THE PERCEIVED VALUE OF MENTORING BY BEGINNING USARF INSTRUCTORS WITH FORMAL, INFORMAL, AND NO MENTORS

by

Frederick K. Read

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Adult and Continuing Education

APPROVED:

_____
A.K. Wiswell, Chairman

H.W. Stubblefield	R.L. McKeen
G. Belli	M. Stout

June, 1997
Falls Church, Virginia

Key Words: Mentoring, Mentors, Induction

THE PERCEIVED VALUE OF MENTORING BY BEGINNING USARF INSTRUCTORS WITH FORMAL, INFORMAL, AND NO MENTORS

by

FREDERICK K. READ

A.K. WISWELL, CHAIRMAN

ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATIONLEARNING

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to determine the value, if any, of a mentoring program for beginning U.S. Army Reserve Forces School instructors, specifically: how mentored and unmentored beginning instructors differ in their perception of a mentorship program, how do mentors improve, if at all, the beginner's instructional practice, how mentors assist the beginner's understanding of the school's operating procedures, and how formally and informally mentored instructors differ in their perception of a mentorship program. Army Reserve instructors teaching the Command and General Staff Course (CGSOC) and the Combined Arms Services Staff Course (CAS3), were the subjects for this study. The total population of 267 instructors was surveyed by questionnaire, 217 (81.3%) usable responses were received. ANOVA and *t*-test statistic calculations showed a significant difference between the mean responses of instructors with a formal mentor and those with an informal or no mentor.

Instructors with formal mentors strongly agree that mentorship is beneficial to beginners and should be part of an induction program. Formal mentors helped improve practice through observation, feedback, counseling, and direct assistance. Instructors with formal mentors state they were provided an orientation into administrative, logistical, and standard operating procedures.

Finally, the formally mentored group report they were helped to become better instructors, guided in professional development, given a formal assessment of their instructional abilities, and provided materials to improve practice and maintain competence. The data appear to suggest that a formal mentorship program produces a more prepared beginning instructor.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Page No.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1992, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army directed the Army's Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) to develop a "Total Army School System" (TASS) (1995). Training and Doctrine Command then developed the following mission statement: "establish a cohesive and efficient Total Army School System of fully accredited and integrated Active and Reserve components schools that provides standard individual training for all soldiers " (p. iv).

A cornerstone of the Total Army School System (1995) is the mandated certification of instructors. The Army defines certification as " qualification to teach based on training and demonstrated proficiency both in teaching techniques and in subject matter" (p. B-2-B-1).

U.S. Army Reserve Forces Schools (USARF), and their instructors, are especially affected by this policy change. USARF Schools are normally staffed by Reserve Component soldiers (instructors), also known as citizen-soldiers, who by their very nature perform their duties on a part-time basis. Other Reserve Component soldiers (students) are these schools' usual consumers, and because the Army demands that all soldiers be trained to the same standard, instructor competence is paramount. It is possible that certification alone may not prepare USARF School instructors to bridge the gap between the learning phase and the practice application phase.

Background of The Problem

The director of the Army's certification program, Dr. R. Spangenberg (personal communication, March 14, 1995) stated, "the aim of instructor certification is to achieve one standard." He further stated, "the goal is for a standard within 'the delivery of instruction,' not the content or subject matter area." Gilley and Eggland (1989) stated that instructor certification is actually a licensing mechanism regulated by a political body. Further, the authors stated that certification is seen as an attempt to improve and standardize the credentialing process.

The certification program as currently promulgated by the Army addresses neither an instructor induction (orientation) program nor professional development. Gilley and Eggland (1989) say that one specific approach, namely, mentoring, is designed to incorporate both of the afore-mentioned areas. A mentoring program's primary purpose is to provide the beginner an orientation into the organization's inner network. In addition, a mentoring program can assist the newcomer in career advancement. A mentoring program provides the newcomer with an assessment of his or her strengths and weaknesses.

Anderson and Shannon (as cited by DeBolt, 1992) have written the seminal literature on mentoring. Distilled to its essence, Anderson and Shannon say a mentor's purpose is to nurture the beginning instructor through the first year of teaching, and to guide him/her in personal and professional development (p. 42).

Statement of The Problem

As currently constructed, the requirements to be a qualified instructor in the Army's concept is guided strictly by the completion of a certification process. This assumes that once an instructor has successfully passed the certification hurdle he/she possesses all the necessary attributes to be a competent instructor. Becoming certified, then, in the Army's vision is the last step in attaining qualified instructor status. This conclusion assumes that there is no gap between what is learned during the certification process and the practice of instructing.

This concept or belief, however, is contrary to the recommendations in Army publications governing instructor qualifications. Several of these publications state that newly assigned instructors (beginners) must serve an apprenticeship or internship prior to assuming full-time instructor duties. In addition, the Army's Combined Arms Services Course (CAS3) mandates that beginning instructors have a mentor assigned to them during their initial assignment.

The problem, therefore, is that certification alone may not achieve the Army's goal of instructor standardization. Stated another way, the problem is: Will the Army's goal of reaching instructor standardization be realized by the instructor certification process, or are additional interventions needed?

The Army's certification process consists of the instructor being a graduate of the course he/she is to teach and of the Instructor Training Course (ITC). The ITC is designed to ensure that the instructor is versed in the methods and delivery of instruction. The ITC, however, does not prepare the instructor for problems he/she may encounter, and it covers neither the quality of instruction nor the ways to improve technique. It is possible, that without a program designed to assist the beginner from learner to practitioner that certification alone will not achieve the Army's stated goal of instructor standardization.

Purpose of The Study

The purpose was to determine the value that mentoring as a type of induction has in assisting the beginning instructor. Specifically, this will focused on one type of induction: mentorship. It is acknowledged that certification prepares an instructor in both subject matter and instructional techniques. Mentorship, however, is seen by many education authors as the method of choice to inculcate the beginning instructor in the

teaching profession and at the same time to orient and socialize the beginner into the inner workings of the organization. The purpose of this study, then, was to find out if the mentored beginning instructor differs from the unmentored and how the mentor guides the protege in his/her professional development.

Rationale

The rationale for this study was to find out if a mentoring program is of value for beginning U.S. Army Reserve Forces schools instructors. Specifically, the study attempted to discover if mentors aid beginners to improve practice, provide an orientation to the standard operating procedures, and whether formal or informal mentoring is best.

Research Questions

The following are the research questions that I attempted to answer:

1. How do mentored and unmentored beginning instructors differ in their perception of a mentorship program?
2. How do the mentors improve, if at all, the beginner's instructional practice?
3. How do mentors assist, if at all, the beginner's understanding of the school's operating procedures?
4. How do formally and informally mentored instructors differ in their perception of the mentorship program?

Significance

This study was important because one of the Army's Training and Doctrine Command proponent school bases not only its development of instructors on the principles of mentorship, but uses the same techniques for students as well. No one within the Army, however, has studied the value of mentorship programs and if they can assist in bridging the gap between knowledge learned and applying the learning in instructional technique(s).

A U.S. Army publication, U.S. Army Reserve Forces Schools (1992), recommends that new instructors serve an apprenticeship prior to assuming full time instructional duty. In addition, Army Reserve Forces school commandants are charged with conducting "periodic and comprehensive instructor evaluations coupled with effective remedial programs." (p. 8) Determining the results of this recommendation have never been accomplished.

Furthermore, determining that a mentorship program is of value to beginning instructors may have added benefits for the Army. A mentorship program for beginning instructors, if determined to have value, could be adopted Army wide at low cost, and may alleviate additional evaluations, reviews, and remediation programs.

Definition of Terms

Apprenticeship - Period of time in which a novice learns a trade or skill from an experienced master.

Certification - A licensing mechanism regulated by a political body attesting that an individual has fulfilled specified requirements and may practice in a field.

Formal Mentoring Program - Process in which a veteran teacher is assigned, as an additional duty, to assist a beginner during the induction period. The mentor may be required to provide reports or an assessment of the protege's abilities.

Induction - The process of admitting or introducing an individual as a member of a distinct entity. An initiation process or rite.

Informal Mentoring Program - Similar to the formal program, except the veteran teacher volunteers to serve as a mentor. No reports or assessments are required.

Internship - Period of training, typically of an advanced student, during which the individual learns by practical experience under supervision.

Mentor - A trusted counselor or guide.

Mentoring - The induction of newcomers to the inner network of the organization. Provides an assessment, normally non supervisory, of the strengths and weaknesses of newcomers, and the relationship serves as a sounding board for both the mentor and his/her protege.

Proponent School - An Army school charged with developing curricula for soldiers pursuing a technical specialty, additional skill, and/or professional development education. Also charged with the certification requirements for instructors teaching its curricula.

US Army Reserve Forces Schools - Schools accredited to teach proponent approved courses of instruction to soldiers of the Reserve Components of the Army. Typically, soldiers who attend and instruct at these schools are not active duty soldiers.

US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) - Department of the Army command responsible for the regulations and policies governing individual training (institutional) and education.

Assumptions and Limitations

Because the study focused on the perceived value of mentoring for beginning USARF instructors, the following assumptions and limitations were set:

All survey participants are certified instructors and are members of the U.S. Army Reserve.

The study was limited to USARF instructors teaching either CGSOC or CAS3.

The study was also limited by the research questions which were designed to gauge the value of mentoring, if any, for beginning USARF instructors.

These limitations allowed the study to be conducted using a defined population that had varying types of mentoring relationships. In addition, limiting the study permitted the researcher to use instructors who met the Army's criteria for certification. Without these limitations the results of the study could have been affected.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section presents a review of the literature on instructor (teacher) certification, both favorable and not, and on programs beyond certification designed to improve practice and competence. It also reviews the literature on teacher induction programs, in particular: mentorship. A review of the literature on certification is necessary because the Army determined that instructor certification is "the method" by which instructor performance will be improved and become standardized.

Pro Certification

Darling-Hammond (1988) says that creating professional teachers (instructors), through certification, increases the probability that all students will be better educated. Professionalism, she concludes, seeks to increase teachers' responsibility by investing in additional teacher preparation courses.

Kaplan (1994) states that teacher certification is both necessary and warranted. He says it is higher education which must play a pivotal role in the teacher certification process. In addition, it is imperative that everyone assist and support those who educate future teachers. He concludes that it is the teacher-educators who must respond and take the lead in the certification process.

In an article advocating national certification standards, Shapiro (1994) states that current certification focuses on entry level requirements. She believes that certification should be developed by teachers for teachers. The type of certification she is promoting zeroes in on performance, not just on a paper and pencil exercise, which she says is little more than a mark on the wall. In conclusion, Shapiro recommends this kind of certification be attainable only after a specified number of years of teaching experience.

Sparks (1994) interviewed James Smith, senior vice president of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, regarding teacher certification. Smith said that teachers will gain a sense of accomplishment and achievement from completing the certification process. In addition, Smith says, teachers receive special recognition in attaining certified status, especially from their peers.

Other writers, while espousing certification as a means to better teaching practice and attain standards improvement, believe additional methods and programs are needed to enhance teaching performance and teachers' professionalism. These authors believe that focusing only on the certification aspect does not address the broad spectrum of teacher (instructor) standards.

Additional Needs Beyond Certification

Shulman (1987) states that education reform calls for several things to happen. First, beginning teachers need to be socialized into practice by serving extensive periods as a teaching intern. Second, standard certification procedures are necessary.

King (1994) concludes that the certification process implies a certain mastery of skills within a subject area and fosters closure. He believes the current process inhibits continual teacher as learner progression and stunts self-development. Teacher self-development, King says, must be encouraged.

Bullough and Gitlin (1994) also believe too much emphasis is placed on accumulating enough credits to gain certification. Teaching is the development of a relationship, a way of being with and relating to students, not just the ability to master a prescribed regimen of tasks and skills. They enlarge upon this statement by referring to Clark. Clark (as cited in Bullough & Gitlin, 1994) said "teacher education should start with who the prospective teacher is, what he/she dreams of being as a teacher, and then assist them in exploring the personal beliefs he/she brings to teaching." (p. 78)

In their article on professional development, Bullough and Stokes (1994) say that not enough attention is paid to instructor education. Bullough, Knowles, and Crow (as cited in Bullough & Stokes, 1994) stated that driven by influences outside the education field," many programs for teacher education pay scant service to instructor development issues." (p. 198) Kagan (as cited in Bullough & Stokes, 1994) states that "little effort is made to bring the concept of self into instructor development," because of this the beginner's ideals become inflexible. (p. 198)

Bullough and Stokes (1994) believe more attention must be paid to beginning instructor development, and not to instructor evaluation. They conclude that the instructor needs to be more than just the one who knows.

Wise (1994 Winter) states the completion of an approved program of studies within the certification process is only a partial indicator of competency. He says the current programs coupled with other assessments are needed to measure the desired knowledge and skills. He concludes, stating that other professions meet certification requirements by, among other things, completing supervised internships before assuming private practice.

Wise (1994 June) in an article for The American School Board Journal calls for tougher certification standards. Further, he

tells his audience that public opinion says it is time for new policies and directions in teacher education and preparation. He envisions a three-tiered level of professional teachers. Prior to reaching the board certified level, teachers would enter a rigorous induction program which includes an internship. He sees the keys to the success of his proposal as completion of teacher preparation programs, a supervised teaching internship, and certification by assessment.

Pultorak's (1994) article on teacher assessment reports on a new approach to teacher certification. Specifically, this approach calls for teaching performance evaluations to be conducted at the new teacher's academic environs. Teachers are observed by trained assessors on the effectiveness of their instruction. Further, he cites an Educational Testing Service (1986) report which stated, "core battery tests measure only academic knowledge and skill, they are not designed as predictors of teaching success." (p. 70)

Pultorak (1994) concludes that if these assessment criteria are proven valid, and if the difference between successful and unsuccessful teacher candidates can be identified, then this new approach in teacher certification procedures will improve the quality of teachers.

Beginning Teacher Assistance Programs

Still, other education writers zero in on the induction process for beginning teachers as the method to take them from the knowledge gained as an undergraduate education student to the practical application of transmitting the learned knowledge. These authors argue that beginners need more than the traditional "sink-or-swim" attitude to inculcate them into the teaching profession.

Wendy Koop (1994), President of Teach for America, says a rigorous selection process is required in the recruitment of new instructors. This enables the recruiter to gain a holistic view of the prospective teacher. In addition, she espouses a vigorous professional development program that is driven by the teacher as learner concept. Here the learner (teacher) takes responsibility for his/her development in specified areas of concentration. Furthermore, she states the certification process appears to have little correlation with the ability to teach. Certification, she continues, should come only after a teacher's performance consistently demonstrates desired levels of competence.

Koop (1994) calls for extensive guidance of beginning teachers from experienced educators (mentors) and ample opportunities for their interaction. Further, to build an effective instructor force, development and support of the

beginners must be undertaken. She acknowledges this is radical thinking, but believes it is the future.

McKibben and Ray (1994) in their article on alternative certification make a strong case for beginning teacher development. They believe that new teacher effectiveness, job satisfaction, and the tendency to remain a teacher is directly related to the amount of time spent with trained and experienced teachers (mentors).

Neuman (1994) cites several studies that indicate student achievement is directly attributed to teachers who are "fully" certified (e.g., Gomez and Grobe, 1990, and Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik, 1985). Later in his article, the author references interviews from teachers who were not traditional education students, that is, they did not major in education. Many of the problems these teachers related, such as, lack of time with a mentor, absence of formal instruction, and little or no guidance, could have been solved by an aggressive induction program which includes mentoring.

In reporting on Houston's alternative credentialing program, Stafford and Barrow (1994) state the program has four essentials. They are: screening, training, supervision, and support. Two of the essentials are accomplished through a mentorship program. Mentors are used to both supervise and support the beginning alternative teacher. The authors relate that each of the four components are interconnected, if any are weak the program cannot succeed.

Knauth (1994), in reporting on Chicago's alternative teacher program, is a strong advocate of mentoring. Beginning alternative teachers work as full-time interns under the supervision of an experienced teacher/mentor. It is the teacher's (mentor's) responsibility to direct, guide, support, and orient the beginning teacher to the school and its policies.

