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Title: Perceptions of Mentoring and Induction in the State of Arkansas (Under the direction of Dr. David Bangs)

This study examined the perceptions of novice teachers and mentors concerning the Arkansas model of mentoring. The independent variables of roles of the teachers (mentor teacher versus novice teacher) and gender (male versus female) were compared among the dependent variable for the overall score and its component parts that measured attitudes represented by scores related to activities, funding, time, and use of Pathwise®. A sample of teachers in Arkansas public schools who were employed as novice teachers ($n = 160$) or as mentors ($n = 158$) who have been involved in the process as outlined by the Arkansas Department of Education-Office of Teacher Quality was surveyed. A review of the literature identified the various aspects of effective mentoring programs, as well as, the details of the Arkansas model of mentoring.

The researcher used a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA to test for interaction effects as well as the main effects of each hypothesis. To test the hypotheses, the researcher used a Bonferroni adjusted alpha of .01 level of significance. Since there was no significant interaction between the variables of gender and role, the main effect of each variable was examined separately. Results indicated that for the compiled or overall score on the survey questionnaire the main effect for gender was significant, $F(1, 313) = 11.252, p =$
.001, $ES = .035$. For the funding score, the main effect for role was significant, $F (1, 313) = 15.598, p = .000, ES = .047$. Finally, for the Pathwise® score, the main effect for gender was significant, $F (1, 313) = 7.050, p = .008, ES = .022$.

Findings of the study were consistent with the literature in terms of teachers’ perceptions related to mentoring in general. The study did indicate that in relation to mentoring overall, females ranked items on the survey higher than their male counterparts did. In the scores related to the use of Pathwise® as a model for mentoring, females again ranked items on the survey higher than their male counterparts. Another difference was noted between novices and mentors in the area of funding where novices ranked items higher than did mentors.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Mentoring has ancient roots having its genesis in Homer’s epic, *The Odyssey* (trans. 1961), as Odysseus entrusts the care of his material possessions and his son, Telemachus, to a man named Mentor. Mentor becomes Telemachus’s guide through life and even accompanies him on his voyage to find his father. This relationship begins a journey where the young, inexperienced Telemachus is able to learn from a well-experienced and seasoned person who is willing to lead him. Today, this neophyte-mentor relationship is being forged in a variety of professional communities including education (Tauer, 1996). Studies have examined these relationships (Cambria, 2006; Ezell, 2005; Giebelhaus & Bowman, 2002; Rauch, 2005; Sandoval, 2005; Tauer, 1996); however, an additional focus is the connection of mentoring to the successful completion of assessments leading to licensure in the field of education. Likewise, research about appropriate mentoring, mentor-novice pairing, and successful licensure attempts are also in a state of genesis. In Arkansas, mentoring and induction is relatively new, having begun in the late 1990s with research and pilot programs and then having been made a requirement for the licensure process in the early 2000s (Bolich, 2001). Currently, all novice teachers in Arkansas are a part of a formalized and mandated induction process that ultimately leads to licensure.
An effective mentoring program has a variety of components that may vary in their perceived importance. In Arkansas, the mandated components for mentoring and induction are determined by the Arkansas Department of Education – Office of Teacher Quality (ADE-OTC) (2007b).

Sweeny (2001) suggests that an effective program should contain 15 different characteristics ranging from differentiated tasks assigned to the mentors to ensuring that the various portions of the mentoring model that is selected be clearly defined and clear expectations are communicated. These characteristics may have varying degrees of importance as perceived by those involved in the mentoring/induction process. Likewise, Curran and Goldrick (2002) state that there are several attributes that a successful mentoring program will exhibit. The question exists, however, as to whether or not the components as mandated by the ADE-OTQ contain activities that those involved in the process feel are important. To that end, this study seeks to determine the perceptions of novice teachers and mentors in relation to these components.

Statement of the Problem

First, the purpose of this study is to determine the differences of how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the overall mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Second, the purpose of this study is to determine the differences between how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the activities component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Third, the purpose of this study is to determine the differences between how mentor teachers and
novice teachers feel by gender about the expenditures/stipends component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Fourth, the purpose of this study is to determine the differences between how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the time requirements component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Fifth, the purpose of this study is to determine the differences between how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the Pathwise® training component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.

