was made in PSTE, and teaching practices were added. With this reform, the roles and practices of MTs were stated, and a three-day mentor training program became compulsory to be a MT. However, this three-day mentor training program is limited for teachers to be MTs (Yılmaz & Bıkmaz, 2020). Though teachers' conceptions about teaching and learning have changed, they might not shape their mentoring conceptions in terms of these new approaches to teaching and learning. Therefore, MTs in Turkey might have shown a tendency to have an instrumental mentoring conception along with a developmental mentoring conception. They might have hesitated to choose one mentoring conception as a dominant one.

The results of the current study showed that MTs tended to give high scores for both motivation factors, and they reported almost equal agreement on personal learning motives ($M = 5.94$, $SD = 0.89$) and generative outcome motives ($M = 5.88$, $SD = 0.89$). This means that MTs have both self-focused, a desire to develop MTs' personal learning and feel enjoyment and satisfaction, and other-focused motives, a desire to guide the next generation by transferring experience and information to PSTs, to be a MT. Other studies found similar results in the literature (e.g., van Ginkel et al., 2016). Though being a MT and a teacher should be considered distinct professions (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005), being a MT has been seen as a part of the teaching profession (van Ginkel et al., 2016). The reason why MTs held both motivation factors might be explained by their reasons for

joining the teaching profession. There are many factors that shape PSTs' motivations to join the teaching profession, which are classified into three categories: intrinsic reasons, altruistic reasons, and extrinsic reasons (Moran et al., 2001). The categories, intrinsic and altruistic reasons, show similarities with the reasons behind personal and generative outcome motives for being a MT, respectively. The results of the studies, which aimed to examine PSTs' motivations to join the teaching profession, indicated that PSTs generally show a tendency to have both high intrinsic and altruistic reasons to join the teaching profession (Hao & Guzman, 2007; Reid & Caudwell, 1997; Richardson & Watt, 2006). This tendency might explain teachers' reasons for being MT. Therefore, MTs in this study might have held both motivation factors as dominant ones.

When the aforementioned reliability and validity results are considered, it can be stated that the MCS and the MMS instruments can be used by researchers who aim to examine MTs' mentoring conceptions and motivations in Türkiye. However, researchers who want to use these two translated instruments should be aware that the factors under mentoring conception and motivation constructs are not two extreme ends, and as stated by Franke and Dahlgren (1996), mentor teachers may hold more than one mentoring conception to shape their practices in the mentoring process. Even if MTs tended to give high scores for both motivation and conception factors, giving high scores for instruments does not always mean that MTs put into practice adopted beliefs (Orland, 2001; Sinclair et al., 2006). Therefore, for further research, along with these two instruments, it might be meaningful to use qualitative data collection methods, interviews, and observations to support quantitative data. This would provide results for both their mentoring conceptions and motivations and reveal how much MTs put into practice adopted beliefs.

Code of Ethics

Ethical approval and written permission were obtained from the Social Sciences and Humanities Human Research Ethics Committee of Boğaziçi University (Application No: 2020-19, Approval Date: 17.02.2020, Meeting No: 2020/02).

Acknowledgements

This study was derived from the master's thesis of the first author under the supervision of the second author at Department of Mathematics and Science Education, Boğaziçi University, and was supported by Boğaziçi University Scientific Research Projects Fund (BAP) under Project No: BU-BAP-15961). The study was presented at the 15th National Science and Mathematics Education Congress held in Kars on September 28, 2023.

References

- Achinstein, B., & Athanases, S. (2005). Focusing new teachers on diversity and equity: Toward a knowledge base for mentors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(7), 843–862. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.05.017>
- Aguirre, J., & Speer, N. M. (1999). Examining the relationship between beliefs and goals in teacher practice. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 18(3), 327–356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0732-3123\(99\)00034-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0732-3123(99)00034-6)
- Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 70–89. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1997.1596>
- Aydın, O., & Ok, A. (2020). Mentoring practices in English language teaching practicum: Student teachers' perspectives on cooperating teachers' roles in the Turkish context. *The Teacher Educator*, 55(3), 248–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2019.1701756>
- Aypay, A. (2011). Öğretme ve öğrenme anlayışları ölçeği'nin Türkiye uyarlaması ve epistemolojik inançlar ile öğretme ve öğrenme anlayışları arasındaki ilişkiler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11(1), 7–29.
- Azkiyah, S. N., & Mukminin, A. (2017). In search of teaching quality of EFL student teachers through teaching practicum: Lesson from a teacher education program. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 4(7), 105–124. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.366>
- Blackwell, J. E. (1989). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. *Academe*, 75(5), 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40249734>

- Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. *Group and Organization Studies*, 9(3), 353–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960118400900304>
- Chan, K. W., & Elliott, R. G. (2004). Relational analysis of personal epistemology and conceptions about teaching and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(8), 817–831. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.09.002>
- Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Crasborn, F., Hennissen, P., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2008). Promoting versatility in mentor teachers' use of supervisory skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 499–514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.05.001>
- De Vaus, D. (2004). *Surveys in Social Research*. Routledge.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Jossey-Bass.
- Donche, V., & Van Petegem, P. (2011). Teacher educators' conceptions of learning to teach and related teaching strategies. *Research Papers in Education*, 26(2), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2011.561979>
- Ekinci, N. (2016). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğretme-öğrenme anlayışları ve öğrenen özerkliğini destekleyici davranışları arasındaki ilişkiler. *Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(19), 1–16.
- Evans, C., & Kozhevnikova, M. (2011). Styles of practice: How learning is affected by students' and teachers' perceptions and beliefs, conceptions and approaches to learning. *Research Papers in Education*, 26, 133–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2011.561973>
- Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, 38, 47–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188960380104>
- Flaxman, E., Ascher, L., & Harrington, C. (1968). *Mentoring Programmes and Practices: An Analysis of the Literature*. Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Columbia University Teachers' College.
- Franke, A., & Dahlgren, L. O. (1996). Conceptions of mentoring: An empirical study of conceptions of mentoring during the school-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12(6), 627–641. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(96\)00004-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(96)00004-2)
- Furinghetti, F. (1998). Beliefs, conceptions and knowledge in mathematics teaching. In E. Pehkonen & G. Törner (Eds.), *The State-of-art in Mathematics-related Belief Research: results of the MAVI Activities* (pp. 11–36). University of Helsinki.
- Gay, B. (1994). What Is Mentoring? *Education+Training*, 36(5), 4–7. <http://doi.org/10.1108/00400919410062257>
- Gencel, İ. E. (2013). Öğretmenlerin öğretim stilleri tercihleri: Türkiye-ABD karşılaştırılması. *International Periodical for The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8(8), 635–648.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 11.0 update* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Graham, B. (2006). Conditions for successful field experiences: Perceptions of cooperating teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(8), 1118–1129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.07.007>
- Graham, S., & Weiner, B. (1996). Theories and principles of motivation. In D. C. Berliner, & R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp. 63–84). Macmillan.
- Gürsoy, E., Bulunuz, N., Baltacı, Göktaay. S., Bulunuz, M., Kesner, J., & Salihoğlu, U. (2013). Clinical supervision model to improve supervisory skills of cooperating teachers and university supervisors during teaching practice. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, Special Issue (1), 191–203.
- Hair, F. J., Black, W., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis*. Pearson Education Limited.