Howey and Zimpher (1994), in their article on alternative or "nontraditional" teachers, decry the notion that experience alone makes the best teacher. Alternative programming (credentialing), however, can produce effective teachers by improving pre-service preparation. Although not using the term, the authors endorse the mentoring concept. They state that beginners do not learn to teach by observing another experienced teacher or by practice alone. Beginners learn by engaging in a constructive dialogue with a veteran teacher about how, where, when, what, and why tasks are accomplished and their consequences.

Tyson (1994) agrees with the position of Howey and Zimpher. He says the folk notion that anyone can teach is firmly ingrained in the licensing system in the United States. There appears to be no goal for the formation of the novice teacher, and he states it seems that the profession has no guidelines for the treatment of beginning teachers.

Willis (1994) is director of corporate education affairs for the BellSouth Foundation which supports teacher preparation and recruitment programs. She also espouses some of the concepts of mentoring without using the term. She believes that teachers must coach and support each other, (a kind of mentorship). She reports on a school system grant recipient that built its professional development program in a collegial atmosphere. Here, teachers demonstrated methods of teaching, shared observations, and participated in regular critique exercises. Class schedules were adjusted to give teachers time to observe the demonstrations. The objective of the program was to share ideas, experiences, techniques, and to foster teaching competency, not to evaluate or report behavior.

Talbert, Camp, and Heath-Camp (1992) zero in on the induction process as being critical for beginning teachers. They say this process includes all the steps necessary to "socialize" the new teacher into the profession. That is, induction transitions the prospective teacher from novice to professional. Furthermore, induction is not a one time encounter, but typically lasts several years.

Talbert, Camp, and Heath-Camp (1992) list four specific induction models: mentoring, fifth-year programs, alternative certification, and professional development models. Significantly, each of these models has mentoring as a "key" component, and much of the current research on induction centers on mentoring.

Talbert, Camp, and Heath-Camp (1992) caution, however, that mentoring programs often fail to provide adequate training for mentors. They are not suggesting that mentoring or induction programs be eliminated, rather induction programs need to be general in nature. This allows each mentor to tailor the program so the specific needs of each new teacher can be achieved.

Van Ast (1992) agrees with Knauth, and Talbert, Camp and Heath-Camp. In a paper delivered to the American Vocational Association in St. Louis, Missouri, he advocated a mentor-induction program. This is especially critical for those entering the teaching arena without the normal education back-ground. He sees the induction process as focusing on educational experiences, personal support, and on-going feedback. The mentor he believes must be: competent, supportive, able to provide perspective, and above all must be a role model.

Lanier and Little (1986) report that induction programs for beginning teachers are a rarity. For most beginners the on-the-job learning experience has been an un-programmed, un-guided trial and error process. In addition, beginners are expected to assume a "full load" from day one. The authors state that researchers (e.g., McDonald, 1980; Zeichner, 1980) have looked

for induction programs designed to provide assistance for beginners, but have been disappointed with their findings.

Lanier and Little (1986), report that other researchers (e.g., Little, 1981) state that mentoring for beginning teachers has not been the norm. The authors argue that mentors can change the "trial and error" experience by assisting the beginner in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for successful teaching. Mentors help the beginner master complex tasks, assume additional responsibilities and guide their professional development. More important, mentors, because of their status within the teaching profession, provide the orientation into the institution's social fabric.

What is A Mentor?

Previously referenced authors have stated that education has no defined goals for beginning teachers, and others have called for specialized programs to transition the beginner from learned knowledge to practical application. Still others have specifically called for beginning teacher induction programs that feature mentoring as the key element. We therefore need to examine what a "mentor" is, what induction programs are designed to accomplish, and what a mentor's role in the induction process is. In addition, we need to examine the pluses and minuses of mentoring programs.

Zey (1984) describes a mentor as a person who oversees the career and development of another, usually junior, through teaching, counseling, supporting, protecting, and at times promoting or sponsoring. He says that mentoring actually has a hierarchy of tasks. First is teaching, in this phase the "novice" receives skill training, in-depth organizational orientation, and lessons on employee decorum. The next phase is counseling/supporting, here the mentor exhorts the novice to excel on the job, and provides family (outside the work place) guidance.

Zey (1984) says that organizational intervention is the next unit in the hierarchy. In this phase the mentor enhances the novice's reputation and standing within the organization. The last step is sponsoring, here the mentor actually promotes the novice for advancement within the organization.

Zey (1984) states the major purposes for having a mentorship program is that it can and does benefit the organization. First, it helps to integrate the newcomer into the organization, as it fosters a sense of inclusion. Second, turnover is reduced because the new employee receives positive encouragement, and has developed a sense of loyalty to the mentor and hence to the organization. Third, because of the mentor's direct involvement in helping to shape and hone the novice's skills, efficiency is increased. Last, professional growth is nurtured because of the

mentor's transferring his/her skills and knowledge to the novice. This helps reduce haphazard learning.

Zey's (1984) " purposes" are based on research from middle and senior managers in a wide variety of businesses. His research was conducted over a two period, and included interviews with more than 100 managers. He concluded that mentoring harmonizes entry into the organization, and assists the protege in learning the organization's structure and culture. In addition, he says that the by products of a mentoring program are increased productivity, turnover reduction, and a strengthening of the organization's culture.

Daloz (1986) says for the novice, a mentor is the key to unlocking the most troubling questions. Mentors are guides and trusted professionals who light the way ahead, warn of lurking dangers, interpret arcane things, and show their charges what must be learned. By being who and what they are, mentors offer the novice a road map for success.

Galvez-Hjornevik (1986) says the term mentor derives from Homer's Odyssey and denotes a "trusted guide and counsellor", and depicts the mentor/novice relationship as deep and meaningful. The author continues, saying the vital role given to the mentor in the induction process requires greater understanding of the relationship's potential and the resulting impact on the education and professional development of the beginning teacher.

Parkay (1988) states that a mentor/protege relationship is complex, evolves over time, and cannot be precisely defined. He does, however, provide what he terms as a working definition. A mentor provides "in-depth" one-on-one instruction designed to induct a protege into a special type of behavior. The type of behavior necessary to be successful.

Parkay (1988) says this relationship is more than just providing formal instruction. The mentor provides not only the requisite knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the profession, but demonstrates the how, when, where, and the way these gained traits are put into practice. In sum, the mentor acclimatizes the protege into the profession.

Gehrke (1988) states that, first and foremost, mentors are teachers. Mentors are, however, more than just teachers. A mentor acts as coach, role model, developer, gate keeper, protector, sponsor, and successful leader. For a mentor to demonstrate these attributes he/she must be more mature, have a higher standing, and be more experienced. In other words, a mentor cannot be an equal. To make the relationship work, there must be mutual involvement and total commitment by both the mentor and the protege.

Kay (1990) defines a mentor as one who assists a protege by developing a total relationship. A relationship which is designed to assist the protege in learning the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of self confidence and competency. In addition, the author says the mentor must bring together the resources necessary to affect the development of the protege from entry level status to seasoned practitioner. Furthermore, for the mentor/protege relationship to be successful each must participate equally. A mentor cannot impose his/her ideas on an unwilling protege. This definition, the author believes, is functional, not the typical one-on-one relationship. It allows many individuals/groups to assist in the protege's development.

The author does not discourage the "normal" one-to-one mentor/protege relationship, but is clearly against what he refers to as typical mentoring of "superior to subordinate." This type of relationship is rife with many problems, which violate the mutual concept of his definition.

The preceding authors depict what a mentor is and does. What are teacher induction programs, are they necessary, do we need them, what are they designed to help accomplish, and why mentors? The following authors help provide both the rationale for and the necessity of these programs.

Beginning Teacher Induction Programs

Fox and Singletary (1986) state that induction programs are frequently noted as a method of improving the quality of beginning teachers. Teacher education programs, the authors say, do not fully prepare beginners for the changes in responsibility, time commitment, and the isolation that occurs during the transition from student to teacher. This results, some studies (e.g., Cruickshank, 1981; Applegate, Flora, Johnston, Lasley, Mager, Newman, and Ryan, 1977) found, from university teacher education programs not focusing on the skills that must be learned in the transition from pupil to practitioner. Other studies (e.g., Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik, 1985) found that unless teacher educators can reconcile the concerns beginners have, much of what they learn during pre-service will seem meaningless.

Teacher induction programs can overcome beginners' fears and concerns. Johnston (as cited by Fox & Singletary, 1986) says that teacher induction programs should focus on: 1) developing additional knowledge and skills, 2) developing improved instructional performance, 3) recognizing and coping with isolation, and 4) socializing into the profession and the institution.

Fox and Singletary (1986) conclude that teaching skill, knowledge, and subject matter expertise are fundamental to teaching, but they do not guarantee success. The novice teacher

needs to learn how to analyze, reflect, and solve problems. A properly structured induction program will assist the novice in attaining these "new" skills and smooth the transition from "amateur" to professional.

Huling-Austin (1986) lists several goals that an instructor induction program should attempt to achieve. She cautions that these goals are not the only ones which induction programs might espouse, rather there are general in nature and are typically included in most programs. They are: 1) to improve teaching performance, 2) to increase the retention of promising teachers, 3) to promote professional and personal well being, and 4) to satisfy mandated requirements.

Huling-Austin (1986) says it is during induction when most beginners come to grips with the reality of the "classroom" as a different world. Because the beginner is expected to undertake the same load as the seasoned veteran, it is critical that his/her personal and professional needs be addressed. Therefore, the beginner must be given the institution's basic information to foster adequate functioning and a sense of belonging. The author states this is not to intimate that poor practice should not be cited and corrected, rather it is to suggest that initial and continued support be aimed at improving practice and providing for professional growth.

Huling-Austin (1986) cautions that induction programs cannot overcome major school problems, such as scheduling, and induction programs cannot correct systemic problems. Finally, she cautions that induction cannot be, or be perceived as a "feel-good" program. Induction's emphasis must focus on both instructor practice and professional growth.

Lasley (1986) states that new teacher induction programs make sense, good sense. He cautions, however, that there should be no head long rush to adopt new teacher induction programs as a cure all for the beginner's real or perceived problems. He says, currently there is not enough data on the subject, and programs should not be implemented without the necessary research and development. He believes that slowing the pace will alleviate potential problems with new teacher induction programs.

Burke (1987) sees teacher development as being shaped and defined by three distinct but related functions. These functions are: induction, renewal, and redirection. The author believes that the purpose of induction is often misunderstood. To many educators induction is a brief period, sometimes as short as one day, in which the beginner is given an orientation into "this is how we do things around here." Further he states that induction should not be limited to a brief description of position responsibility, but must include information about the aspects of different teaching assignments, changes in curriculum, teacher responsibilities, use of instructional materials, and changes to school policies and procedures.

When viewed in this context, the author argues, induction is not just a one time event but a lengthy and necessary process for beginners. Furthermore, the author says, induction is essential to teacher development.

Ishler and Kester (1987) make the following points. First, beginning teachers have different needs than veterans, therefore specialized support is necessary. Second, certification should be linked to the completion of a beginning teacher induction program, not granted prior.

Huling-Austin (1987) states that the bottom line aims of induction programs are professional development of the new instructor and the retention of promising beginners. New teacher induction programs, she argues, must be seen as methods to improve the beginner's morale and dissuade drop-out.

Odell (1987) agrees with Huling Austin in principle, but makes somewhat different points. She says the rationale for beginning instructor induction programs is to address the personal and professional issues of the beginner. Furthermore, induction programs must provide support that nurtures, fosters a sense of inclusion, and aids the beginner's professional growth and competence.

Odell (1989) expands on the previous points. She says that programs designed to assist beginning teachers rests on several assumptions. First, although beginners are deep in subject matter content and theory, they don't know how to translate these necessary teaching attributes into practical application. Second, providing support to beginning teachers will improve their technical competence. Third, and perhaps most important, providing support to beginning teachers makes good sense.

Reinhartz (1989) sees effective instruction and delivering quality instruction as goals of professional growth. It is unrealistic to expect the beginner to have the same proficiency as the veteran. New teacher induction, the author states, is the link between entry level and achieving these goals. Induction then, she concludes, should be evolutionary, thorough, and required for beginners.

Huling-Austin (1989) says the sequence of the beginning teacher moving from entry level to seasoned practitioner is different and more unique than any other profession. On the very first day, the beginning teacher realizes that he/she has the same overall responsibilities and duties as the veteran. It is a situation, the author says, that happens only in the teaching profession. This "baptism of fire" does not allow the beginner to gradually learn the practical intricacies necessary for success.

Huling-Austin (1989) says since the beginner does not have time to grow into the job, this becomes the basis for instituting beginning teacher induction programs. Further, she argues, educators have the duty to properly socialize and assist the beginning teacher. Not providing these basic needs of beginners is, she claims, irresponsible.

Darling-Hammond (1990) adds agreement. Beginning teacher induction is necessary, she says, for two reasons. First, teaching is a complex task that cannot be adequately learned in the classroom environment. Second, because classroom instruction is for the learning and growth of students, beginning teachers should not be simultaneously teaching and learning on the job without support of experienced mentors. She concludes that induction programs for beginners eliminates the sink-or-swim syndrome which many new teachers face.

Furthering the case for new teacher induction programs is Hawley's (1990) article. He says that since the early 1980s most states have attempted to better their schools by changing the standards for teacher education. Although numerous school improvement prescriptions have been considered and/or implemented, six types of "regulations" have caught the attention of state boards of education. Among these six is a type of induction program for beginners designed to assure the new teacher can put into practice the lessons learned from university based education courses.

Hawley (1990) says that induction programs are presumed to support beginners, assist in improving teaching effectiveness, and preclude or help reduce drop-out. He cautions, however, that while some preliminary research data appear to support the effectiveness of induction programs, few states have studied induction programs and/or reported their findings.

Clark and McNergney (1990) also report that state education boards are taking a pro-active stance regarding new teacher education. States have taken direct involvement in beginning teacher education after learning how daunting and arduous the beginner's tasks are. To support their statement, the authors refer to Darling-Hammond and Berry's (1988) work.

Darling-Hammond and Berry (as cited in Clark and McNergney, (1990) noted "officials" charged with overseeing education quality have become appalled at the negative effects of the traditional "sink-or-swim" mentality surrounding new teacher induction. These officials concluded that induction programs that do not provide adequate support for beginning teachers leads them to adopt poor practice techniques and causes high drop-out rates.

Darling-Hammond (1992) says there are many new teacher education proposals that seek to bridge the gap between what was learned in university teacher preparation courses and what is put into practice. These proposals are focusing attention on the

initial teacher induction period, and are based on the assumption that the induction period is an important learning time.

Darling-Hammond (1992) says induction is the time when new teachers learn how to transfer knowledge and theory to practice. This transfer cannot be learned in the university classroom alone, and school systems need a well developed induction program to assist the beginner with this transfer, without which the beginner's initial experience will be unsatisfactory. She concludes, that a sound teacher induction program is essential to the beginner's success.

Mager (1992) states that teacher induction is not a new term, but that it has taken on new meaning. Instead of being thought of as informal and somewhat ceremonial in nature, it is now regarded as a programmed initiation process for the prospective career teacher.

Mager (1992) cites Huling-Austin's (1989) goals as those an induction should attempt to achieve. They are, 1) to improve the practice of teaching, 2) to increase the retention of promising teachers, 3) to promote professional and personal well-being, 4) to satisfy mandated requirements and, 5) to transmit the school system's culture. Adoption of an induction program centered on these goals, the author states, is essential for the new instructor's passage from novice to professional.

Finally, Odell and Ferraro (1992) state there has been a transition in terms concerning beginning teacher programs. In the 1980s most of these programs were referred to as teacher induction, whereas the new 1990s buzz term is "mentor-teacher." Whatever the program is called, however, its principal aims are to promote professional growth and smooth the transformation from student teacher/learner to primary classroom instructor.

The authors reported on the Albuquerque Public School's induction program success. Beginning teachers, approximately 130 per year, were administered a questionnaire at the end of each academic year from 1985-89, and asked to rate their induction experience. Scores were measured on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being highest. The findings depict mean responses to each item across the study's five year time span:

1.	Induction was a positive experience	= 4.4
2.	Induction influenced professional development	= 4.4
3.	Mentors were available when needed	= 4.8
4.	Mentors were helpful	= 4.4
5.	Mentors were supportive	= 4.8
6.	Mentors offered feedback	= 4.3

From the results of this study and those of Odell (as cited in Odell & Ferraro, 1992) and of Odell, Loughlin, & Ferraro (as cited in Odell & Ferraro, 1992), the authors conclude that

beginners who participate in an induction program focus more on instructional issues than those not receiving induction support.