**Background**

Because more than two million new teachers will be needed during the first decade of the 2000s, leaders in education are realizing the increased need for mentoring (Marx, 2006). This shortage has necessitated the formalizing of mentoring within schools in the hope that teachers will remain in the profession because of the support that is offered through mentoring. In addition to the teacher shortage that exists, a new trend of hiring teachers who are not trained in the traditional methodology and pedagogy requirements has further created a need for these individuals to have someone, a mentor, to assist them in their transition to a new profession (Boreen & Niday, 2003). The hope, according to Ganser (2002) and Andrews (2003), is that teachers will acquire the skills and characteristics necessary, through clear expectations, to be successful as teachers and to remain loyal to the profession.
Economic Impact of Mentoring

In the upcoming 2009-2011 biennium, the Arkansas Department of Education is requesting an appropriation of $7,508,758 from general revenue for each year of the biennium to fund the teacher licensure and mentoring program in the state of Arkansas. At this point, 12,000 mentors have been trained in the Pathwise® model, and 90 Praxis® III assessors have received training to administer the final assessment (ADFA, 2009). Approximating this level of funding for the years since the program’s beginning, Arkansas has appropriated over $50 million to the teacher induction program. With this level of funding being appropriated to this program, the Arkansas legislature might benefit from the results of this study by using it as an aid in determining if these dollars have been well utilized based on the perceptions of those who have participated in the program of induction. It is also possible that this study could be used as a springboard of discussion by ADE-OTQ with legislators for additional funding for this program.

Licensure and Mentoring

Prior to entering the classroom as a beginning teacher needing to be mentored, a novice teacher is quite familiar with the various aspects of the rigorous licensure standards that are mandated by the state. These standards also include the preliminary testing provided by Educational Testing Services (ETS) and a part of the broad scope of the Praxis® Series of assessment. In order to receive the initial license as a teacher, candidates must have taken the Praxis® I in order to gain entrance into a teacher licensure program. The Praxis® I assesses the basic skills such as reading, writing, and mathematical computation skills that are possessed of the candidate. The state determines the minimum or cut scores that are required for licensure, and typically,
colleges or universities use these same scores for admission purposes into their teacher preparation programs. Likewise, the non-traditional licensure (NTL) program within the state utilizes the Praxis® I as a pre-admission qualification. Once this assessment is passed, an individual wanting to become a teacher can be admitted to a college or university’s teacher education program. Those involved in the NTL program are then ready for continuing steps in the admission plan (ADE, 2008).

At the completion of the teacher education program, a potential teacher must again take a Praxis® Series test, the Principles of Teaching and Learning, in order to assess his/her knowledge. The Praxis® II assesses a potential teacher’s knowledge of pedagogy, methodology, and learning theory. In addition, the Praxis® II also covers content knowledge relevant to the content-area of teacher’s desired area of licensure. The state determines the minimum or cut score for the Principles of Teaching and Learning assessment and for each of the content-knowledge tests. Cut scores for the content-knowledge tests vary from test to test. Once these assessments are passed, the individual who has been traditionally trained can be issued an initial license from the state of Arkansas. Those enrolled in the NTL program must take the content-knowledge test as a preadmission qualification. When this portion is passed, individuals are admitted to the two-year NTL program while they are also working as teachers. The NTL program, among other things, will provide the knowledge base necessary for the individual to pass the Principles of Teaching and Learning assessment series. This test is taken at the end of the NTL program. When the assessment is passed, the individual is ready for the Praxis® III (ADE, 2008).
In Arkansas, the Pathwise® model of mentoring as suggested by ETS has been selected as the prescribed method of mentoring to novice teachers who are formally trained as well as for non-traditional teachers. One purpose of the Pathwise® model is to prepare teachers for the Praxis® III observational assessment. Before completing Praxis® III, novice teachers are provided with a variety of supports for their mentoring time. The program for novice teachers includes:

- The mentor must spend a minimum of two hours every two weeks with the novice teacher.
- In addition to this time, the novice and the mentor must spend 25 hours in “off-contract” time.
- The novice teacher is provided $800 for materials and/or professional development.
- The mentor is provided a $1200 stipend.
- A project director is provided within each school district that is trained in the Pathwise® model and who can answer questions specific to the program.
- The Pathwise® model is used to provide an observable and objective method of evaluating instructional and professional responsibilities. (ADE, 2007b)

In the last semester of the mentoring time, the candidate for standard licensure must complete the final portion of the Praxis® assessments, the Praxis® III. This assessment is an observational and performance assessment conducted by a rigorously trained assessor who uses the 19 criteria identified as essential teaching skills to determine the competency of the individual within an actual classroom setting (ADE, 2007a). The state of Arkansas also uses the Praxis® III to make the final decision in
licensure by establishing the minimum or cut score that must be obtained in each of the four domains. ETS (2008a) scores teachers in the following areas and criteria:

1. Domain A – Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning
   - Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students’ background knowledge and experiences
   - Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate for the students
   - Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future
   - Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson

2. Domain B – Creating an Environment for Student Learning
   - Creating a climate that promotes fairness
   - Establishing and maintaining rapport with students
   - Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student
   - Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior
   - Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible

3. Domain C – Teaching for Student Learning
   - Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students
   - Making content comprehensible to students
• Encouraging students to extend their thinking
• Monitoring students’ understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands
• Using instructional time effectively

4. Domain D - Teacher Professionalism

• Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met
• Demonstrating a sense of efficacy
• Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students
• Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning

Once this observational assessment is passed, the novice teacher can be issued a standard teaching license.

Effective Mentoring

According to Sweeny (2001), there are 15 characteristics that comprise a successful and effective mentoring program that include support groups and provisions for planning and coaching. Curran and Goldrick (2002) further reveal that effective mentoring programs contain 10 attributes including mentor preparation and clear standards. An examination of whether or not these characteristics and attributes are actually a part of mentoring programs could prove to be useful in developing the statewide program. In addition, whether or not they are perceived as being contributing factors to the success of the statewide programs that are in place in public schools could likewise be constructive in further expansion of programs.
Petersen (2008) recognizes that little research has been done to reveal the perceptions of the mentee. It is therefore important to examine the perceptions of teachers who have been a part of mentoring/induction programs and to determine what components of current mentoring/inductions programs are perceived as being effective. Also, the expertise of those who have served as mentors to those novice teachers should be examined to see what their perceptions are concerning what components of current practices are successful.

**Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses have been formulated, based on the review of literature, to guide this study:

1. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the overall mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.
2. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the activities component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.
3. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the expenditures/stipends component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.
4. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the time requirements component of the mentoring/induction program in
Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.

5. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the Pathwise® training component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.

Description of Terms

**Beginning teacher.** In the Arkansas model, a beginning teacher is a teacher with an initial license who must complete at least one year with a Pathwise® trained mentor and then successfully complete the Praxis® III assessment before being issued a standard teaching license. This term is also an interchangeable term with novice, protégé, and mentee.

**Experienced teacher.** In the Arkansas model, an experienced teacher is one who has three years of teaching experience that is needed before a teacher can become a Pathwise® mentor. For the purpose of this study, this term is an interchangeable term with mentor.

**Induction.** Induction is the process, inclusive of mentoring, that prepares teachers for the profession of teaching.

**Initial license/Licensure.** An initial license is a license issued by the state for up to three years for individuals who are enrolled in the state’s induction program (ADE, 2007a).

**Mentee.** The term mentee is interchangeable with novice teacher, protégé, and beginning teacher.
**Mentor.** A mentor is one who is trained in the Pathwise® model of mentoring and who is willing to give the time necessary to form a relationship offering “wisdom and counseling” (Sullivan, 2004, p. 3).

**Mentoring.** Mentoring is the process by which novice teachers in the state of Arkansas receive guidance from a mentor to aid in building relationships, to help understand the school climate, and to prepare for successful completion of the Praxis® III.

**Novice teacher.** This term is interchangeable with mentee, protégé, and beginning teacher.

**Off-contract time.** This term is time spent in the mentor relationship that occurs outside of the traditional school day.