- Hao A., & Guzman, A. (2007). Why go into teaching? Understanding Filipino preservice teachers' reasons for entering teacher education. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 4(2), 115-135.
- Hennissen, P., Crasborn, F., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2008). Mapping mentor teachers' roles in mentoring dialogues. *Educational Research Review*, 3(2), 168-186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2008.01.001>
- Hudson, P., & Skamp, K. (2001, November 3-5). *Mentoring preservice teachers of primary science* [Conference session]. The Science Teachers' Association of Ontario Conference, Toronto.
- Hudson, P., & Skamp, K. (2002). Mentoring preservice teachers of primary science. *The Electronic Journal of Science Education*, 7(1).
- International Test Commission (ITC). (2018). ITC guidelines for translating and adapting tests. *International Journal of Testing*, 18(2), 101–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15305058.2017.1398166>
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation: A collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in the planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). EdITS.
- Jan, H. (2017). Teacher of 21st century: Characteristics and development. *Research on humanities and social sciences*, 7(9), 50–54.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. Basic.
- Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. Routledge.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 77–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.10.002>
- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 608–625. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255910>
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Kroeze, C. (2014). *Georganiseerde begeleiding bij opleiden in de school. Een onderzoek naar het begeleiden van werkplekleren van leraren in opleiding* (Arranged mentoring in school-based teacher education. A study of mentoring student teacher's workplace learning) [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Tilburg University.
- Leshem, S. (2012). The many faces of mentor-mentee relationships in a pre-service teacher education programme. *Creative Education*, 3(4), 413–421. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2012.34065>
- Levinson, D. J., Carrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960117900400214>
- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., Balla, J. R., & Grayson, D. (1998). Is more ever too much? The number of indicators per factor in confirmatory factor analysis. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 33(2), 181–220. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3302_1
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074171368303300304>
- Moran, A., Kilpatrick, R., Abbot, L., Dallat, J., & McClune, B. (2001). Training to teach: Motivating factors and implications for recruitment. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 15(1), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500790108666980>
- Munby, H., Russell, T., & Martin, A. K. (2001). Teachers' knowledge and how it develops. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 877–904). American Educational Research Association.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Nganga, C., Bowne, M., & Stremmel, A. (2020). Mentoring as a developmental identity process. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 28(3), 259–277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2020.1783498>

- Nieva, V. F., & Gutek, B. A. (1981). *Women and work: A psychological perspective*. Praeger.
- Nguyen, T. (2020). The factors influence the preservice teachers' learning in the practicum. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, 12(651), 31–36. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v12i6S1.3089>
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2011). *Education at a glance 2011: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2011-en>
- Orland, L. (2001). Reading a mentoring situation: One aspect of learning to mentor. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(1), 75–88. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(00\)00039-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00039-1)
- Orland-Barak, L., & Klein, S. (2005). The expressed and the realized: Mentors' representations of a mentoring conversation and its realization in practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 379–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.05.003>
- Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). *Mentors and proteges*. Arbor House.
- Reid, I., & Caudwell, J. (1997). Why did secondary PGCE students choose teaching as a career? *Research in Education*, 58(1), 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003452379705800105>
- Reilkoff, T. (1981). Advantages of supportive supervision over clinical supervision of teachers. *NASSP Bulletin*, 65(448), 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658106544804>
- Richardson, P. W., & Watt, H. M. G. (2006). Who chooses teaching and why? Profiling characteristics and motivations across three Australian universities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(1), 27–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598660500480290>
- Sağ, R. (2008). The expectations of student teachers about cooperating teachers, supervisors and practice schools. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 32(32), 117–132.
- Shi, D., Lee, T., & Maydeu-Olivares, A. (2018). Understanding the model size effect on SEM fit indices. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 79(2), 310–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164418783530>
- Sinclair, C., Dowson, M., & Thistleton-Martin, J. (2006). Motivations and profiles of cooperating teachers: Who volunteers and why? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(3), 263–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.11.008>
- Stout, C. (1982). Why cooperating teachers accept students. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(6), 22–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002248718203300605>
- Tanisli, D. & Kose, N.Y. (2013). Pre-service mathematics teachers' knowledge of students about the algebraic concepts. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n2.1>
- Under, H. (2010). Yapılandırmacılığın epistemolojik savlarının Türkiye'de ilköğretim fen ve teknoloji dersi programlarında görünüşleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim*. 35(158), 199–214.
- Usta, İ. (2019). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin epistemolojik inançları ve öğretme-öğrenme anlayışlarının incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi.
- van Ginkel, G., Verloop, N., & Denessen, E. (2016). Why mentor? Linking mentor teachers' motivations to their mentoring conceptions. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 22(1), 101–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1023031>
- Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 481–546. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072003481>
- Yılmaz, G., & Bıkmaz, F. (2020). Revealing the professional learning needs of teachers for the successful mentoring of teacher candidates. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(4), 538–554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1777978>
- Zeichner, K. (2009). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671>
- Zey, M. G. (1984). *The mentor connection*. Dow Jones-Irwin.