Why Use A Mentor?

Johnston (1985) describes an additional form of induction which he calls "job-embedded." Job-embedded support is the type that takes place in the work environment and occurs during the normal school day. Mentoring is among the better known of job-embedded support type induction. He says that schools must make use of the available literature and research on induction programs prior to implementation. The literature indicates that it is helpful for beginners to receive assistance, support, and guidance from mentor teachers, also programs work best when the mentor has no evaluation duties.

Ryan (1986) says beginning teachers are beset with problems, some known and others a result of either the beginner's characteristics or the school environment. The author offers ten self-help tips to assist the novice in coping with the trials and tribulations of being a beginning teacher. One of the tips is to "find a mentor." He suggests finding an older experienced teacher who: is willing to help, can act as a guide, can be a resource, and trusted confidant.

Ryan (1986) says that many experienced teachers are looking for new challenges and welcome the opportunity to mentor a beginner. He cautions, however, that selection of a mentor must be done with great care. The one thing worse than having no mentor is having one who is of little help.

Varah, Theune, and Parker (1986) state that the mentor is the key in any induction program. Most important, however, the mentor should not be appointed, as an additional duty, but should be a volunteer. A mentor, the authors state, must possess at least two qualifications: 1) he/she must be dedicated to teaching and, 2) be willing to include the novice as part of his/her tasks.

Varah, Theune, and Parker (1986) state the major purposes of a mentor's role in new teacher induction is to promote the novice's confidence in his/her teaching abilities, and to eliminate the beginner's perception of isolation. In addition, the mentor assists the beginner in understanding the nature of learners, and in knowing the curriculum.

To support their statements, Varah, Theune, and Parker (1986) report on their research of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Teacher Induction Program for the 1984-85 academic year. The study included twelve inductees and a control group of twelve randomly selected teachers not in an induction program. The study's objectives were to describe and evaluate: 1) the mentor/inductee development program and, 2) the teacher induction

program designed to provide assistance and support to beginners. Research findings were: 1) problems experienced by both groups were similar, however, inductees had less difficulty motivating students, 2) inductees describe themselves in concrete teaching terms, whereas control subjects used attributions to describe their experiences and, 3) observation and feedback from mentors is helpful and would be welcomed by most beginners. In addition, administrators were surveyed to determine their perceptions of program. Administrators indicated: 1) fewer problems with the inductees as opposed to the control group and, 2) the close relationship between the mentor and the inductee was the primary reason for fewer problems.

Huffman and Leak (1986) state that a beginner is many times expected to perform the same tasks and duties as the seasoned veteran, but without orientation or guidelines. Many education systems in the United States have begun induction programs aimed at easing the beginner's entry into the teaching profession. Of particular interest is the role mentors play in these programs.

To ascertain the effectiveness of mentors in an induction program, Huffman and Leak (1986) conducted an evaluation of the beginning teacher program of a large Southeastern U.S. city school system. The system employs approximately 4,000 teachers and hires about 300 new teachers per school year. All new teachers were invited to attend a year end forum to assess the beginning teacher program, and the mentor's role. Participation was voluntary, 108 of the new teachers attended.

The new teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire about the mentor's role in the beginning teacher program. Findings: In response to an open ended question asking if having a mentor was beneficial, 96% said the mentor was an important part of the program. Specific comments about mentors were very positive. Respondents said the mentor provided support, encouragement, reinforcement, guidance, and even gave a "shoulder to cry on."

Participants were asked to rate which mentor functions were the most beneficial: 1) written observation reports, 2) formal conference after observation, 3) informal conversation(s), 4) observing my mentor or others and, 5) other aspects of the mentor's role. Sixty-seven percent ranked informal conversation most beneficial, nineteen percent ranked observing my mentor or others highest, and eleven percent ranked receiving written reports highest.

Participants were also asked what changes they would recommend for the mentor's role. The participants' response was to confirm the importance of the mentor role in the beginning teacher program. Most recommendations centered on ensuring that mentors had enough time and training to accomplish their duties. The new teaches, however, did indicate a preference for capable

mentors who were genuinely interested in assisting beginners, not just anyone who simply fills a position.

In summary, Huffman and Leak (1986) say their data indicate: 1) that beginning teachers strongly support the mentor's role in new teacher induction, 2) mentors are effective in assisting beginners during the induction process and, 3) further definition and refinement of the mentor's role will add to its importance in new teacher induction.

Hardcastle (1988) says that significant mentoring relationships may be misunderstood by most and experienced by the fewest. The author, an associate professor at Southwest Texas State University, wanted to explore the proteges' perceptions of mentoring benefits. Fourteen former proteges responded to a faculty newsletter request for research participants. Of the fourteen, 12 were current or former professors, 1 was a psycho-therapist, and 1 a graduate student. All, except the graduate student, were currently mentoring others. All participants were interviewed separately by the author over the course of one year.

Hardcastle (1988) reported that the proteges believed the mentors greatly affected their lives. Proteges stated that mentors: 1) motivated them to grow, 2) pointed out talents that were unknown to the proteges, 3) taught them to think differently about themselves and, 4) offered spiritual support. In summary, it is obvious these mentors played a significant part in their proteges' lives, she cautions, however that the key to successful mentoring may be the individual selected, and not the program.

Waters and Bernhardt (1989) report on induction programs that use a variety of titles. At differing times and locations these programs are called consulting teacher, teacher consultants, or support teachers. The basic tenet of these programs, regardless of the name, is pairing an experienced teacher with a novice during the induction process.

Waters and Bernhardt (1989) believe there is a dilemma in using the terms consulting teacher and teacher consultant. They assert this individual's role tends to be more distant especially when giving teaching assessments. The authors view this role as being evaluative in nature, and as a consequence any semblance of confidentiality is lost.

While not referring to the support teacher as a mentor, the roles the authors specify for the support teacher match those others ascribe to a mentor. The authors view the mentor as a powerful force during the induction period. The mentor provides an orientation, support, technique advice, and assists with the professional development of the beginner.

Waters and Bernhardt (1989) say that using mentors to enhance beginning teacher effectiveness can occur only with careful program planning. To be successful, the mentor/protege

program must: 1) define the mentor's role, 2) specify mentor selection criteria, 3) provide mentor training, and, 4) provide incentives to mentors.

Romantowski, Dorminey, and Van Vorhees (1989) report the results of a task force organized in 1986 by the Michigan Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACE) to investigate Teacher induction programs. Romantowski served as the task force chair. The task force was to study current induction programs and to present recommendations to MACE.

The task force reviewed 11 induction programs in use across the country, and made the following recommendations: 1) adopt statewide induction standards, 2) mandate training for those involved with induction, and, 3) implement a mentoring program as part of induction. Mentoring would include: on-site visits designed to meet new teachers' needs, regular conferences that feature observation and feedback, orientation to the school and community, and provisions for the beginner's professional growth through introduction to learned and professional societies.

Objectives of the induction program, the task force stated, should be to: 1) promote quality instruction and increase teacher competence, 2) provide a support network for beginners, 3) encourage promising beginners to remain in teaching and, 4) view the first year as the initial step in professional development. The task force's position was that beginning teacher support programs, with mentoring as an integral part, are necessary.

Fessler (1990) sees mentoring as improving teachers' leadership skills. He says experienced teachers have a critical role to play in assisting the beginning teacher. Mentors assist the beginner not only in learning the school's environment, but also help them with classroom management and instruction techniques.

Parker (1990) agrees that mentoring is an effective tool to provide support and assistance to the beginner. It is, she says, the induction method of choice. The author says that successful mentoring programs adhere to the following guidelines: 1) mentor training is required, 2) mentors should be volunteers, 3) mentor/ protege confidentially must not be breached, and 4) mentors should not be involved with beginning teacher evaluation.

Haipt (1990) enlarges the mentors' role. Mentors serve as support persons to beginners giving not only technical advice but providing emotional support as well. She says this assistance is continual, not "spur-of-the-moment" help offered by a concerned associate. Mentors also help reduce the beginner's sense of isolation, frustration, and struggle to survive.

To support her statements, the author cites Odell's work. Odell (as cited in Haipt, 1990) found that various studies

indicate beginners without mentors ranked discipline,organization, and securing materials and supplies as most important. The mentored, however, ranked instruction advice, personal/emotional support, and access to teaching resources/ materials as most important.

These findings lead Odell to postulate that mentors help beginners focus more on instruction and less on discipline. Haipt (1990) concludes her article by stating that mentoring fosters a professional development concept in beginning teachers. That mentoring is a nurturing and supporting process that assists the beginners from entry to professional maturity. Mentoring is, she says, a continuation of the professional development process begun in teacher education courses. Mentors help the beginner understand that learning to teach is a life-long endeavor.

Bey (1990) says that mentoring is not new to education, actually seasoned teachers have been passing their expertise on to beginners as standard practice. The current mentoring efforts, according to the author, rest on two principles. First, is the retention of promising beginners, and the second is focused on improving practice. In addition, assigning a mentor to a beginners is a method of welcoming them into the education field, and to foster a sense of commitment to both the novice and the profession as well.

Huling-Austin (1990) also says that mentoring is not new. When newly assigned mentors learn their duties, the normal response is, "but we already do that." The author states that mentoring styles fall into three categories. She bases the categories on research conducted on change facilitators.

Huling-Austin (1990) quickly points out that research has not been conducted on her "mentor category" concepts. Because these "categories" have a strong similarity between mentor functions and those of a change facilitator, she suggests there is a strong relationship between the two. The author labels these categories as responder, colleague, and initiator.

Huling-Austin (1990) believes these categories are hierarchial in nature, with responder the lowest and initiator the highest. She correlates the responder's role to an informal mentoring concept where the mentor provides "what is asked for" and little else. Here the protege is clearly in charge. The colleague style is an improvement over the responder, but the protege still determines in what areas he/she requires help. The protege/mentor relationship gains the most benefit when initiator style is used. Here the mentor focuses his/her attention on assisting the protege to become a better teacher. Mentors report that using this style increases awareness of their own abilities to help the protege's professional growth, and the mentor gains a sense of achievement. In addition, the protege's development is

not constrained by a lack of experience, rather it is determined by potential and the mentor's guidance.

Huling-Austin (1990) concludes that many behaviors become manifest within these mentoring styles. She presented these styles so that mentors can see the traits available to assist the beginner during induction, and to demonstrate that mentoring is more than just "we already do that."

Odell (1990) says that despite the importance of mentoring to career and professional development there is no clear consensus on what a mentor's role is. To support this statement, the author, presents a listing of roles ascribed to mentors by various writers. These roles, which have labels attached, run the gamut from advisor to trusted friend. Mentor roles, include, but are not limited to: coaching, consulting, opening doors, and counseling. Apparently, she says, mentors are expected to help the novice attain goals, show how things are done, and/or provide advice.

Odell (1990) says, however, that much of the success in mentoring beginners stems from the concept of mentoring. That is, success is more often determined by what the protege receives rather than attaining "the mentoring program's" stated objectives. By demonstrating competency, knowledge, and skill, the mentor earns the protege's respect while at the same time providing feedback and guidance to improve the beginner's instructional ability. Effective mentoring programs work best, the author believes, in an atmosphere of trust and assistance.

Gordon (1991) gives six reasons why beginning teachers experience difficulty at the outset. The are: 1) demanding initial assignments, 2) lack of definitive parameters, 3) lack of resources, 4) isolation and a sense of inadequacy, 5) adapting to new roles and, 6) the reality that he/she is now in charge.

Gordon (1991) says the way to deal with and allay beginners frustrations is through a beginning teacher assistance program (BTAP). A cornerstone of any BTAP is mentoring, and the author believes that it may not be possible to initiate an effective BTAP without mentors. Because of the positive effects mentors have on beginners, he doubts any BTAP without mentoring will be successful.

In support of this statement, Gordon (1991) cites several research studies on mentoring. Huling-Austin and Murphy's study (as cited in Gordon, 1991) concluded that the assignment of a support teacher (mentor) is likely the most influential and provides the best cost-benefit ratio in any BTAP. In addition, beginning teachers stated it was the mentor they turned to most often for assistance.

Warring's study (as cited in Gordon, 1991) of a Minnesota mentoring program found that beginning teachers credited their

improved teaching techniques to advice and counsel received from the mentor. The mentor also provided needed social and emotional support. In addition, beginners stated the mentors demonstrated outstanding leadership abilities and were exemplary role models.

Warring's study (as cited in Gordon, 1991) also indicated that the participating schools' administrators were pleased with the mentoring program. A majority of the administrators said that mentoring was helpful to the beginners, and that the beginners' students appeared to benefit as well.

Mentoring Pitfalls

Some authors suggest caution in the rush to institute induction programs which have a mentor playing a prominent role. These authors are not against induction per se, but believe care must be taken during planning and implementing to assure program objectives are met.

Thies-Sprinthall (1986) states that for induction programs to work, systematic supervision for the beginner is imperative. Of equal importance is the selection of and the role played by the mentor. The mentor must be able to act as coach, counselor, and observer in an effective and efficient manner. Furthermore, no mentor can or should be expected to preform these duties without adequate training. Having untrained mentors could be fatal to any induction program.

Some schools ("Teacher mentoring", ERIC Digest #7, 1986) change a normally voluntary relationship into a formalized process. These relationships, are arbitrary, not natural, and directed by a formula designed by the school system. While these programs have benefits, there are major down sides to consider.

First, it is not possible to regulate the level of responsibility, direct which activities must be accomplished, or decide the correct amount of time for classroom observation. Second, mandated evaluation by mentors can eliminate the mutual trust needed for mentor/protege relationships to be successful. Surveys have documented mentor program success, but caution must be exercised when developing and implementing.

Merriam, Thomas, and Zeph (1987) say " they have found few empirically based articles on faculty-to faculty mentoring (p. 202)." The authors says there has been one fairly large study which tends to support the benefits of mentoring. A study by Queralt (as cited in Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987) of more than 400 faculty and administrators indicates that those who had mentors enjoyed much greater career status than those without mentors. Using academic standing, publication status, income, and leadership, among other factors, Queralt found that those

with mentors achieved greater career success than those without mentors.

Merriam, Thomas, and Zeph (1987) say studies of mentoring in education have many difficulties. First, there is disagreement about what a mentor does. Studies using Daloz' definition find few respondents saying they had a mentor, but when terms as "role model" or "sponsor" are used to distinguish mentor traits more respondents report having had a mentor relationship. Another problem is that of collecting data. Interviews with a small sample yield a higher number of "significant" mentor relationships than do surveys with a large number of respondents.

The authors are also concerned that few of the studies have attempted to determine the impact, if any, a mentor has on a protege's career. Furthermore, having a mentor may be detrimental to health and welfare. Blotnick (as cited in Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987) says that mentoring can cause more work, constant kibitzing, and misunderstandings.

Merriam, Thomas, and Zeph (1987) conclude that because of inadequate research, hazy definitions, and the wide disparity of research results little can be said about the benefits of mentoring, either positively or negatively, in higher education. The authors call for more studies which will clearly articulate exactly what mentoring is, and its impact, if any, on career development.

Anderson and Shannon (1988) relate the term mentor, and mentoring, to its mythical origins and draw several conclusions. First, mentoring is intentional, not accidental. Second, it is a nurturing (maturing) process that promotes growth and development toward self-fulfillment. Third, it is a transformation of the wisdom and experience from the mentor to the protege. Fourth, the protege is given both support and protection. Fifth, it provides a role model for the protege to emulate in pursuit of professional development.

Following their conclusions about mentors, and mentoring, the authors state a mentoring program must have the following objectives to assist the beginner. Mentors must: 1) nurture proteges, 2) be role models, 3) embody the five mentoring functions of teaching, coaching, encouraging, counseling, and befriending, 4) promote professional and personal growth and, 5) display an ongoing caring relationship.