**Pathwise®.** Pathwise® is the program offered by Educational Testing Service that is based on widely accepted standards that provide a common language for discussing, assessing, and improving educator practice. In particular, this term refers to the system of classroom observations that utilize 19 criteria of teacher practice that are observable and quantifiable (ETS, 2008b).

**Pathwise® mentor.** A licensed teacher who has at least three years of experience and has received the three-days of training in the Pathwise® model can serve as a Pathwise® mentor.

**Praxis® I.** Praxis® I is an assessment used by college and university departments to determine that a candidate attempting to enter a teacher education program has sufficient skills in reading, writing, and mathematics (ETS, 2006).
**Praxis® II.** Praxis® II is a set of assessments used by state teacher licensing agencies to determine that a candidate for initial licensure has sufficient knowledge of pedagogical skills and of the content area to be taught (ETS, 2006).

**Praxis® III.** Praxis® III is an observational assessment that assesses the skills of beginning teachers within classroom settings from which teacher licensure decisions can be made (ETS, 2008a).

**Protégé.** This term is interchangeable with mentee, novice, and beginning teacher.

**Provisional license/licensure.** The state issues a provisional license, temporary license, to non-traditional teacher licensure candidates until they meet the requirements for initial or standard licensure (ADE, 2007a).

**Standard license/licensure.** The state issues a five-year license, typically referred to as a standard license, to individuals who have completed the induction process and passed the Praxis® III assessment (ADE, 2007a).

**Significance**

The results of this study will benefit the ADE-OTQ and public schools by providing information concerning the perceptions of mentoring and the induction process as currently implemented in the state. These outcomes could benefit decision-making concerning teacher retention, teacher recruitment, mentoring program revisions, and professional development. The ADE could also utilize this information to see the perceptual impact on the recipients of a portion of the large amount of financial resources that are being placed into the program considering almost $8 million each fiscal year is being appropriated for induction in Arkansas.
Additionally, the study will provide an opportunity for feedback from those involved in the programs. This feedback could be used in a variety of ways that might include professional development concerning mentoring and teaching skills acquisition. In response to the study, project directors, as well as personnel in ADE-OTQ, could use the information to open a discussion about additional roles and responsibilities that should be undertaken by those directing the program.

In addition, the components of the study related to gender will allow program managers to assess whether or not different components should be considered for each gender in order to maximize the mentoring/induction experience. The potential exists to offer a more tailored experience to individuals who are entering the teaching profession. These experiences might focus on components that are perceived as being a more important part of the knowledge base to be successful and thereby increase retention of new teachers. Administrators within the state could be the first to utilize the information from the study to offer individualized professional development and mentor-mentee opportunities.

Finally, since the financial impact of this program as mandated and approved by the Arkansas Legislature is so great, the results of this study could be examined by legislators to assess the continuation of funding for the program. The study could potentially indicate to legislators the need for changes within the program to make it more accountable and to make it more tailored to the needs of those involved.
Process to Accomplish

Sample

Participants for the study were randomly selected from the novice teachers as identified by the ADE-OTQ as being employed in the fall semester of 2008 and who were currently being mentored in the induction model created by Pathwise®. A list of the mentor teachers for these novice teachers was obtained from the ADE-OTQ. The number of original participants depended upon the number of novice teachers actually employed by school districts across the state in the fall of 2008. An appropriate sample was drawn for the distribution of the survey instruments. The population \( (N) \) was approximately 2,000 to 2,200 novices with a duplicate amount of mentors. According to Johnson and Christensen (2008), the sample size \( (n) \) was to be between 322 and 327 novices with a duplicate amount of mentors. The samples were drawn randomly from the identified mentors and novices.

Questions were included in the survey instrument to obtain demographic information from each mentor and each novice. Descriptive statistics will be presented regarding age, gender, ethnicity, and district size.

Design

A quantitative, non-experimental design was utilized in the study. The independent variables for all five statements of the problem were roles of the teachers (mentor teacher versus novice teacher) and gender (male versus female) regarding the mentoring and induction program in the state of Arkansas. The dependent variable for statement one was the measured attitudes represented by a score for the overall program. The dependent variables for statements two through five were the measured attitudes
represented by a score for the four components of the overall mentoring/induction program for teachers in Arkansas public schools who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. These components included the activities component, the expenditures/stipends component, the time requirements component, and the Pathwise® training component, respectively.