Mentörlük Anlayış Ölçeği ve Mentörlük Motivasyon Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye Çevrilmesi: Güvenirlik ve Geçerlik Çalışması

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Mentörlük Anlayış Ölçeği ve Mentörlük Motivasyon Ölçeğini Türkçe 'ye çevirip ölçeklerin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik analizlerini yapmak ve mentör öğretmenlerinin mentörlük anlayışlarını ve motivasyonlarını Türkiye bağlamında betimsel olarak incelemektir. Ölçekler Hollandaca'dan Türkçe 'ye geri çeviri yöntemi kullanılarak çevrilmiş ve İstanbul'da 141 mentör öğretmene uygulanmıştır. Güvenilirlik analizi için iç tutarlılık katsayıları ve düzeltilmiş madde-toplam korelasyonları hesaplanmıştır. Ölçeklerin yapı geçerliliğinin kontrolü için Doğrulayıcı Faktör Analizleri yapılmış ve ayırıcı geçerlilik de kontrol edilmiştir. Geçerlilik sonuçları, ölçeklerin iki faktörden oluşan orijinal yapısını doğrulamıştır: gelişimsel ve araçsal mentörlük anlayışı; kişisel öğrenme ve üretken sonuç güdülere. Anlayış faktörlerinin iç tutarlılık katsayıları 0,96 ve 0,94 olarak hesaplanırken, motivasyon faktörlerinin iç tutarlılık katsayıları 0,87 ve 0,89 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Betimsel bulgular, mentör öğretmenlerinin her bir anlayış ve motivasyon faktörü için yüksek puanlar verme eğiliminde olduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: staj için mentörlük, mentörlük anlayışı, mentörlük motivasyonu, geçerlik, güvenilirlik

Appendix

Mentoring Conception Scale and Mentoring Motivation Scale

MENTÖRLÜK ANLAYIŞ ÖLÇEĞİ

1. Mentörlük Amaçları ve Niyetleri

Aşağıda mentör olmadaki amaçları ve niyetleri içeren birtakım ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadelere katılıp katılmadığınızı (1) Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum, (2) Katılmıyorum, (3) Kısmen Katılmıyorum, (4) Kararsızım, (5) Kısmen Katılıyorum, (6) Katılıyorum, (7) Kesinlikle Katılıyorum cevaplarından bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Mentörlük görüşmelerinde öğretmen adaylarının iyi bir dersin arkasındaki ilkeleri keşfetmeleri için olanak sağlamaya çalışırım.							
2. Öğretmen adaylarının kendi gelişimleri üzerine sürekli yansıtma yapmalarını sağlamaya çalışırım.							
3. Öğretmen adaylarının nasıl bir öğretmen olmak istediklerini keşfetmelerine yardımcı olmaya çalışırım.							
4. Öğretmen adaylarının kendi derslerini öğrencinin bakış açısından görmelerini sağlamaya çalışırım.							
5. Öğretmen adaylarını öğretimle ilgili farklı görüşler hakkında başkalarıyla tartışmaya teşvik etmeye çalışırım.							
6. Öğretmen adaylarının ders üzerine tartışmak için dersin birkaç dakikalık kısmını seçmelerine olanak sağlamak benim için önemlidir.							
7. Öğretmen adaylarına, öğrencilerin kendi çalışmalarını değerlendirmelerini sağlamayı öğretmeye çalışırım.							
8. Öğretmen adaylarına mesleğin bir parçası olduklarını hissettirmeye çalışırım.							
9. Benim için, öğretmen adayları ile mentörlük görüşmeleri için belirli zamanlar planlamak önemlidir.							
10. Öğretmen adaylarına ders hazırlamanın temel kurallarını öğretmeye çalışırım.							
11. Öğretmen adaylarına sınıfta sıkı kontrol sağlamayı öğretmeye çalışırım.							
12. Öğretmen adaylarının derslerini yapılandırmasını sağlamaya çalışırım.							
13. Öğretmen adaylarına temel sınıf içi rutinlerini öğretmeye çalışırım.							
14. Öğretmen adaylarına ihtiyaç duydukları becerileri öğretmeye çalışırım.							
15. Öğretmen adaylarının belirli bir ders yapısı kullanmalarını sağlamaya çalışırım.							
16. Dersin gidişatını öğrencilerin değil, öğretmen adaylarının belirlemesinin önemli olduğunu düşünürüm.							
17. Öğretimi değerlendirirken dersi baştan sona gözden geçirmeye çalışırım.							
18. Ders gözlemine dayanarak öğretmen adaylarıyla konuşmak ve öğretimi değerlendirmek benim için önemlidir.							