Anderson and Shannon (1988) state that it is essential for developers to understand these objectives and embed them into a mentoring program's framework. Ignoring these objectives, the authors state, is to foster programs that are aimless, devoid of integrity, and disastrous. Further they say, that without thinking through the development process effective mentoring programs will not be successful.

Zimpher and Rieger (1988) say there has been much interest in teacher induction as indicated by 30 research projects funded by the U.S. Department of Education, of these 11 feature the mentor-inductee relationship. The authors state there are five mentors issues which need clarification: 1) the mentor's role, 2) the mentor's function, formal or informal, 3) work conditions to include policies and support systems, 4) criteria for identifying effective mentors and, 5) pairing mentors with proteges.

The mentor's role has been given many "names" and/or "titles." From Galvez-Hjornevik's "trusted guide" and counselor, to Ryan's "helper-friend," to Huling-Austin's "support teacher/ buddy-teacher," to Odell's "clinical support teacher." Zimpher and Rieger (1988) say these "different" names/titles can lead to confusion over what the mentor's role really is, and because there is no clear definition, research studies may not yield similar results.

Zimpher and Rieger (1988) state there is a similar uncertainty over formal versus informal functions. The former includes training or assistance sessions designed to improve the effectiveness of instruction. Whereas informal tends to be viewed as providing feedback and helpful advice. The authors see a problem here of either giving constructive criticism focused on professional practice or "friendly advice." If the function is not clearly delineated, the mentor and protege have a shaky relationship.

Work conditions, Zimpher and Rieger (1988) say revolve around several issues. First is teacher isolation. Beginners and mentors need to feel a sense of belonging and community. The protege needs to know he/she belongs, and the relationship between mentor and protege must be supported. Second, mentors need time to perform their "mentoring" duties. Third, the mentor should have some input to the beginners evaluation. This gives the mentor a sense of closure, and the protege believes someone is actually on his/her side.

The criteria used to select mentors is critical. The authors say there is a variety of methods used to select a mentor, ranging from Galvez-Hjornevik's "expert," to Varah, Theune, Parker's "volunteer." While it can be argued that a volunteer would ideally be best, he/she should have all the other social and technical characteristics necessary for success.

Pairing of mentor and protege is important for the relationship's survival. Galvez-Hjornevik and Huffman & Leak recommend the mentor and protege have the same subject and grade levels. Other writers believe pairing is ideally accomplished using personal and social criteria. How the pairing is done, Zimpher and Rieger (1988) believe can be facilitated by preparing the mentor for his/her role, and providing mentor and protege time to become acquainted.

Zimpher and Rieger (1988) state that while much has been written and shared about mentoring, no comprehensive treatment has been presented. These issues were presented to depict, for program developers, their complexity. Developers need consider the long term impact of interpersonal relationships when designing mentoring programs focused on improving beginning teacher instruction.

Newcombe (1988) also cautions about instituting mentoring programs because mentoring has a variety of meanings. Problems emerge when comparing mentoring's use in the business world with its use in education. Because mentoring has different meanings, she recommends careful study prior to implementing a program.

Newcombe (1988) cites three major differences between mentoring in education versus other fields. First, in education a mentor is normally assigned to a beginner, instead of a relationship that occurs in the course of events. Second, because of education's nature it is usually difficult for the mentor and protege to work together to foster a mutually beneficial relationship. This can be a barrier to achieving the goals of mentoring. Third, mentoring programs in education are normally of short duration, not the typically long mentor/protege relationships enjoyed in other fields. The author believes that new teachers need the type of support mentoring offers, but cautions that pitfalls must be addressed before embarking on a mentoring program.

Gehrke (1991) says beginning teacher assistance programs are the in thing, but she cautions about "jumping" on the mentor bandwagon. These programs are put in place to help beginners cope with the trials of entry into teaching, but really are not focused on the newcomer. She envisions helping the beginner with a community approach. Beginners will recognize their place within the community by engaging in various rites of passage.

Gehrke (1991) concedes that her vision is somewhat Utopian, but firmly believes that it is the entire school community that is responsible for the success or failure of the beginner, not just one "appointed" person. She contrasts the helping community scenario rooted in personal and social well-being with the mentoring approach.

Gehrke (1991) states that mentoring cares little for the the individual's needs, wants, and desires. It assumes no responsibility for helping the beginner grow cognitively or reflectively. Whereas her "helping" community takes a holistic approach to inducting the novice. With mentoring, she says, it is only by happenstance that the beginner travels from novice to veteran teacher. Mentoring programs, the author concludes, are narrowly focused and do not foster in the protege a sense of helping others.

Fullan (1995) agrees with Gehrke that mentoring is not an "end all and be all." He says that mentoring programs designed to assist beginning teachers leave much to be desired. Induction programs which feature supervised mentoring of beginners offer some hope. These programs, however, tend to be rigid and lack validity.

To support his contentions, Fullan cites Little's work as well as that of Smylie and Denny. Little (as cited by Fullan, 1995) found that because mentors do not clearly understand their responsibilities the result was less direct involvement with the protege. This is directly opposite of what a mentor program is designed to achieve. Smylie and Denny (as cited by Fullan, 1995) report a similar finding. Their studies depict lower incidence of mentor assistance in areas of classroom observation and teaching techniques than stated program objectives.

Fullan (1995) concludes that mentoring, as well as other development programs, is well intentioned, but not completely sound. That is, he believes that mentoring is not providing the comprehensive teacher development it was designed to address.

Research on Mentoring and Induction Programs

Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes, and Paulissen (1986) say that induction programs are in the forefront of changes directed at improving classroom instruction. The insecurity of beginning teachers mark induction as the time to begin instituting teacher education changes. Many of these induction programs have been mandated by state legislatures. To ascertain the effectiveness of these programs, the authors conducted research on two state programs. Two schools districts per state were selected to participate in the study based on assessments from their state school board and university teacher educators.

Hoffman, et al. (1986) devised a research instrument targeting six teaching traits. The study used qualitative research methods to gather data. That is, no attempt was made to gather a random sample, and control/comparison groups were not included. The study focused on gathering data based on descriptions of experience which would help in identifying patterns or trends. In addition, the research team interviewed each participant six times.

Hoffman, et al. (1986) reported the following findings: 1) a majority of the beginning teachers felt the first year of teaching was not easy, 2) the peer/support teacher was typically rated as highly influential, and became more influential later in the year, 3) peer/support teachers were regarded variously as mentors, counselors, friends, or colleagues and, 4) peer/support teachers were regarded as sources of information and a morale booster. The authors report that not all beginners had a high opinion of the program. Three of the four dissatisfied beginners

had high teaching loads, and the other was trained for secondary education but teaching at the primary level.

Hoffman, et al. (1986) state that based on their experience with the data collection instruments these finding do not demonstrate excellence in teaching. The role and skills of the mentor must be identified and standardized. The do conclude, however, that their findings indicate the value of induction programs for beginning teachers.

Holmes (1986) reports on the District of Columbia's intern-mentor program. The study was undertaken to determine the effectiveness of the District's intern-mentor program, and to make recommendations for improvements. Some of the data presented here, however, are relevant to mentorship in general.

Holmes' (1986) study was conducted using both survey (questionnaire) and interview techniques. All 90 interns were surveyed by questionnaire, and a random sample of 21 interns participated in both group and individual interviews. A total of 21 principals/administrators, and 10 mentors participating in the study were interviewed. The mentors were also interviewed in groups settings as well. As part of the survey, mentors were required to keep bi-weekly logs.

Holmes (1986) study found that administrative personnel and mentors felt that interns needed assistance in analyzing their teaching abilities. Furthermore, mentors and administrators felt the interns were not adequately prepared to teach, needed help with lesson planning, and there was a variation of subject mater expertise among the interns. The mentors and administrators overwhelmingly agreed with the statement "mentors are the key to new teacher success."

The interns received a 26 item questionnaire. The survey return rate was 79%. Some of the significant findings were: 1) 83% said the mentor was the major source of orientation to the school system, 2) 95% agreed with, " that as a result of participating in program I feel more confident about my technical skills", 3) 95% agreed the mentor provides encouragement and moral support, 4) 95% agreed the mentor understands their strengths and weaknesses and, 5) 95% agreed the mentor is an advocate who inspired a commitment to teaching.

The District's intern-mentor program, Holmes (1986) says was developed to improve beginning teacher performance, to facilitate the professional development of the beginners, and to screen out poor performers. The author concluded, the program was accomplishing its objectives, and that the mentor was instrumental to the program's success.

Hawk and Robards (1987) surveyed teacher induction programs in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The authors stated that because statewide teacher induction programs (STIPs)

were new, their research could not substantiate claims of teacher improvement and other benefits attributed to STIPs. The data, however, did indicate that beginning teacher assistance was a major strength of induction programs.

Hawk and Robards (1987) survey also found that STIPs had the following components: 1) STIPs are designed to guide and assist in the beginning teacher's professional development, 2) a support team, including a mentor and administrators, observe, evaluate, and assist the beginner's teaching techniques and, 3) upon successful completion of the STIP the beginner is recommended for certification.

Hawk and Robards (1987) conclude the greatest asset of STIPs is the assistance beginners receive. Furthermore, they believe this assistance eases the transition from education student to educator. The authors predict that induction programs will become universal by the 1990s.

Huling-Austin and Murphy's (1987) study on induction practices analyzed data collected from collaborative research on more than 150 beginning teacher induction programs in eight states. The authors state this survey was unique in that it was the first one attempted. The survey included urban, suburban, rural, and rural-suburban school districts and ranged in size from large to small. Seven of ten sites had formal induction programs, three sites had no program, only two states had mandated programs. The study was conducted via questionnaire and interview. In addition, the authors list the following limitations of the study: 1) no follow-up, 2) variation of sample size prohibits use of statistical procedures to compare data, 3) researchers did not collect data and, 4) research grant was lost, therefore data were not collected over a full year.

Huling-Austin and Murphy (1987) report the following findings from their study: 1) formal support teachers (mentors) were the most helpful part of the programs, 2) having no support teacher caused the beginner to rely on the teacher across the hall and, 3) the support teacher (mentor) was the most commonly found component in induction programs. The beginning teachers said the mentor was responsible for helping them learn a variety of duties from clerical tasks to understanding school policies and procedures. Without a mentor, the beginners stated they would have to learn these non teaching duties on their own.

Huling-Austin and Murphy (1987) make the following conclusions from the data. First, induction programs by their very existence appear to make a difference in how beginners perceive their ability and profession. Second, support teachers (mentors) may be the most powerful and cost effective induction practice available. Third, support teachers (mentors) are relied upon most heavily by the beginner, absent a mentor beginners find help wherever and however they can. Fourth, mentors require training for their duties.

Franceschini and Butler (1987) state that the traditional lonesome "trial-by-fire" initiation is not a valid starting point for teacher induction programs. To test this statement, the authors studied and compared mentor roles in two fifth year induction programs, one a master's degree program, the other an alternative certification program.

The study attempted to determine the personal and professional factors necessary for a mentor's success. The study included 42 subjects, 27 masters' and 15 alternative certification students. Four general questions about mentor roles formed the research: 1) what roles did the mentor perform?, 2) what personal and professional traits are important for mentors to exhibit?, 3) how do mentors rate success and how did it vary? and, 4) what school-contact factors promote or inhibit success? The study was conducted using a Likert scale questionnaire.

Franceschini and Butler (1987) noted there were statistical differences in the data compiled from the two groups, but some similarities existed. First, support in both groups was heavily pointed toward providing instructional related assistance. Second, both groups stressed the important personal and professional traits of competence, honesty, openness, professional confidence, and commitment to teaching of the mentors. The data also indicate that there is no evidence that formal induction programs produce unhealthy climates.

The data did reveal one large disparity between the two groups. The masters degree subjects rated the mentor's role in induction significantly higher than did the alternative certification subjects. The authors conclude that the higher ratings given the mentors by the masters degree students is directly related to the time spent with mentors. Because of their situation, the alternative certification subjects received assistance from mentors on a part time basis only.

Xu and Newman (1987) report on a study conducted on the University of Albany's mentor program for new faculty members. The university's mentor program had the following objectives: 1) orient newcomer to the university and make him/her familiar with the academic environment, 2) aid in building career through assistance of experienced faculty and, 3) assist in advancement toward tenure.

Xu and Newman (1987) state the program was loosely structured in that proteges were notified via mail and were asked to meet with their mentors only several times a year. The study had 52 subjects, evenly divided between mentors and proteges. A survey was sent to each subject twice during the academic year using on-campus mail. Mentors and proteges received separate surveys which asked parallel questions. The survey was designed in three parts to address the following areas: 1) program

implementation, 2) perceptions and opinions about the program and, 3) the mentor selection process. The researchers reported an 87% response rate.

Xu and Newman (1987) reported the following protege findings:

Program is important to extremely important:	74%
Program was a valuable experience:	79%
Program benefited them professionally:	89%
Program made them more comfortable in teaching:	69%
Program made them more comfortable with research:	74%
Satisfied with quality of time spent with mentor:	95%
Satisfied with quantity of time spent with mentor:	74%
Satisfied with mentor/protege pairing:	
Content area:	95%
Teaching style:	94%
Research:	74%

Xu and Newman (1987) report the following mentor survey findings:

Program is important to professionalism:	89%
Program assisted beginning faculty:	100%
Satisfied with quality of time with protege:	84%
Satisfied with quantity of time with protege:	84%
Enjoyed serving as a mentor:	94%
Volunteered to serve as a mentor:	50%
Recommend program continuation: Male mentors:	75%
Recommend program continuation: Female mentors:	78%

While favoring the mentor/protege relationship, some mentors were opposed to having an institutionalized program. The mentors felt they needed to be helpful without being patronizing.

The authors make the following conclusions about the university's mentor/protege program. First, it appears to be successful in its initial stage(s). Second, both mentors and proteges perceive the program to be beneficial. Third, there appears to be a parallel between the needs of beginning teachers in K through 12 and higher education. Fourth, the results indicate that mentoring is an important function that should be considered as part of an academic requirement for beginning university faculty members.

Henry (1988) reports on a study of Project CREDIT, an Indiana beginning teacher improvement initiative developed under the auspices of Indiana State University. The program's goals were: 1) to improve the teaching skills of the beginner, 2) to reduce perceived and real problems of beginning teachers and, 3) to reduce beginning teacher dropout. Project CREDIT used a three pronged assistance approach, university based supervisors, peers, and mentors. Mentors were considered to be a key element in the program. Mentors were to provide for orientation, assist with

classroom planning, act as a role model, observe the beginners teaching, and have the beginner observe their teaching.

The study contrasted the experiences of the 20 Project CREDIT interns, and a control group of 20 non interns. At the conclusion of the year, the study revealed that the interns had: 1) a greater mastery of learning theory, 2) an increased motivation to use higher order questions and, 3) an increased inclination to use critical thinking. In addition, the interns improved in 33 competency areas versus the control group which showed improvement in 14 areas.

Henry (1988) concludes that the Project CREDIT was successful. Further, he says that induction programs based solely on a mentor may be too narrowly focused and may not provide a complete induction experience. He states, however, that mentors are key components in any induction program, and recommends that all future beginning teachers in Indiana public schools be assigned a mentor during induction.

Bullough's (1989) case study relates a beginning teacher's experience, or lack of, with an assigned mentor. A mentor was assigned, but had no "formal" mentoring responsibilities. When asked, the mentor would give answers, or provide materials but rarely volunteered advice. Advice came only when it was obvious the beginner was about to "break the rules." Even though the beginner was assigned a mentor, she eventually fell victim to the "sink-or-swim" induction mentality.

The author relates that the state where his case study took place changed its certification procedures requiring "Kerrie" to have a mentor during her second year of teaching. Under the new certification regulation, the mentor was compensated and required to complete quarterly evaluations. Little if anything, however, changed in "Kerrie's" mentor/protege relationship.

Although Bullough (1989) has presented a negative picture, from "Kerrie's" perspective about mentoring, he does believe mentoring is both useful and warranted. The author is concerned that many mentor programs ignore the beginner's professional development. Beginning teachers, he says, should be assigned a mentor who is a role model, assists with the beginner's professional development, and acts as the beginner's advocate. Above all, the mentor should not be involved with evaluating his/her protege.