**Instrumentation**

The dependent variables were the measured attitudes represented by scores on a survey instrument designed by the researcher that addressed criteria based on the components of the Arkansas model. The survey instrument measured mentor and novice teachers’ perception concerning the overall program and its four component parts. The survey instrument consisted of 20 items, and each was on a seven option Likert rating scale. The scale ranged from 7 = “very important: to 1 = “very unimportant.”

The survey instrument was pilot tested in order to evaluate its validity and reliability. The researcher used a group of twenty novices and twenty mentor teachers randomly selected from the Arch Ford Service Cooperative area in Arkansas to conduct the pilot. This area was chosen for ease of communication for the researcher.

In addition, the pilot study improved the ease of completing the survey, the length of the instrument, and the appropriateness of the items for the target audience. The survey was produced online using an online surveying tool. A link to the survey was sent to identified participants via email along with the required disclosures and consent forms. Screens were included that addressed the participants’ consent to participate. A reminder email was sent one week after the original solicitation. A final follow-up email was sent two weeks after the original solicitation. The data were collected from the online
surveying tool and transferred to SAS for statistical computation. The data were stored electronically on the online surveying tool’s website and on the researcher’s personal computer.

Data Analysis

The results of the survey instruments were compiled and appropriate statistical tests were conducted to accept or reject the hypotheses that were formulated. To address the first hypothesis, a 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using role of teacher (mentor versus novice) by gender as the independent variables and the overall perception of the program as the dependent variable. The second hypothesis was analyzed by a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA with role of teacher by gender as the independent variables and the activities component as the dependent variable. Hypothesis number three was examined by a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA using role of teacher by gender as the independent variables and the expenditures/stipends component as the dependent variable. The researcher conducted a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA to test the fourth hypothesis with role of teacher by gender as the independent variables and the time requirements component as the dependent variable. To test the fifth hypothesis, a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA using role of teacher by gender as the independent variables and the Pathwise® training component as the dependent variable. The 2 x 2 factorial ANOVAs were chosen to test for interaction effects as well as the main effects of each hypothesis. To test the hypotheses, the researcher used a two-tailed test with a .05 level of significance.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Mentoring has become a fundamental portion of the process of educational licensure. As the need for teachers grows, the need to form relationships that foster a desire to remain in the profession and that foster good teaching skills and habits becomes more apparent. The process of mentoring has also taken on a variety of forms, and each of these forms contributes in different ways to the growth of novice teachers into veteran teachers.

This chapter seeks to examine the literature related to the forms of mentoring used in the educational field as well as what is viewed as effective methodology for mentoring. Further, the literature specifically related to the model of mentoring utilized in Arkansas is reviewed in relation to the purpose of this study.

The Need for Mentoring

According to Marx (2006), two million plus teachers will need to be recruited during the first decade of this millennium. Shortages of qualified candidates will continue to exist in math, science, foreign language, and technology. Teacher shortages have caused a variety of new dilemmas for education including problems in recruiting, retention, and licensure. In order to recruit new teachers and keep them, one strategy has been to provide new teachers with mentors that can “help them over the unexpected hurdles they’ll inevitably encounter…” (p. 318). Mentoring has, therefore, become an extensive part of retention efforts that are further promoted by state departments of
education by the inclusion of mentoring as a part of teacher induction and the licensure process. Another problem is revealed by Boreen and Niday (2003):

Due to a teacher shortage in certain content areas, some beginning teachers have been hired to teach outside their primary discipline. Mentors working with beginning teachers in this situation often have a double responsibility: not only must they take care of the typical responsibilities…but they have to support the novice teacher’s knowledge development. (p. 175)

Non-traditional licensure programs and programs focused on content-related knowledge have consequently been developed that address these needs and are often incorporated as yet another part of the total induction program for protégés.