2. Öğretmeyi Öğrenme Kaynakları Hakkındaki İnanışlar

Aşağıda öğretmeyi öğrenme kaynakları hakkındaki inanışları içeren bir takım ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadelere katılıp katılmadığınızı (1) Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum, (2) Katılmıyorum, (3) Kısmen Katılmıyorum, (4) Kararsızım, (5) Kısmen Katılıyorum, (6) Katılıyorum, (7) Kesinlikle Katılıyorum cevaplarından bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Öğretmen adaylarının birbirlerini iyi destekleyebileceğini düşünürüm.							
2. Öğretmen adaylarının birbirlerine yaptıkları yorumların onlar için çok faydalı olduğunu düşünürüm.							
3. Öğretmen adaylarının birlikte analiz ettikleri zaman, öğretmenlik uygulamalarını daha iyi yorumlamayı öğrendiklerini düşünüyorum.							
4. Diğer öğretmen adayları ile birlikte ders gözlemi yapmanın, öğretmen adayları için faydalı olacağını düşünürüm.							
5. Daha az tecrübeli öğretmenlerin derslerini de gözlemlemenin öğretmen adayları için faydalı olacağını düşünürüm.							
6. Birbirlerinin hatalarını görmenin, öğretmen adayları için çok eğitici olduğunu düşünürüm.							
7. Meslektaşlarının sorunlarını görmenin, öğretmen adaylarının kendi performanslarını geliştirmelerine yardımcı olduğunu düşünürüm.							
8. Öğretmen adaylarının, öğretmenlik deneyimi elde edebilmeleri için deneyimli öğretmenlerin yardımına ihtiyaçları olduğunu düşünürüm.							
9. Mentör olmak için öncelikle iyi bir öğretmen olmak gerektiğini düşünürüm.							
10. Öğretmen adaylarının performanslarını arttırmak için mentörlerin yorumlarına ve değerlendirmelerine ihtiyaçları olduğunu düşünürüm.							
11. Öğretmen adaylarına mentörlük etmek için, ortalamadan daha iyi öğreten biri olmanın şart olduğunu düşünürüm.							
12. Öğretmen adaylarının uygulama durumlarını anlaması için bu durumları başkalarının yorumlamasının önemli olduğunu düşünürüm.							
13. Bence, yaptıklarıyla yargılanıyor olma hissi, öğretmen adaylarının öğretimleri üzerine çalışmalarına yardımcı olur.							
14. Öğretmen adaylarının derslerinde karşılaştıkları sorunlara iyi çözümler geliştirebilmeleri için mentörlüğün çok gerekli olduğunu düşünürüm.							