Ishler and Edelfelt (1989) relate that based on their survey, although limited, school districts with induction programs report a number of impacts on the education system. These programs have shown achievement in the retention of promising beginning teachers, and improvement in both the beginner's professional and personal status. In addition, support teachers (mentors) have developed a satisfaction in their own professional growth as a direct result of mentoring

beginners. The authors caution, however, that more detailed research is necessary to assess these "perceived" improvements especially in the area of enhanced student performance.

In reporting on the existing research of beginning teacher assistance programs, Huling-Austin (1989) set three criteria for selecting studies. The studies had to be: 1) data based, 2) targeted to beginning teachers who were in formal assistance programs and, 3) the research must have been reported since 1977. She analyzed the studies against the five commonly agreed upon goals, previously reported, for beginning teacher assistance programs.

Huling-Austin (1989) reports on several studies which focused on teaching performance. Blackburn (as cited in Huling-Austin, 1989) reported no difference in student achievement regardless of beginning teacher induction programs. He did find, however, that beginners who went through an induction program were consistently rated higher in teaching competence than their contemporaries by administrators.

Summers (as cited in Huling-Austin, 1989) comes to a different conclusion than Blackburn. Summers, reported, in 1987, that beginners who participated in teacher induction programs demonstrated measurable differences when compared to a control group in, among other traits, "a marked tendency to teach critical thinking skills, and use higher-order questioning" (p. 40).

Finally, Huling-Austin cites Huling-Austin and Murphy's (1987) study. Huling-Austin and Murphy (as cited in Huling-Austin, 1989) conclude from their research that most of the changes adopted by the beginner after participating in an induction program were of the kind that is directly associated with the "quality of instruction" (p. 41).

Huling-Austin (1989) cites several studies which focused on personal and professional well-being. Huling-Austin and Murphy's study (1987) found that teachers who had no formal induction were decidedly less positive in perceiving themselves as competent teachers.

Summers (as cited in Huling-Austin, 1989) reported findings similar to that of Huling-Austin and Murphy' study. Summers found that non-supported teachers gave negative responses to 90% of survey questions regarding their attitudes and perceptions toward teaching. Huling-Austin (1989) suggests that these two studies indicate that when beginning teachers are forced to "fend" for themselves, their self-confidence is lost.

Huling-Austin's (1989) research synthesis found four additional items that were evident in the studies. Among them are: 1) induction programs need to be flexible and, 2) the importance of the support (mentor) teacher. In support of the

first item, the author references two studies. Wildman, T. M., Niles, J A., Magliaro, S. G., McLaughlin, R. A., and Drill, L.G. (as cited in Huling-Austin, 1989) argue that flexibility is necessary because beginner's needs, reactions, and teaching ambitions are different.

Huling-Austin, Putman, and Galvez- Hjornevik (as cited in Huling-Austin, 1989) says a "one size" fits all induction program is doomed to failure because it discounts individuality. They recommend continual program assessment to assure that individual assistance is identified and provided.

The aspect of induction programs on which these studies consistently agreed is the importance of the support (mentor) teacher. Huling-Austin (1989) references several studies which attest to the mentor's significance. Huling-Austin, Putman, and Galvez-Hjornevik (as cited in Huling-Austin, 1989) report that beginning teachers stated having a mentor was very important because they were able to turn to a single source when problems arose. Similarly, Huffman and Leak (as cited in Huling-Austin, 1989) observed that assigning a mentor to assist the beginner with lesson planning, instructional techniques, etc., within the same subject area is warranted.

Huling-Austin (1989) says the findings of these studies imply several things. First, having an induction program for beginning teachers makes sense. Second, mentoring is the most seen aspect of induction programs and provides the best cost to benefit ratio available. Beginners attest to the importance of mentors by their "stated" reliance on their guidance.

Odell (1990) says the concept of mentoring beginning teachers rests on several concepts. First, mentoring assumes that beginners, while well versed in subject matter(s) and teaching theory, have little practical experience. Second, becoming a competent teacher is a career long process which can be eased with the help of a mentor. Further, she states that mentoring programs have common goals, among them are: 1) to promote professional development and, 2) to provide support and information to alleviate beginner trepidations.

Odell (1990) relates that there is not much evidence to indicate that the first goal is being met. She does, however, refer to Huling-Austin's work concerning professional development of beginning teachers. Huling-Austin (as cited by Odell, 1990) reported on three studies that focused on mentor influenced teacher development. One study found that mentored beginners had increased competency ratings versus beginners without mentors.

The second study reported that mentored beginners demonstrated increased abilities in the use of higher order questioning techniques, a greater understanding of curriculum, and better communication skills. The third study found that

mentored beginners were significantly better at planning and preparing lessons and in leading classroom discussion than unmentored beginners.

Odell (1990) refers to several studies which support the second goal. Brooks (as cited by Odell, 1990) states that mentored beginners relate that they have fewer non teaching concerns, feel more competent and motivated to teach than unmentored beginners. In another study, Odell (as cited by Odell, 1990) tracked the impact mentors had on beginners during the first year of teaching. She found that 80% of beginners relied on the mentor to provide support in dealing with various teaching related issues.

Odell (1990) sums up the benefits of mentoring as a win-win-no lose relationship. She concludes that beginners show positive development and mentors benefit because they must critically reflect on their professional practice in order to assist the beginner. This reflection on practice, the author believes, produces better beginning teachers, which produce better schools, and better schools should produce better students.

Literature Review Summary

The literature review suggests that mentoring is of value to the beginning instructor. It is true that some authors don't ascribe to this credo, because they believe that mentoring has not been adequately studied or researched. Furthermore, these authors state that there is confusion over what a mentor is and does.

Authors favoring mentoring agree with the previous point. These authors also state that programs must be well conceived, properly designed, and have defined goals and objectives to be successful. Authors in favor of mentoring, however, point out that feedback from beginners overwhelmingly favors using mentors to assist the novice in moving from learner to practitioner. From the studies and research conducted on beginning teachers it is apparent that some type of assistance is necessary to ensure the beginner's success. The literature is clear, even from those opposed, that mentoring, if properly designed, is the method of choice in beginning teacher assistance.

CHAPTER 3. METHOD

Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine the value, if any, that an induction program has on the perceived effectiveness of the beginning instructor. Specifically, the focus is on one type of induction: mentorship. Certification prepares an instructor in both subject matter and instructional techniques. Some education authors, however, believe that beginning instructors require more than the certification process if they are to be successful. Mentorship is seen by some education authors as the induction method of choice to inculcate the beginner in the teaching profession, and at the same time orient and socialize him/her into the inner workings of the organization. The focus of this study was on the following research questions: (1) How do mentored and unmentored beginning instructors differ in their perception of the value of a mentorship program?, (2) How do the mentors improve, if at all, the beginner's instructional practice?, (3) How do mentors assist, if at all, the beginner's understanding of school procedures?, and (4) How do formally and informally mentored instructors differ in their perception of the mentorship program?

Subjects

All subjects were commissioned officers of the U.S. Army Reserve, serving as instructors in U.S. Army Reserve Forces (USARF) Schools. Each was a graduate of the course they teach, and each was certified by the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

The officers were separated into two groups, based on the course they taught. The subjects surveyed teach either the Combined Arms Services Staff Course (CAS3) or the Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC). Both courses are under the auspices of the Command and General Staff College. Furthermore, these subjects were not members of the Active (Regular) Army. The USARF Schools to which they are assigned act as "extensions" of the Command and General Staff College for these courses. The Command and General Staff College provided the names and addresses of the 82 officers certified to teach CGSOC and 185 officers certified to teach CAS3. All were surveyed via a mail questionnaire.

Instrument

A questionnaire was designed to gather data based on the proposed research questions. Further, the questionnaire was developed after conducting interviews with various individuals within the Army's institutional training (school) system.

The questionnaire was designed to measure if the respondents believed that mentoring adds value to the beginning instructor's experience, assists the beginner in improving instructional practice, and/or assists in learning the institution's procedures. The instrument was also designed to identify beginning instructors who had formal and informal mentoring relationships.

The questionnaire was formatted using a four point Likert scale. This scale was selected for the following reasons: 1) this type of measurement scale is easy to self administer, 2) it is a widely used scale, and most Army personnel are familiar with this type of scale, and 3) four points were chosen to eliminate a neutral or not applicable response. See Appendix A for a copy of the actual questionnaire.

Procedures

A descriptive design that compares mentored versus unmentored U.S. Army Reserve Forces School instructors to ascertain what value, if any, mentors have on beginning instructors during the induction period. A questionnaire that was field tested to help assure validity, was sent to all instructors certified to teach their respective course. The list of 267 instructors was provided by the certifying authority, the Command and General Staff College.

Questionnaires were distributed via the U.S. Postal Service. Each instructor was mailed the questionnaire, a pre-addressed return envelope, and a letter of instruction explaining terms, definitions, the purpose of the survey, and why each subject was asked to participate. The letter of instruction provided details for completing and returning the questionnaire, and thanked each subject for his/her participation. See Appendix B.

Instructors from each course were mailed differently pre-addressed envelopes to return the questionnaire. Neither questionnaires nor return envelopes were coded, therefore using different pre-addressed return envelopes provided a means to segregate responses of the CGSOC instructors from those of the CAS3 instructors. Subjects were informed that they, and their responses will receive anonymity.

Anonymity was addressed in the following manner. Each subject received a pre-addressed return postcard with the questionnaire. The subjects were requested to sign and return the postcard. Return receipt of the postcard verified that the subject received, completed, and mailed the survey. The subject's signature was then matched with the master list of names. The questionnaire, return envelopes, and return postcards were not coded or numbered. Affording the subjects anonymity helped assure validity, and probably increased the response rate.

Precautions to eliminate non-response were taken. Non-respondents were mailed follow-up reminder postcards three weeks after the survey's mailing date. Three weeks after sending reminder postcards, non-respondents were mailed a follow- up questionnaire. The survey was mailed to each subject, a total of 267 USARF School instructors, on December 30, 1996. Follow-up postcards were mailed to non-respondents on January 20, 1997. A final survey was mailed to non-respondents on February 7, 1997.

Data Organization

Data was collected, coded, and entered into a spread sheet format to be organized into groups to address research questions. Data was further organized into groups according to the type of mentoring, or lack thereof, each participant had experienced at the USARF School. This data organization was determined by how the participants answered questionnaire items 15 and 16, ("I was assigned a mentor during the new instructor induction period", and "I had an informal mentor during the induction period, one was not formally assigned", respectively). Answers to these items determined the mentoring categories. The mentoring categories are: 1) unmentored, 2) informally mentored, 3) formally mentored, and 4) both types of mentoring. A no response on both 15 and 16 denoted unmentored, a no on 15 and yes on 16 depicts informally mentored, a yes on 15 and a no on 16 shows a formal mentor, and a yes on both items indicates both types of mentoring.

In addition, the data was organized by a separate category shown as the mentor discriminator. This category was determined by how the participants answered questionnaire items 14, ("I was assigned a mentor during the certification process"), 15, and 16. A yes answer on any of these items indicated the participant had a mentor at sometime, a no on all items indicated no mentor. The data were organized in this manner because some participants were mentored during the certification process, but may not have been mentored at the USARF School.

Statistical Procedures

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the data and compare the sample means from each group, formally mentored, informally mentored, those with both formal and informal mentors, and the unmentored. Research Question # 1 asked how mentored and unmentored beginning instructors differ in their perception of a mentorship program, and was measured by questionnaire items # 1 through # 5. Research question # 2 asked how mentors improve, if at all, the beginner's instructional practice, and was measured by questionnaire items # 6 through # 10.

Research question # 3 asked how mentors assist, if at all, the beginner's understanding of the school's operating procedures, and was measured by questionnaire items # 11 and

12. Research question # 4 asked how do formally and informally mentored instructors differ in their perception of the mentorship program, and was measured by questionnaire items # 17 through # 23.

Data was also analyzed using an independent *t*-test statistical calculation. This procedure was used to determine the statistical difference (significance) between the mentored, and unmentored groups in questionnaire item # 14 (mentor during the certification process) and the mentor discriminator, previously discussed.

Data was also coded as to whether the survey was received after the first or second mailing. Responses were differentiated as Wave 1 or Wave 2. Independent *t*-test statistic calculations showed a difference on three survey items at $p < .05$ between Wave 1 and Wave 2 responses. The number of usable Wave 2 responses was 27, or 12.5% of the total sample. The Wave 2 responses for questionnaire items # 17 through # 23 totaled 16, or 10% of the number of responses. Because these numbers and percentages are small when compared to the total population surveyed, Wave 2 responses are not deemed to be of significance.

Data was entered in a spread sheet format and analyzed using the Number Cruncher Statistical System (NCSS). Analysis and interpretation of the data is reported in the findings chapter. The findings chapter communicates the interpretation of and summarizes the data.

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

Overview

The focus of this study was on the perceived benefits of a mentoring program; specifically, if a mentor aids the beginning instructor in transferring "gained knowledge" into practical application. The study had 221 respondents who are Army Reserve instructors teaching either the Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC) or the Combined Arms Services Course (CAS3). Both courses are under the auspices of the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The list of survey subjects was provided by the Command and General Staff College. Each of the survey participants is a certified instructor.

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do mentored and unmentored beginning instructors differ in their perception of a mentorship program?
2. How do mentors improve, if at all, the beginner's instructional practice?
3. How do mentors assist, if at all, the beginner's understanding of the school's operating procedures?
4. How do formally and informally mentored instructors differ in their perception of the mentorship program?

Response Data

Two Hundred and sixty seven questionnaires were mailed on December 30, 1996. Follow-up postcards, 120 in total, were mailed on January 20, 1997 to non-respondents. Finally, 100 questionnaires were mailed to non-respondents on February 7, 1997. Two hundred and twenty one responses were received, the last on March 10, 1997. Total response rate was 82.8%. Two hundred and seventeen responses were usable, or 81.3%. Twenty nine responses were received from the second questionnaire mailing, a 10.9% return rate. Twenty seven of these responses were usable, or 10.1%.

The list of participants revealed the following respondent discrepancies: 1) 20 respondents stated they were retired, 18 of them returned usable questionnaires, 2) 15 indicated they were not currently instructing, all 15 provided usable responses, 3) 4 were instructing both courses, all 4 returned usable responses. All of these usable responses became part of response total. Finally, 9 questionnaires were returned from the Postal Service as undeliverable. Each piece was posted a second time, 7 to new addresses as provided by the Postal Service. All were returned as undeliverable.

Numerous personnel and structure changes occurred in the U.S. Army Reserve and became effective on October 1, 1996, the beginning of the Army's fiscal year. The list of subjects was received in August 1996, but the survey was not mailed until

December 30, 1996 which most likely accounts for the address and the change in instructor status discrepancies.

The letter of instruction asked the respondents to sign and return a pre-addressed postcard. The postcard's purpose was two fold: 1) it provided anonymity, in that the postcards were not coded or otherwise related to the survey, and 2) the postcard provided a method to check the respondent against the master list as receiving and returning the survey.

Approximately 7% of the respondents returned the postcard with either illegible signatures, or unsigned. This caused some respondents to receive a second survey. Several responded that they had completed the survey, but I was still unable to check their names against the list because the return postcards were again received as described above. Conversely, approximately the same percentage sent notes apologizing for delaying their response. Reasons for delays included: 1) out of the country, 2) just found it, 3) children hid survey in a magazine, 4) moved and survey just caught up with me, 5) husband threw it away, and 6) either "it is on the way" or thanks for the reminder. In addition, more than a few of the respondents added lengthy signed notes, some said this type of study was overdue, and others thanked me and signed their names.

The demographic data depicts the respondents' various experiences as instructors in Army Reserve schools. See Table 1. Approximately 61% of the respondents indicated they teach CAS3, and 37% teach CGSOC. These figures are slightly different from the population surveyed. Approximately 2/3 of the population were CAS3 instructors, the remaining 1/3 taught CGSOC.

Survey participants were asked if their civilian occupation was school teacher or college professor. Overwhelmingly, by a margin of almost 4 to 1, 79.1% to 20.9%, the respondents state they do not hold this type of occupation. This question was asked to show that a large percent of USARF instructors are not "teachers" by training or education.