Sullivan (2004) states, “Formal mentoring programs focus on teachers in the early years of their careers because novice teachers tend to leave education in disproportionate numbers” (pp. 16-17). The hope of this initiative is to prevent the “sink or swim” concept that has plagued novice educators in the past (Ganser, 2001). This notion has caused many of the novice educators to depart the profession because they have not received the support necessary to continue as a valued part of the educational community. Andrews (2003) and Ganser (2002) both suggest that administrators address this issue by ensuring that novice teachers have clear expectations from the beginning of their tenure. This feedback helps to alleviate the fears that are shared among novice teachers and helps the novice teacher to know his/her progress and feel valued as a part of the profession. It is vital, therefore, to examine the areas of the model related to time, funding, activities, and Pathwise® usage by obtaining the feedback from those involved in mentoring and induction.
Although the profession needs to retain teachers, it cannot do that at the cost of employing individuals who do not obtain or who do not already possess the necessary skills to be a teacher. Ganser (2001) acknowledges that new teacher licensure requirements have been a major catalyst for mentor program reform in his home state of Wisconsin. The restructuring of the licensure system, much like Arkansas’s, requires that mentoring become a part of the total process so as to produce a workforce that has the required skills.

Educators must, however, be reminded that mentoring is only one part of the total induction process. Wong (2003) differentiates between mentoring and induction. Induction is an ongoing, structured process of which mentoring is a vital part. Mentoring, however, is the part of the structure that is focused on supporting teachers in such a way as to get them to reveal their needs to someone they can trust and rely upon for guidance as well as someone who can assist them through the process of licensure. As Sweeny (2001) pointed out, educators are aware that beginning teachers “do not want to reveal their concerns and problems for fear of looking incompetent” (p. 1).

The role of mentoring is to overcome this fear by fostering a relationship between novice and mentor where the barrier is eliminated and improvement can take place. Although nothing can guarantee that a protégé will begin by offering these concerns to the mentor immediately, some methods must be employed that will create a true mentoring atmosphere. Eventually this environment will be one where ideas can be shared and where profitable solutions can be made to the novice teacher for his or her improvement. With licensure as a major hurdle to be overcome at the end of the process,
the novice will need this nurturing to eliminate the fears involved in the progression from novice to licensed teacher.

**Forms of Mentoring**

In 1998, Crow and Matthews noted that mentoring takes on a variety of forms that include providing guidance; serving as a role model; or being a counselor, coach, or sponsor (as cited in Bauer & LeBlanc, 2002). Traditionally in education, the mentor has been regarded as the expert who serves in the role in order to share his or her expertise and to guide the novice through the intricacies of the profession. Likewise, mentoring has often been an informal relationship where novices were only assisted after seeking out assistance from a person they recognized as being willing to aid them in their struggles. According to Bauer and LeBlanc, lawmakers and policymakers have raised the stakes by mandating this relationship between novices and veteran teachers perhaps in the hopes of making teaching a more professional career.

**Characteristics of Effective Mentoring Programs**

As recognized by Petersen (2008), little is offered in the research about the perceptions of effectiveness from the mentee. It has been implicitly assumed that novice teachers benefit from mentoring in order to obtain skills that they would otherwise have difficulty obtaining on their own; therefore, “the mentee naturally benefits from such advice and guidance” (pp. 6-7). However, in order to determine what should be considered perceptually from the perspective of either the mentor or the mentee, a review of the characteristics of effective mentoring as defined by those who are recognized as being knowledgeable within the field should be conducted.
Sweeny (2001) suggests that a model-mentoring program should include these characteristics:

- Clearly defined roles and tasks for mentors that are aligned to program purpose
- Mentoring tasks differentiated for needs of beginning and new employees
- Clearly defined characteristics of effective mentors
- A set of selection criteria and a process based on effective mentor characteristics
- Matching criteria and process that emphasize proximity and similar job assignment
- Process for dealing with mismatches
- Research-based initial and ongoing mentor training and expert coaching
- Clear expectations for the mentor-protégé relationship
- A mentoring process model based on addressing beginning and new employee needs and facilitating professional growth
- Mentor peer support groups
- Mentoring of mentors by a coordinator or lead mentor that models desired mentoring practices
- Administrative support for mentoring
- Time provided for planning and coaching
- Summative and formative program evaluation relative to program purposes
- Ongoing efforts at program refinement based on evaluation data (pp. 33-34)
Sweeny (2003) further urges that the purpose of mentoring must be expanded to assist in creating a more professional culture where feedback and collaboration become the norm. These, too, could be identified as key elements of an effective mentoring program.