3. Öğretmen Bilgi ve Öğreniminin Doğası ve Süreci Hakkındaki İnanışlar

Aşağıda öğretmen bilgi ve öğrenimin doğası hakkındaki inanışları içeren bir takım ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadelere katılıp katılmadığınızı (1) Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum, (2) Katılmıyorum, (3) Kısmen Katılmıyorum, (4) Kararsızım, (5) Kısmen Katılıyorum, (6) Katılıyorum, (7) Kesinlikle Katılıyorum cevaplarından bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, giderek kendinizi nerede geliştirebileceğinizin daha iyi farkına varmaktır.							
2. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, giderek öğrencilerle başarmak istediklerinizin daha fazla farkına varmaktır.							
3. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, kendi mesleğinize ilişkin anlayışınızın sürekli olarak derinleşmesidir.							
4. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, daha iyi öğretebilmek için ihtiyaç duyduğunuz, farklı türlerdeki bilgilerin bütünleştirilmesini gitgide-aşama aşama öğrenmektir.							
5. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, konu alanını her seferinde daha iyi anlamayı öğrenmektir.							
6. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, çalışma şekilleri ve öğretim yöntemleri hakkında giderek daha fazla bilmektir.							
7. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, gitgide mesleğin farklı yönlerini anlamaktır.							
8. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, öğrencileri gitgide daha iyi tanımaktır.							
9. Bazı insanların öğretmenlik için yetenekli olduğunu, bazı insanlarda ise bu yeteneğin bulunmadığını düşünürüm.							
10. Bence, öğretmen adaylarındaki mesleğe olan yeteneği tanıyabilirsin.							
11. Öğretme becerilerimi geliştirebilirim ancak öğretmenlik mesleğine olan yatkınlığımı değiştiremem.							
12. Yetenekli öğretmen adayları daha erken iyi öğretecektir.							
13. Herkeste bir miktar öğretme yeteneği bulunur ve bence, bunu değiştirmek için yapabileceğiniz çok az şey vardır.							
14. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, sınıftaki düzeni koruyarak başlar.							
15. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, öğretmenlikle ilgili her türlü rutini otomatik olarak uygulamayı öğrenmektir.							
16. Bence öğretmeyi öğrenmek, deneyim kazandıkça öğretim sırasında daha rutin bir şekilde karar verebilmektir.							

MENTÖRLÜK MOTİVASYON ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda mentor öğretmenlerin mentor olmadaki motivasyonlarını içeren, “Neden öğretmen adaylarına mentörlük yapıyorum?” sorusuna cevap olabilecek bir takım ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadelere katılıp katılmadığınızı (1) Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum, (2) Katılmıyorum, (3) Kısmen Katılmıyorum, (4) Kararsızım, (5) Kısmen Katılıyorum, (6) Katılıyorum, (7) Kesinlikle Katılıyorum cevaplarından bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

Neden öğretmen adaylarına mentörlük yapıyorum?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Alandaki güncel gelişmelerden haberdar olmak için.							
2. Branşımın iyi eğitilmiş ve yetkin öğretmenler tarafından öğretildiğinden emin olmak için.							
3. Çünkü gelecekte eğitimde yeni insanlara ihtiyaç olduğu için.							
4. Çünkü mentörlüğün zorlayıcı bir görev olduğunu düşünüyorum.							
5. Çünkü bir öğretmen olarak işime dair anlayışımı derinleştiriyor.							
6. Öğretmen adaylarına, öğretmen eğitiminden mesleğe geçişi kolaylaştırmak için.							
7. Çünkü beni kendi eğitim vizyonum hakkında düşünmekte devam etmeye zorluyor.							
8. Bilgi ve tecrübelerimi aktarmak için.							
9. Çünkü kendi öğretim performansına eleştirel bakmaya devam etmemi sağlıyor.							
10. Çünkü, öğretmen adaylarının okulda mentor öğretmen rehberliğinde tecrübe edinme hakkı olduğunu düşünüyorum							
11. Çünkü öğretmen adaylarıyla çalışmayı seviyorum.							
12. Çünkü işimde çeşitlilik sağlıyor.							
13. Çünkü kendi öğretimim için bana yeni fikirler ve öneriler sunuyor.							
14. Çünkü uygulama, öğretmenliği öğrenmek için en iyi yerdir.							
15. Öğretmenlik mesleğine dair şevkimi aktarmak için.							
16. Öğretmen adaylarına, öğretmen olmanın güzelliğini göstermek için.							
17. Bu mesleğe yeni başlayanların mesleği bırakmasını önlemek için							
18. Öğretmen adaylarına kendilerini kanıtlamaları için bir şans vermek için.							
19. Çünkü öğretmen adaylarına eğitim vizyonumu aktarmak isterim.							