A slight majority of participants, 52.7%, reported that their USARF School had an induction program. This figure contrasts with the mentor profile which indicates that over 73% of the respondents received some type of mentoring at the school. The mentor discriminator, which includes mentoring during certification, shows that 82% of the respondents were mentored. Some respondents stated they were mentored but did not understand what an induction program was or a mentor's role in induction. The confusion about terms probably accounts for this difference.

Participants were asked to indicate their years of service and the length of time serving as an instructor. Average years of service was 24.9, and instructor service was 6.5 years. This

indicated that the participants were neither new to the Army nor to instructing, adding credibility to their responses.

Survey participants were provided the opportunity to add open ended comments. More than 56%, 122, of the participants provided comments, which were coded as positive, negative, or neutral. Of those providing comments, 70.5% were positive, 4.1% were negative, and the remainder were neutral.

Negative responses stated that mentoring was either not necessary or it was a waste of resources. Positive responses about mentoring were separated into the following categories: 1) beneficial/helpful - 38.4%; 2) essential/vital - 26.7%; 3) important/excellent program - 13.9%; 4) need formal program - 8.1%; 5) desirable - 7%; and 6) invaluable - 5.8%. Neutral comments were not separated because they did not refer or pertain to mentoring.

Table 1 Demographics

Variables	**Categories/Responses**	**N**	**%**
Courses Taught	CAS3	105	61.0%
	CGSOC	63	36.6%
	Teach Both	4	2.3%
Teacher/Professor	Yes	44	20.9%
	No	167	79.1%
Induction Program	Yes	96	52.7%
	No	86	47.3%
Mentor Profile (Type of Mentor)	None (unmentored)	58	26.7%
	Informal mentor	52	24.0%
	Formal mentor	78	35.9%
	Both types of mentor	29	13.4%
Mentor during certification	Yes	132	60.9%
	No	85	39.1%
Mentor Discriminator	Yes	178	82%
	No	39	18%
Comments made	Positive comments	86	70.5%
	Negative comments	5	4.1%
	Neutral comments	31	25.4%
		mean	
		sd	
Years as Instructor		6.5	
		4.50	
Years of Service		24.9	
		3.97	

Discussion of Results

Research Question 1

Research question # 1 was, how do mentored and unmentored beginning instructors differ in their perception of a mentorship

program. For this question, questionnaire items 1 through 5, and items 14, 15, and 16 were used. The latter three items correspond to the type of mentoring relationship, if any, and whether a mentor was or was not formally assigned. The question was further delineated by adding another discriminator during the data calculations of whether or not the instructor had a mentor of any type. This discriminator was determined based on how the respondents answered survey items 14, 15, and 16. A yes answer on any of these questions denoted a mentor, a no on all three indicated no mentor. The significance level for all statistical calculations was set at .05.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistic calculations showed a significant difference among instructors who had a formal mentor, had an informal mentor, or both and instructors who had no mentor assigned on questionnaire items # 1 and # 2. "A mentorship program is beneficial for new instructors"; and "assigning mentors should be part of an induction program." Independent *t*-test statistic calculations also showed a significant difference on these survey items for those who had a mentor during certification or had a yes on the mentor discriminator and those who had no mentor.

Unmentored instructors did agree with survey items # 1 and # 2, but not as strongly as mentored instructors, regardless of the type of mentoring relationship. Instructors with formal mentors or with both a formal and informal mentor, however, agreed more strongly with these items than did instructors with informal mentors. The data seem to indicate that instructors with formal mentors, or both, benefit from and believe mentoring should be part of an induction program more than do the informally or unmentored instructors. ANOVA and independent *t*-test statistic calculations did not indicate a significant difference between groups on questionnaire items # 3 and # 4. "Assigning mentors to new instructors helps improve their instructional ability"; and "mentors should not be immediate supervisors or in the chain of command." In addition, there was no significant difference among groups on questionnaire item # 5. "A mentor/protege relationship works best when the mentor is not formally assigned."

The data suggested that having a mentor is the difference in how the groups responded to survey items 1 and 2. Having a mentor, however, did not appear to effect the responses to items 3 and 4. Of special interest are the responses to survey item 5. All groups tended to disagree that "a mentor/protege relationship works best when the mentor is not formally assigned." See Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2 Perception of the Value of Mentoring

	Benefit Item # 1	Part of Program Item #2	Improves Item #3	Not Supvs. Item #4	Not Formally Assigned Item #5
During Induction					
Unmentored (n= 58)	1.31	1.40	1.65	1.80	2.92
Informal Mentor (n= 52)	1.13	1.27	1.51	1.61	2.76
Formal Mentor (n= 78)	1.09	1.12	1.44	1.62	3.10
Both Formal & Informal (n= 29)	1.07	1.17	1.31	1.71	2.75
F- ratio	4.27	3.97	1.79	0.49	1.74
Probability	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.69	0.16

Table 3 Perception of the Value of Mentoring

	Benefit Item #1	Part of Program Item #2	Improves Item #3	Not Supvs. Item #4	Not Formally Assigned Item #5
During Certification	**Mean/ sd**				
Unmentored (n= 85)	1.28/ .508	1.37/ .595	1.55/ .738	1.74/ .998	2.82/ .941
Mentored (n= 132)	1.08/ .292	1.15/ .400	1.46/ .674	1.64/ .949	2.99/ .939
T value	-3.82	-3.16	-0.91	-0.79	-1.24
Probability	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.43	0.22
Mentor Discriminator	**Mean/ sd**				
Unmentored (n= 39)	1.41/ .549	1.51/ .683	1.68/ .782	1.86/ .993	2.80/ .835
Mentored (n= 178)	1.10/ .338	1.17/ .423	1.45/ .676	1.64/ .960	2.95/ .963
T value	-4.56	-3.99	-1.85	-1.29	0.87
Probability	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.19	0.38

Research Question 2

Research question # 2 asked how a mentor helps improve the beginner's instructional practice. Answers to this question were based on survey items 6 through 10, and items 14 through 16.

Comparisons were further refined by adding the mentor discriminator, as previously discussed.

ANOVA statistic calculations did not indicate a difference among groups on questionnaire item # 6, nor did *t*-test calculations on having a mentor during certification. A *t*-test, however, did show a difference in the mentor discriminator area for: "my instruction performance was observed on at least one occasion." ANOVA and independent *t*-test statistic calculations did indicate a significant difference between instructors who had a mentor, formal, informal, or both, and unmentored instructors on questionnaire items # 7, # 9, and # 10. In addition, those who had a mentor during certification and a yes on the mentor discriminator indicated a significant difference versus the unmentored on questionnaire item # 8. These items are: "after observation, I was given feedback about my instructional techniques"; "I was counseled on ways to improve my instructional technique"; "I was shown methods to help eliminate poor instructional habits"; and "I was provided information on course curriculum and available resources." Instructors with formal mentors, or both were in stronger agreement with these questionnaire items than those with an informal or no mentor. The data appear to suggest that having a mentor assists in improving the beginner's practice. The data also indicate that beginners receive more counseling from a mentor during the certification process. There was also a significant difference between the yes and no groups on the mentor discriminator for the same survey item. This finding indicates that having a mentor, regardless of the type, provides beginners with counseling aimed at improving technique.

In addition, instructors with formal mentors, or both, agreed the mentor helped improve their practice by: giving feedback, demonstrating how to eliminate poor habits, and providing information. These data indicate that having a formal mentor, or both, is of greater assistance in the instructor practice area. See Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4 Practice Improvement

	Observed Item #6	Critiqued Item #7	Advised Item #8	Assisted Item #9	Informed Item #10
During Induction					
Unmentored (n= 52)	1.32	1.61	1.98	2.31	1.84
Informal Mentor (n= 52)	1.17	1.60	1.94	2.31	1.58
Formal Mentor (n= 78)	1.06	1.29	1.64	1.84	1.27
Both Formal & Informal (n= 29)	1.24	1.34	1.66	1.93	1.28
F- ratio	2.24	2.73	1.78	2.90	7.09
Probability	0.85	0.04	0.15	0.04	0.00

Table 5 Practice Improvement

	Observed Item #6	Critiqued Item #7	Advised Item #8	Assisted Item #9	Informed Item #10
During Certification	**Mean/ sd**				
Unmentored (n= 85)	1.25/ .709	1.63/ .929	2.06/ 1.14	2.36/ 1.21	1.77/ .974
Mentored (n= 132)	1.14/ .475	1.35/ .642	1.64/ .901	1.92/ 1.02	1.32/ .609
T value	-1.41	-2.64	-2.97	-2.79	-4.23
Probability	0.16	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
Mentor Discriminator	**Mean/ sd**				
Unmentored (n= 39)	1.37/ .883	1.71/ 1.01	2.13/ 1.14	2.49/ 1.24	2.05/ 1.06
Mentored (n= 178)	1.14/ .484	1.40/ .709	1.73/ .979	2.01/ 1.07	1.38/ .680
T value	-2.23	-2.23	-2.20	-2.43	-4.98
Probability	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.00

Research Question 3

Research question # 3 asked how do mentors assist, if at all, the beginner's understanding of the school's operating procedures. Answers were based on survey items 11 and 12, again using items 14 through 16 to create comparison groups. The research question was further delineated by adding the mentor discriminator area.

ANOVA and independent *t*-test statistic calculations showed a significant difference between instructors who had a mentor during certification, were assigned a mentor, had both a formal and informal mentor, or had a yes on the mentor discriminator and instructors with an informal or no mentor and questionnaire items # 11 and # 12.

These items measured: " someone was available to me when I needed assistance regarding non teaching matters", and "I was provided an orientation into the logistical and administrative requirements needed to begin instructing." Instructors with a mentor during certification, a mentor formally assigned, both a formal and informal mentor, and a yes on the mentor discriminator agreed with these statements. Instructors with an informal mentor agreed with: "someone was available to me when I needed assistance regarding non teaching matters", but were toward tend to agree with: "I was provide an orientation into the logistical and administrative requirements needed to begin instructing." Unmentored instructors tended to agree with the former item, but were toward tend to disagree on the latter.

These data appear to indicate that a mentor, especially one formally assigned, assists beginners in learning how the institution operates. Furthermore, unmentored and informally mentored beginners did not indicate receiving non-teaching assistance in the same manner as did the formally mentored group. See Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6 Instructor Orientation

	Helped with Non Teaching Details Item #11	**Provided an Orientation Item #12**
During Induction		
Unmentored (n= 58)	2.07	2.40
Informal Mentor (n= 52)	1.87	2.13
Formal Mentor (n= 78)	1.50	1.69
Both Formal & Informal (n= 29)	1.50	1.90
F- ratio	5.32	6.11
Probability	0.00	0.00

Table 7 Instructor Orientation

	Helped with Non Teaching Details Item #11	Provided an Orientation Item #12
During Certification	**Mean/ sd**	
Unmentored (n= 85)	2.02/ 1.03	2.23/ 1.05
Mentored (n= 132)	1.56/ .826	1.82/ .959
T value	-3.68	-3.62
Probability	0.00	0.00
Mentor Discriminator	**Mean/ sd**	
Unmentored (n= 39)	2.16/ 1.05	2.61/ 1.08
Mentored (n= 178)	1.65/ .887	1.89/ .970
T value	-3.10	-4.06
Probability	0.00	0.00

Research Question 4

Research question # 4 asked how do formally and informally mentored instructors differ in their perception of the mentorship program. Survey items 17 through 23 were used to answer this question. The mentor discriminator area was not used with this research question because non mentored respondents were instructed to skip these survey items. See Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8 Perception of Mentorship Program

	Honed Skill Item #17	Added Polish Item #18	Helped Tech. Item #19	Assess Ability Item #20	Was Role Model Item #21	Gained Know How Item #22	Pre-Pared Item #23
During Ind.	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Inf. Mentor (n=52)	1.48 **n=48**	1.94 **n=49**	1.90 **n=48**	3.00 **n=48**	2.21 **n=48**	2.17 **n=47**	3.00 **n=48**
Formal Mentor (n=78)	1.29 **n=78**	1.50 **n=78**	1.61 **n=77**	2.22 **n=78**	1.54 **n=76**	1.58 **n=76**	2.23 **n=78**
T value	-1.52	-2.77	1.73	-3.97	-4.25	-3.52	-3.79
Prob.	0.13	0.01	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 9 Perception of Mentorship Program

	Honed Skill Item # 17	Added Polish Item #18	Helped Tech. Item #19	Assess Ability Item #20	Was Role Model Item #21	Gained Know How Item #22	Pre-Pared Item #23
During Ind.	**Mean/ sd**	**Mean/ sd**	**Mean/ sd**	**Mean/ sd**	**Mean/ sd**	**Mean/ sd**	**Mean/ sd**
No Mentor (n=85)	1.43/ .728	1.86/ .889	1.81/ .890	3.02/ 1.09	2.10/ .983	2.12/ .954	2.83/ 1.15
Mentor (n=132)	1.28/ .586	1.57/ .864	1.64/ .890	2.23/ 1.10	1.69/ .855	1.70/ .888	2.31/ 1.10
T value	-1.38	-1.85	-1.03	-4.01	-2.52	-2.54	-2.60
Prob.	0.17	0.07	0.30	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01

Independent *t*-test statistic calculations indicated no significant difference between instructors who had a mentor formally assigned and instructors with an informal mentor on questionnaire items # 17 and # 19. These items were: "the mentorship program in my USARF school assists in improving instructor skill and competence", and "having a mentor assisted in improving my instructional techniques." Instructors with a mentor during certification or having a formal mentor were in stronger agreement with items # 17, # 18, and # 19 than the unmentored during certification or instructors with informal mentors. There was a significant difference between the formal and informal groups on questionnaire item, "my mentor was instrumental in helping me to become an effective instructor." This indicates that the formal mentor is perceived to be of assistance to the beginning instructor.

Independent *t*-test statistic calculations indicate a significant difference between instructors groups having a mentor during certification or having a formally assigned mentor and the informally and unmentored during certification groups and questionnaire items # 20, # 21, # 22, and # 23. These items are: "my mentor provided a formal assessment of my instructional abilities"; "my mentor guided my professional development by being a role model"; "my mentor showed me the materials needed to maintain competence and improve practice"; and "without a mentor, I would not have been prepared to instruct my first class."

Instructors who had a mentor during certification or were assigned a mentor generally agreed with questionnaire items # 21, and # 22. These same groups tended to agree with items # 20 and # 23. Instructors with informal mentors agreed with survey items # 17, # 18, and # 19. This same group, however, tended to agree with items # 21 and # 22, and tended to disagree with items # 20 and # 23. The unmentored during certification agreed with item # 17, and tended to agree with items # 18, # 19, # 21, and # 22.

The unmentored during certification also tended to disagree with items # 20 and # 23.

These data appear to suggest that instructors who were mentored during the certification process or had a formal mentor assigned better understand their technical abilities and are prepared to begin instructing. These same groups also appear to indicate the mentor helped guide their professional development and assisted them to maintain technical competence. The data also seem to suggest that the informally mentored and the unmentored do not perceive mentorship in the same context. That is, the data suggest that the formally mentored seem to value mentorship whereas the informally and unmentored during certification place a lesser importance on the perceived value of mentorship. Having a mentor during the certification process was not part of research question # 4. The data and findings are reported because they add value to the study.

Data Interpretations

In response to research question # 1, the data appear to indicate that instructors who had a "formal mentor/protege" pairing agreed that a mentorship program is beneficial and assigning mentors to beginning instructors should be part of an induction program. Furthermore, this same group agrees that a mentor helps the beginner improve their instructional ability. Instructors with an informal mentor and unmentored instructors agreed slightly less than the formal mentor group. These observations by the formally mentored are in are in agreement with the findings of Franceschini and Butler (1987), who stated their research showed that formal mentoring programs did not produce unhealthy climates.

In response to research question # 2, instructors who had a formal mentor agreed that they: were given feedback about instructional techniques; were counseled on ways to improve techniques; were shown methods to help eliminate poor habits; and were provided information on course curriculum and available resources. Instructors with informal mentors agreed but less strongly with these items. Instructors with no mentor tended to agree they: were counseled on ways to improve techniques; were shown methods to help eliminate poor habits; and were provided information on course curriculum and available resources.

Finally, instructors with a mentor during certification agreed they: were given feedback about instructional techniques; were counseled on ways to improve techniques; were shown methods to help eliminate poor habits; and were provided information on course curriculum and available resources.