Lindley (2003), writing about the mentoring of administrative novices, asserts that the “mentoring process is about the mentee, not the mentor” (p. 130) and thereby stresses the need for reflection opportunities to be a part of an effective mentoring model. As a part of this reflection, mentees should be asked what their perceptions are concerning various situations they encounter. They should be encouraged to “generate viable alternatives” (p. 130) and to choose various courses of action.

Another component of effective mentoring mentioned in the literature is the need for the program to provide appropriate training to those involved to ensure that the overall purposes of the mentoring situation are understood and the model, whatever it might be, is appropriately implemented. Feiman-Nemser (1996) suggests that training be ongoing throughout the mentoring process. Weiss and Weiss (1999) noted that in order for a mentor program to work well, a program’s effectiveness is dependent upon the amount of training that is afforded its mentors.

Evans-Andris, Kyle, and Carini (2006) in their study of the mentoring components of the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) conducted a series of interviews with 55 interns nearing the end of their first year in teaching. The interviews asked the interns what their needs were and in what ways the KTIP met those needs. Evans-Andris, et al. advocate in their qualitative study that mentoring programs should include overall support and assurances and technical assistance addressing discipline,
organizational and time management, parental concerns, and identification of teacher resources. They state that novice teachers were overwhelmed and under-anticipated the need for “emotional support” (p. 296).

The KTIP does not allocate a prescribed portion of time to be spent between novice and mentor. Likewise, it does not advocate what topics or issues should be discussed when time is spent together. To that end, interviewees voiced concerns about the struggle within the KTIP to know exactly what was expected and wished that they had “guidance on how to perform the job most effectively” (p. 299).

Interns in the KTIP entered the program with confidence in their abilities to teach and acknowledge that mentoring was a valuable part of the KTIP interns first year of teaching. However, the interns also reported that they needed more professional development, networking, and collaboration. Evans-Andris et al. (2006), therefore, suggested that a systemic form of professional development be created for novices that includes, in its inception, a focus on “technical advising and guidance” and that continues to “more interaction and networking with peers” (p. 306).

Finally Evans-Andris et al. (2006), recommend that states that are participating in mandatory induction/mentoring programs consider policies that address training teachers to become effective mentors. “Explicit guidance” for both novices and mentors concerning expectations and meeting the needs of interns was also recommended for programs to be more effective (p. 308).

According to Curran and Goldrick (2002), effective mentoring programs share these attributes:
Promote universal participation by teachers from traditionally trained and alternatively trained programs

Use experienced teachers as mentors

Include mentor preparation

Facilitate release time

Have earmarked funding

Are based on clear standards

Are structured and defined by veteran teachers and beginning teacher input

Assess beginning teacher performance

Have a subject-specific focus

Provide working conditions that allow for strengthened teaching skills (pp. 3-4)

In less specific terms, Neubert and Bratton (1987) identify five characteristics they identified in a Maryland study. The characteristics were devised from a coaching model that was implemented in 20 Maryland classrooms where teachers partnered together to teach. In the partnering, one teacher was coached by the other teacher who was an expert in a particular method or subject matter. The characteristics cited were knowledge, credibility, support, facilitation, and availability. These five qualities were vital to the success of the model. In the area of support, Neubert and Bratton emphasize that the coach must “be ready to praise the teacher’s efforts, step by step” (p. 31).

Likewise, Joyce and Showers (1995) give five functions of mentors in a mentoring model. The purpose of the mentor is to provide companionship, provide
technical feedback, provide an analysis of teaching skills, help the new teacher adapt to
the school climate, and assist the novice in personal facilitation.