The formally mentored groups' responses are in agreement with Varah,Theune, and Parker (1986) who found that beginners

stated observation and feedback were both helpful and welcome. The data also appear to agree with the findings of Hoffman, et. al.(1986) that the mentor was a source of valued information.

In response to research question # 3, formally mentored instructors agreed that the mentor provided assistance with non teaching matters and provided an orientation into the administrative and logistical requirements. Those with an informal mentor agreed that the mentor provided assistance and tended to agree the mentor gave an orientation. Instructors with no mentor tend to agree with the assistance statement, but were toward tend to disagree that they received an orientation. The mentored groups' responses are in agreement with Holmes (1986) and with Huling-Austin and Murphy (1987).

Holmes (1986) found that 83% of his subjects stated the mentor was the major source for beginner orientation. In a similar finding Huling-Austin and Murphy (1987) reported it was the mentor beginners most often turned to, and the mentor provided assistance in the learning administrative procedures and school policies.

In response to research question # 4, formally mentored instructors and those with a mentor during certification agreed with questionnaire items: #17, mentorship in my USARF school assists in improving instructor skill and competence; # 18, my mentor was instrumental in helping me become an effective instructor; # 19, having a mentor assisted in improving my instructional abilities; # 21, my mentor guided my professional development by being a role model; and # 22, my mentor showed me the materials needed to maintain competence and improve practice. These same groups tended to agree with items: # 20, my mentor provided a formal assessment of my instructional abilities, and item # 23, without a mentor I would not have been prepared to instruct my first class.

Instructors with informal mentors agreed with items # 17, # 18, and # 19, and tended to agree with items # 21 and # 22. The formally mentored instructor groups, however, were in stronger agreement with these survey items than were the informally mentored group. Informally mentored instructors tend to disagree with survey items # 20 and # 23, whereas instructors with formal mentors tend to agree with these items. The data seem to indicate that instructors with informal mentors did not receive the same assistance as did the formally mentored groups.

The responses to research question # 4 seem to agree with the findings of Odell and Ferraro (1992), Warring and Lindquist (1989), and Xu and Newman (1987). Odell and Ferraro's (1992) survey of beginning teachers found that mentors were available when needed, helpful, supportive, and provided feedback. Warring and Lindquist (1989) found that mentors provided beginners with a role model to emulate in pursuit of professional development. In

addition, Xu and Newman's (1987) study of mentors in a higher education setting found that they performed important functions for their proteges. Furthermore, higher education beginner's "problems" parallel those of teachers in K through 12.

Of significant interest are the responses made by the survey participants in the open ended comments section. As previously reported, 70.4% of the comments were positive, only 4.1% were negative, the remainder were neutral. Examples of negative comments are as follows:

"Mentorship should be on an individual basis, waste of resources to have full time mentors for those who don't require it."

"I had three separate mentors. Two were excellent, one had no business instructing. Believe mentors should be assigned carefully."

Examples of positive comments are as follows:

"Without the mentorship I experienced during certification, I would have been behind the eight ball."

"Mentorship is a critical part of this program."Respondent in favor of mentorship, but adds "mentors can beeffective if they take on the role my USARF mentor did not."

"CAS3/CGSOC is too comprehensive with too much material for the new instructor to instruct effectively and maintain standards without a certified instructor mentor."

"Strong advocate for a mentorship program! It is utilized at my college where I instruct. Start it --- NOW!"

"The real help of a mentor will be with all the administrative details of teaching."

"I believe the concept of mentorship is vital in all institutions and organizations, greatly improves the quality of instruction and enhances instructor qualifications."

"I worked with an instructor for eight weekends and during Annual Training. It helped quite a bit, even though I worked informally."

"Mentor process is essential and should be used as a model for other ranks and in private industry. I cannot speak more highly of it. Please call me if you like."

"I feel that a mentorship program is essential for all new CAS3/ CGSOC instructors. The program provided me insight, helped my preparation, and most importantly provided me several views/ approaches while watching/observing experienced instructors."

"It is essential to have a mentorship program. No one could start from ground zero without help."

"A mentorship program (formal or informal) is very important in any instructor environment."

These responses indicated that the overwhelming majority of participants who added open ended comments strongly believe that mentoring is desirable, essential, important, and beneficial. In addition, more than 8% of these responses indicated that a formal mentoring program was needed. These responses support and confirm the data interpretations previously reported.

Summary of Findings

This study focused on the perceived value of mentoring for beginning USARF school instructors. The study included 267 subjects (instructors) with different mentor/protege relationships. Each subject was surveyed by questionnaire distributed via the U.S. Postal Service. A total of 221 responses were received, yielding a return rate of 82.8%; 217 of the responses were usable or 81.3% of the survey population.

The major findings of the study are as follows: First, research question 1, asked how do mentored and unmentored beginning instructors differ in their perception of a mentorship program? Most respondents felt that mentoring was beneficial for beginning instructors and should be part of an induction program. The formally mentored agreed with this concept, instructors with informal or no mentors also agreed, but to a lesser degree. All groups tended to disagree that a mentor/protege relationship works best when the mentor is not formally assigned.

Second, research question 2, asked how do the mentors improve, if at all, the beginner's instructional practice? The formally mentored instructors agreed they were observed, given feedback, counseled on ways to improve technique, helped to eliminate poor instructional habits, and provided information on course curriculum and available resources by their mentor. Informally and unmentored instructors agreed in part with these statements. These groups, however, agreed to a significantly lesser extent that they were counseled on ways to improve technique or helped to eliminate poor instructional habits.

Third, research question 3, asked how do mentors assist, if at all, the beginner's understanding of the school's operating procedures? Instructors with formal mentors agreed they were provided an orientation into the school's administrative and logistical requirements, and were assisted with non teaching matters. The informally mentored and unmentored instructors tended to agree they were assisted with non teaching matters.

The unmentored and informally mentored groups also tended toward disagree that they received an orientation into the school's administrative and logistical procedures.

Fourth, research question 4 asked, how do formally and informally mentored instructors differ in their perception of the mentorship program? Instructors with formal mentors generally agreed that the mentor: 1) was instrumental in helping the beginner to become an effective instructor, 2) aided professional development by being a role model, and 3) provided materials to help maintain competence and improve practice. Informally mentored instructors tended to agree with these statements. Both groups tended to disagree that mentors provided a formal assessment of their instructional abilities, or that without a mentor they would not have been prepared to instruct.

Finally, respondents were given the opportunity to add un-restricted comments at the end of the survey. Comments were coded as positive, negative, or neutral. Positive comments about mentoring for beginning instructors were received from 70.4% of the respondents. Only 4.1% of the comments were negative, the remainder were neutral.

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Study Summary

In 1992, the U.S. Army embraced a new concept for institutional (schoolhouse) training. The concept called the Total Army School System (TASS) has as one of its precepts the mandated certification of instructors. The Army sees certification as the method to achieve a "standardization in the delivery of instruction."

This study was developed to determine if beginning instructors required additional assistance in transition from learner to practitioner. Further, the study attempted to ascertain if a mentoring program for beginners provided this kind of assistance and was deemed beneficial. U.S. Army Reserve instructors were the study's target audience because of the "part-time" military status.

The following research questions were posed: 1) how do mentored and unmentored beginning instructors differ in their perception of a mentorship program?, 2) how do mentors improve, if at all, the beginner's instructional practice?, 3) how do mentors assist, if at all, the beginner's understanding of the school's operating procedures?, and 4) how do formally and informally mentored instructors differ in their perception of the mentorship program?

The literature supports assistance programs for beginning instructors, and calls for an end to the "do-or-die" mentality that beginners face in their initial teaching experience. Only in the teaching profession are novices expected to take the same responsibilities as the veteran. The literature calls for induction programs to address the needs of the beginner and states that mentoring is the most effective and provides the best cost-benefit ratio. There is some caution about mentor programs. Programs that are developed without guidelines and objectives to be achieved are destined to failure.

A survey designed to gauge the value of a mentoring program was mailed to 267 U.S. Army Reserve instructors who had varying mentoring experiences. The instructor list was provided by the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Survey was mailed on December 30, 1996, follow-up postcards were mailed on January 20, 1997, the final survey mailing was February 7, 1997. Total response rate was 82.8%, 81.3% usable. Data was entered into a spread sheet format. ANOVA and *t*-test statistic calculations were used to determine the difference between mean responses of instructors who had a mentor during certification, were assigned a formal mentor, had an informal mentor or were unmentored.

The findings suggest that formally mentored instructors agree that mentoring is beneficial and should be part of an induction program. Informally and non mentored instructors also agreed, but to a lesser degree. All groups tended to disagree that a mentor/protege relationship works best when the mentor is not formally assigned. The formally mentored group agreed they were observed, were provided feedback, were counseled to improve technique, and helped to eliminate poor practice. The informally and non mentored groups agreed they were observed and provided feedback, but only tended to agree they were counseled about technique or were assisted to eliminate poor practice.

The formally mentored group agreed they received assistance with non teaching matters, and an orientation into administrative and logistical requirements. The informally and non mentored groups tended to agree with receiving assistance, but tended to disagree they were oriented into the administrative and logistical requirements.

Formally mentored instructors agreed the mentor helped them become an effective instructor, guided professional development by being a role model, and showed the materials necessary to maintain competence and improve practice. The informally mentored group only tended to agree with these statements. Both groups tended to disagree that mentors provided a formal assessment of their instructional abilities or that they would not have been prepared for their first class if they had not had a mentor.

Conclusion

The data indicate that beginning instructors strongly agree that mentoring is beneficial and should be part of an induction program. In addition, formally mentored instructors are guided in to improve practice, assisted with administrative, logistical and other non teaching matters to a greater degree than instructors with and informal or no mentor.

The data also show that mentoring is helpful to the beginner as he/she makes the transition from learner (student) to practitioner (instructor). Further, it is the formal mentor/ protege relationship that provides the most help to the beginner. The scope of the study did not attempt to gauge the unmentored beginners' perceptions of any type of assistance as measured by by questionnaire items # 17 through # 23. We can infer from the responses of the informally mentored to the same questionnaire items that the unmentored would have received little if any assistance.

A formal mentorship program, as indicated by the data, provided more benefits to the beginner, is preferred, promoted good practice, and is viewed as a healthy relationship. In addition, the data indicated that instructors who had no mentor

or an informal mentor also agree with the potential value of a mentorship program. In conclusion, it is the formal mentor/ beginning instructor relationship that is in the best interests of Army Reserve instructors if it is designed, implemented, and administered effectively.

This conclusion is reached from responses of the survey participants. Those with formal mentors strongly agreed that mentoring was beneficial, needed, assisted in promoting better instruction technique, helped with orientation and non teaching matters, and was perceived more highly. Further, as noted in the open ended comments and the literature review programs with no goals, objectives, or guidelines are not helpful/useful.

Implications for Practice

The data seem to indicate that beginning instructors with a formal mentor, either during certification or at the institution: 1) are assisted on ways to improve instruction, 2) are helped to maintain competence and improve practice, 3) are provided an orientation in such non teaching matters as administrative and logistical requirements, 4) are provided a role model to emulate, and 5) are provided advice and assisted in preparing to instruct their first class. Furthermore, formally mentored instructors indicate that mentoring is beneficial for beginners. While instructors with informal mentors also view mentoring as beneficial, they did not indicate receiving the same type or level of assistance as did the formally mentored group.

The data analysis revealed that assigning formal mentors to beginning USAR instructors should become a matter of practice. Informal mentors do provide assistance but not in the same proportion as the formal mentor.

Care should be taken in choosing a mentor, and the literature clearly indicates that volunteers make better mentors. Mentor training is also necessary, as well as a defined set of goals and objectives for both mentors and a mentoring program. In addition, the data indicated that assigning a mentor during the certification process produces a more prepared instructor. Finally, the data analysis showed that assigning a mentor during induction provides the beginner with an understanding of the institutions policies and procedures.

Care must be taken in choosing mentors because, as Ryan (1986) says, the only thing worse than having no mentor is having an ineffective one. Mentors also require training, for programs not only must goals and objectives be set, but mentors must know what they are and receive training in ways to help achieve them. The certification process not only attests to the beginner's knowledge, but to his/her technical skills as well. Assigning a mentor during certification will assist the beginner with the technical skills. Finally, it is imperative to orient the

beginner to the institution and its policies and procedures. Assigning a mentor to the beginner during newcomer orientation accomplishes these tasks and assists the beginners transition from student to practitioner.

Recommendations for Further Research

Future research on mentoring for USAR instructors should focus on the difference between those mentored during the certification process versus instructors mentored as part of induction by their institution. Specifically, this research should determine which mentored instructors perform better against a defined set of measurable standards. Results from this type of study would enable the efficient use of resources.

Future research should also investigate the use of feedback as part of mentoring. Survey respondents gave opposing answers to similar questions. All groups agreed that they received feedback about their performance, but tended to disagree that they received a formal assessment of their instructional abilities. This question needs to be answered about whether or not feedback is considered a formal assessment. It is possible the respondents confused formal assessment with an efficiency rating. Another part of this research should investigate how instructors are observed. Respondents in this study acknowledge feedback, but not observation. This apparent contradiction should be resolved.

Research is needed to answer whether assigning mentors directly or asking for volunteers to act as mentors is better. From the data in this study it appears that the formal mentor/protege relationship is better, but we do not know if these mentors were assigned or volunteered for the duty.

Formal mentorship programs, at least in this kind of hierarchial organization, appear to benefit the novice. This type of mentor/protege relationship should not be discarded on the basis of needing a "good fit." Recommend further study of formal mentor/protege relationships with regard to program effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability.

Finally, as supported by both the literature and the survey data an appropriate amount of study must be devoted prior to developing and implementing a mentoring program. For a program to be successful, goals and objectives must be clearly defined and set. The program, however, should have a general outline so that it can be adapted to the individual novices' differences. A training program for mentors is necessary prior to beginning, and volunteers should be solicited to serve as mentors. If the mentoring relationship is not mutually beneficial, proteges should not be constrained, within reason, from choosing a different mentor.

Mentoring within the education community has become the "buzz" term of the 1980s and 1990s. It is not an end all and be all, but mentors can provide assistance to both new instructors and those "oldsters" in a new system. Mentoring is not a new concept to education, although the term may be. Whether they are called mentors, buddy teachers, help mates, or coaches the premise of assisting new instructors to be more productive, effective, efficient, and smoothing the transition from learner to practitioner makes sense.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E. M., & Shannon, A. L. (1988). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. Journal of Teacher Education. 39 (1), 38-42.

Applegate, J., Flora, V., Johnston, J., Lasley, T., Mager, G., Newman, K., & Ryan, K (1977). The first year teacher study. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Bey, T. M. (1990). A new knowledge base for an old practice. In Bey, T. M., and Holmes, C. T. (Eds.), Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers, (p. 51-73). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Blackburn, J. (1977). The first-year teacher: Perceived needs, intervention strategies and results. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 768).

Blotnick, S. (1984). With friends like these. Savvy 5, (10), 42-52.

Bullough, R. V. (1989). First-year teacher: A case study. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bullough, R. V., & Gitlin, A. D. (1994). Challenging teacher as training: Four propositions. Journal of Education Teaching, 20, (1), 67-80.

Bullough, R. V., & Stokes, D. K. (1994). Analyzing personal metaphors in preservice teacher education as a means for encouraging professional development. American Education Research Journal, 31 (1), 197-224.

Burke, P. J. (1987). Teacher development: induction, renewal, and redirection. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis.

Clark, C. M. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teacher thinking. Educational Researcher 17, 5-12.

Clark, D. L., & McNergney, R. F. (1990). Governance of teacher education. In Houston, W. R. (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education, (p. 101-118). New York: Macmillan.

Cruickshank, D. R. (1981). What we know about teachers' problems. Educational Leadership, 38, 402-405.

Daloz, L. (1986). Effective teaching and mentoring. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). Accountability and Professionalism. American Educator 12, 8-13.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1988). The evolution of teacher policy (JRE-01). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teachers and teaching: Signs of a changing profession. In Houston, W. R. (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education, (p. 267-290). New York: Macmillan.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). Perestroika and professionalism: The case for restructuring teacher preparation. In R. M. McClure (Ed.), Excellence in teacher education: Helping teachers develop learner centered schools, (p. 9-27). Washington, DC: NEA.

DeBolt, G. (1992). Mentoring as part of induction. In DeBolt, G. (Ed.), Teacher induction and mentoring, (p. 35-48). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Evertson, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1985). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (3), 2-12.

Fessler, R. (1990). The teacher as leader. In Burke, P., Heideman, R., & Heideman, C. (Eds.), Programming for staff development: fanning the flame, (p. 57-67). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis.

Fox, S. M., & Singletary, T. J. (1986) Deductions about supportive induction. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 12-15.

Franceschini, L. A. & Butler, E. D. (1987). Fifth-year induction internships and mentor roles. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, AL, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 725).

Fullan, M. (1995). Contexts: Overview and framework. In O'Hair, M. J. & Odell, S. J. (Eds), Educating teachers for leadership and change, (p. 1-10). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers: a review of the literature. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 6-11.

Gehrke, N. J. (1986). On preserving the essence of mentoring as one form of teacher leadership. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (1) 43-45.

Gehrke, N. J. (1991 Spring). Seeing our way to better helping of beginning teachers. The Educational Forum, 55, 233-242.

Gilley, J. W., & Eggland, S. A. (1989). Principles of human resource development. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.

Gomez, D. L., & Grobe, D. L. (1990, March). Three years of alternative certification in Dallas: Where are we? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Americal Educational Research Association, Boston.

Gordon, S. J. (1991). How to help beginning teachers succeed. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Hardcastle, B. (1988). Spiritual Connections: Proteges' reflections on significant mentorships. Theory into Practice, XXVII (3), 201-208.

Haipt, M. (1990). A guide for the voyage. Momentum (November), 16-19.

Hawk, P. P. & Robards, S. N. (1987). Statewide teacher induction programs. In Brooks, D. M. (Ed), Teacher induction - a new beginning, (p. 24-40). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Hawley, W. D. (1990). Systematic analysis, public policy making, and teacher education. In Houston, W. R. (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education, (p. 136-156). New York: Macmillan.

Henry, M. A. (1988). Project Credit: Certification renewal experiences designed to improve teaching. A cooperative multiple-support program for first-year teachers between Indiana State University and to Public School districts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 681).

Hoffman, J. V., Edwards, S. A., O'Neal, S. F., Barnes, S., & Paulissen, M. O. (1986). A study of state-mandated beginning teacher programs. Journal of Teacher Education 37 (1), 16-21.

Holmes, D. H. (1986). A study of the intern-mentor program District of Columbia Public Schools. Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 077).

Howey, K. R., & Zimpher, N. L. (1994 Winter). Nontraditional contexts for learning to teach. The Educational Forum, 58, 155-161.

Huffman, G., & Leak, S. (1986). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentors. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 22-25.

Huling-Austin, L., Putman, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). MTIP satellite conference proceedings. Report No. 7209. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, (ERIC Document Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 442).

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot be reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 2-5.

Huling-Austin, L. (1987). Teacher induction. In Brooks, D. M. (Ed.), Teacher induction - a new beginning, (p. 3-23). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Huling-Austin, L., & Murphy, S. C. (1987). Assessing the impact of teacher induction programs: Implications for program development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 779).

Huling-Austin, L. (1989). Beginning teacher programs: An overview. In Huling-Austin, L., Odell, S. J., Ishler, P., Kay, R. S., & Edelfelt, R. A. (Ed.), Assisting the beginning teachers, (p. 5-18). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Mentoring is squishy business. In Bey, T. M., & Holmes, C. T. (Eds.), Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers, (p. 39-50). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Ishler, P. & Edelfelt, R. A. (1989). Impact of beginning teacher assistance programs. In Huling-Austin, L., Odell, S. J., Ishler, P., Kay, R. S., & Edelfelt, R. A. (Eds.), Assisting the beginning teacher, (p. 57-78). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Ishler, P., & Kester, R. (1987). Professional organizations and teacher induction: Initiatives and positions. In Brooks, D. M. (Ed.), Teacher induction - a new beginning, (p. 61-68). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Johnston, J. M. (1985). Teacher induction: Problems, roles, and guidelines. In Burke, P. J., & Heideman, R. G. (Eds.), Career-long teacher education, (p.194-222). Springfield, IL Charles C. Thomas.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 62 (2), 192-169.

Kaplan, L. (1994 Winter). Teacher certification: Collaborative reform. The Educational Forum, 58, 169-172.

Kay, R. S. (1990). A definition of developing self-reliance. In Bey, T. M. & Holmes, C. T. (Eds.), Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers, (p. 25-37). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

King, M. B. (1994). Locking ourselves in: National standards for the teaching profession. Teaching & Teacher Education, (10) (1), 95-108.

Knauth, S. (1994 Winter). Teachers for Chicago: Changing the connections. The Educational Forum, 58, 209-213.

Koop, W. (1994 Winter). Teach for America: Moving beyond the debate. The Educational Forum, 58, 187-192.

Lanier, J., & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, (p. 527-569). New York, NY: MacMillan.

Lasley, T. J. (1986). Teacher induction: Programs and Research. Journal of Teacher Education 37 (1), 1.

Little, J. W. (1981). School success and staff development: The role of staff development in urban desegregated schools. Boulder, CO: Center for Action Research.

Little, J.W. (1990). The "mentor" phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. In C. Cazden (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, 16, 297-351.

Mager, G. (1992). The place of induction in becoming a teacher. In DeBolt, G. (Ed.), Teacher induction and mentoring, (p. 3-33). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

McDonald, F. J. (1980). Study of induction programs for beginning teachers: Vol. 1 The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

McKibben, M., & Ray, L. (1994 Winter). A guide for alternative certification program improvement. The Educational Forum, 58, 201-208.

Merriam, S. B., Thomas, T. K., & Zeph, C. P. (1987 Winter). Mentoring in higher education: What we know now. The Review of Higher Education, II (2), 199-210.

Neuman, R. A. (1994 April). Reconsidering emergency teaching certificates and alternative certification programs as responses to teacher shortages. Urban Education, 29 (1), 89-108.

Newcombe, E. (1988). Mentoring programs for new teachers. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Odell, S. J. (1986). Induction support for new teachers: A functional approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 26-29.

Odell, S. J. (1987). Teacher induction: Rationale and issues, In Brooks, D. M. (Ed.), Teacher induction - a new beginning, (p. 69-80). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Odell, S. J., Loughlin, C. E., & Ferraro, D. P. (1987). Functional approach to identification of new teacher needs in an induction context. Action in Teacher Education, 8 (4), 51-57.

Odell, S. J. (1989). Developing support programs for beginning teachers. In Huling-Austin, L., Odell, S. J., Ishler, P., Kay, R. S., & Edelfelt, R. A. (Eds.), Assisting the beginning teacher, (p. 19-38). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Odell, S. J. (1990). Support for new teachers in mentoring. In Bey, T. M. & Holmes, C. T. (Eds.), Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers, (p. 3-23). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Odell, S. J., & Ferraro, D. P. (1992). Collaborative teacher induction. In DeBolt, G. (Ed.), Teacher induction and mentoring, (p. 51-74). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Parkay, F. W. (1988). Reflections of a protege. Theory into Practice, XXVII (3), 195-200.

Parker, L. S. (1990). A prototypic human resources model. In Burke, P., Heideman, R., & Heideman, C. (Eds.), Programming for staff development: Fanning the flame. (p. 87-116) Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor, Francis.

Pultorak, E. G. (1994 March). Teacher Assessment: A dimensional change. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 65 (3), 70-73.

Queralt, M. (1982). The role of the mentor in career development of university faculty members and academic administrators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 3 April 1982, Indianapolis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 216 614).

Reinhartz, J. (1989). The teacher induction process: Preserving the old and welcoming the new. In Reinhartz, J. (Ed.), Teacher induction, (p. 4-12). Washington, DC: NEA.

Romantowski, J. A., Dorminey, J. J., & Van Vorhees, B. (1989). Teacher induction programs: A report. September 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 525).

Ryan, K. (1986). The induction of new teachers. Bloomington, IN: PDK Educational Foundation.

Shapiro, B. C. (1993 September). A boost for teachers? How national board certification would work ... and what's in it for you. Vocational Education Journal, 68 (6), 28-29,54.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching. Harvard Educational Review, 57 (1), 1-27.

Smylie, M.A., & Denny, J.W. (1989). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Sparks, D. (1994 Winter). Staff development implications of national board certification: An interview with NBPTS's James Smith, Journal of Staff Development, 15 (1), 58-59.

Stafford, D., & Barrow, G. (1994 Winter). Houston's alternative certification program, The Educational Forum, 58, 193-200.

Summers, J. A. (1987). Summative evaluation report: Project CREDIT. Terre Haute, IN: Indiana State University.

Talbert, B., Camp, W., & Heath-Camp, B. (1992 Winter). A review and synthesis of the literature on teacher induction: The vocational education perspective, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 29 (2), 35-50.

Teacher mentoring (1986). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, ERIC Digest, (7).

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentor training: A working model. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (6), 13-20.

Total Army school system (1995). Fort Monroe, VA: Training and Doctrine Command.

Tyson, H. (1994). Who will teach the children?: Progress and resistance in teacher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

United States Army Reserve forces schools (1992). Fort Monroe, VA: Training and Doctrine Command.

Van Ast, J. (1992 December). Induction experiences and needs for preparing Vo-Tec instructors without teachers education background. A position paper presented to the American Vocational Association, Saint Louis, MO.

Varah, L. J., Theune, W. S., & Parker, L. (1986). Beginning teachers: Sink or swim. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (1), 30-34.

Warring, D. F., & Lindquist, L. (February 1989). A collaborative mentor-mentee program based in the Bloomington, Minnesota Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302 328).

Waters, L. B., & Bernhardt, V. L. (1989). Providing effective induction program support teachers: It's not as easy as it looks. In Reinhartz, J. (Ed.), Teacher induction, (p. 52-60). Washington, DC: NEA.

Wildman, T. M., Niles, J. A., Magliaro, S. G., McLaughlin, R. A., & Drill, L. G. (1987). Virginia's colleague teacher project: Focus on beginning teachers' adaption to teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Willis, P. L. (1994). Staffing our schools. The Education Forum, 58, 173-179.

Wise, A. E. (1994). Teaching the teachers. The American School Board Journal, 181 (6), 22-25.

Wise, A. E. (1994). Choosing between professionalism and amateurism, The Educational Forum, 58, 139-146.

Xu, M. & Newman, D. (1987). Mentoring new faculty in higher education setting. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 428).

Zey, M. (1984). The mentor connection. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones-Irwin.

Zeichner, K. M. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in pre-service teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (6), 45-55.

Zimpher, N. L., & Rieger, S. R. (1988). Mentoring teachers: What are the issues? Theory into Practice XXVII (3), 175-181.

APPENDIX A
Data Collection Instrument
(Questionnaire)

MENTORING DURING THE INDUCTION PERIOD

Some beginning USARF school instructors report that having a mentor during the induction period provides assistance in learning teaching techniques, insight into the institution's standard operating procedures, as well as support and encouragement. The following statements deal with mentorship, in general, and with assistance or guidance you may have received during your induction program or the initial stages of your teaching a USARF course. Whether you have or have not had a mentor, please indicate your agreement or disagreement to each statement, using the following scale:

1 = Agree; 2 = Tend to agree; 3 = Tend to disagree; 4 = Disagree

1. A mentorship program is beneficial for new instructors.	1	2	3	4
2. Assigning mentors to new instructors should be part of an induction program.	1	2	3	4
3. Having mentors assigned to new instructors helps improve their instructional ability.	1	2	3	4
4. Mentors should not be immediate supervisors or in the chain of command.	1	2	3	4
5. A mentor/protege relationship works best when the mentor is not formally assigned.	1	2	3	4
6. My instruction performance was observed on at least one occasion.	1	2	3	4
7. After observation, I was given feedback about my instructional techniques.	1	2	3	4
8. I was counseled on ways to improve my instructional techniques.	1	2	3	4
9. I was shown methods to help me eliminate poor instructional habits.	1	2	3	4
10. I was provided information on course curriculum and available resources.	1	2	3	4
11. Someone was available to me when I needed assistance regarding non teaching matters.	1	2	3	4
12. I was provided an orientation into the the logistical and administrative requirements needed to begin instructing.	1	2	3	4

MENTORING DURING THE INDUCTION PERIOD

13. I was able to gain insight into the organization's mechanics and procedures. 1 2 3 4

Please indicate your experience with mentors by circling Yes or No:

14. I was assigned a mentor during the certification process. Yes No

15. I was assigned a mentor during the new instructor induction period. Yes No

16. I had an informal mentor during the induction period, one who was not formally assigned. Yes No

If you answered NO to both 15 and 16 above, please skip to item 24. If you answered YES to either item, please indicate your agreement or disagreement to each of the following items, using the scale:

1 = Agree; 2 = Tend to agree; 3 = Tend to disagree; 4 = Disagree

17. Mentorship program in my USARF school assists in improving instructor skill and competence. 1 2 3 4

18. My mentor was instrumental in helping me to become an effective instructor. 1 2 3 4

19. Having a mentor assisted in improving my instructional techniques. 1 2 3 4

20. My mentor provided a formal assessment of my instructional abilities. 1 2 3 4

21. My mentor guided my professional development by being a role model. 1 2 3 4

22. My mentor showed me the materials needed to maintain competence and improve practice. 1 2 3 4

23. Without a mentor, I would not have been prepared to instruct my first class. 1 2 3 4

MENTORING DURING THE INDUCTION PERIOD

Please indicate your instructor experience by circling the appropriate response or by filling in the blank to the right:

24. Currently, I teach:	1. CAS3 2. CGSOC 3. BOTH
25. Previously, I taught:	1. CAS3 2. CGSOC 3. BOTH
26. I am employed as a school teacher/college professor.	1. YES 2. NO
27. My USARF school has an induction program.	1. YES 2. NO
28. I have been an Army Reserve instructor for:	_____ years.
29. I have been in the Army for:	_____ years.

Please add any additional comments that you may have about mentorship.

_
_
_
_

Thank you.

APPENDIX B
Letter of Instruction

December 30, 1996

Dear USARF School Instructor:

I need your help in completing a project. I am attempting to determine the value, if any, a mentoring program has for beginning instructors. Specifically, if it helps the new instructor improve his/her teaching practice, assists in learning the institution's policies and procedures, and whether a formal or informal mentoring program works best. Because I am an Army Reserve soldier, serving on active duty, U.S. Army Reserve Forces (USARF) school instructors are my focus.

If a mentoring program proves of value for beginning instructors, the Army may consider changing the way instructors are trained and developed. Your response(s) to the enclosed questionnaire will help determine if a change is warranted.

Your name has been provided to me by the Command and General Staff College as a certified instructor for the course you teach. I have been given approval to conduct this study. There is no attempt to take issue with any instructor, USARF school, or the Command and General Staff College. Both you and your answers will be provided anonymity.

I ask that you complete the enclosed questionnaire, whether you had a mentor or not, and return to me in the enclosed pre-addressed and stamped envelope. In addition, you will find a pre-addressed and stamped post card. Please sign and return the post card separately. This indicates that you have received and completed the questionnaire. Receipt of the post card allows me to verify that you received and completed the questionnaire. The questionnaires, return envelopes, and post cards have not been coded, thereby guaranteeing anonymity.

Finally, I ask that you complete and return both the questionnaire and post card within two weeks. Thank you for your participation in the survey. If you need to contact me, please feel free to call me collect (804) 930-9404 after 5:00 PM.

Sincerely,

Frederick K. Read

VITA

Frederick Kelly (Rick) Read

Place of Birth:	Covington, Kentucky
Date of Birth:	August 8, 1939
Education:	National-Louis University - BA 1989 Behavioral Sciences Lindenwood College - MS 1991 MBA (Human Resources Management)

Positions Held:

All positions listed are with the U.S. Army.

Staff Administrator	1979-81
Operations & Training Noncommissioned Officer	1981-85
Division Personnel Manager	1985-86
Student	1986-87
Directorate Personnel Manager	1987-91
Senior Enlisted Trainer	1991-1994
Senior Enlisted (Army Reserve) Advisor to U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command	1994-