In much broader terms of mentoring, Witmer (1993) also identified characteristics
of successful programs derived from a Pennsylvania study where six teachers in the
Lower Dauphin School District are employed as full-time mentors. These teachers not
only mentor novices, they mentor any teacher in the district who has a desire for these
services. These highly-qualified individuals are selected through a rigorous process
including an application and interview procedure. They are expected to “be familiar with
research . . . have demonstrated some innovation in their own classrooms . . . [and]
possess above average interpersonal skills” (p. 72). The mentors are focused on
developing their district’s teachers in the areas of collegiality, instructional strategies,
professional growth, and special services.

**Licensure and Mentoring in Arkansas**

**Arkansas’s Model**

By no means is mentoring new to education. Many states have adopted some
form of mentoring as a part of their induction programs. Arkansas is no exception;
mentoring has been selected by the state of Arkansas as a required portion of the
beginning teacher induction programs. Darling-Hammond (1997) notes that Arkansas
started with an initiative of improving education by the passing of “ambitious legislation
that raised teacher salaries and improved benefits” as well as the creation of “supports for
National Board Certification” and “increased teacher planning time” (p. 42).

Following the lead by Ohio in 1998 to adopt the Pathwise®/Praxis III model, a
major effort by the state to pilot and fund this portion of induction was undertaken in
early 2001 (Bolich, 2001). Since then, the use of the Pathwise® (ETS, 2002) model, accompanied by the Praxis III® (ETS, 2006) as an assessment tool for beginning teachers, has been utilized by the state (Lipsmeyer & Callahan, 2007). Giebelhaus and Bowman (2002) wanted to determine the impact of the method used for mentoring upon the performance of preservice teachers. In their study of 29 student teachers from two mid-western universities, they utilized the Pathwise®/Praxis III model, the same one adopted by the state of Arkansas. The 29 student teachers were randomly assigned to two groups. One group’s cooperating teachers received training in the Pathwise® model whereas those in the control group received no such training. Using the Praxis® III observational assessment for quantitative data and statistical analysis, Giebelhaus and Bowman concluded that based on their study,

prospective teachers who collaborate with cooperating teachers who have been trained using a common framework for discussion, demonstrate more complete and effective planning, more effective classroom instruction, and greater reflectivity on practice than those whose cooperating teachers received only the orientation. (p. 250)

A person interested in teaching can pursue licensure via one of two paths, either the traditional method or the non-traditional method. In the traditional method, an individual seeks a four-year degree in education from an accredited college or university. The implementation of a non-traditional teacher licensure program (NTL) has provided teaching opportunities for those having expertise or the ability to pass an exam in a content area may begin teaching while also being enrolled in special courses that focus on classroom management, pedagogy, and strategies (Culpepper, Williams, & Dorrough,
2007). In the non-traditional method, an individual already having a degree seeks to utilize the degree and life experiences to pass the necessary assessments required prior to entry into a two-year program that focuses on the development of vital teaching related skills. The need for NTL programs throughout the United States has been caused in part by the high attrition rate of beginning teachers (Fullan, 2001). This dilemma required looking for an alternative method to get teachers into the classroom who could deliver content specific knowledge even with limited or no pedagogical skills.

**Licensure**

As a part of the rigorous licensure standards mandated by the state, potential novice teachers begin the steps toward licensure while actually still in college. For those in the non-traditional track, the first step toward licensure occurs before enrolling in the non-traditional program. This process is started when the individual is required to take the Praxis I. The Praxis I assesses the basic skills of writing, reading, and mathematical computation. ADE (2008) determines the cut score, the score required for passing the test, that is required for a license, and colleges and universities typically use these same scores for admission into their programs of study. The NTL program uses the same cut scores as a pre-admission qualification.

At the end of a potential teacher’s course of study, the teacher is once again required to take a Praxis® Series test, the Principles of Teaching and Learning (ADE, 2008). This test, a part of the Praxis® II battery of tests, assesses the knowledge of pedagogy, methodology, and learning theory. Additional tests from this battery are used to assess content knowledge relevant to the area in which the teacher desires to be licensed. The cut scores for the content area test vary from assessment to assessment.
Once passed, the potential teacher who has been trained traditionally is issued an initial license. Those enrolled in the NTL program must also take the Praxis® II test related to the subject area in which they desire to be licensed. In addition, this assessment is a preadmission qualification to the program. Once completed, the individual is admitted to the two-year program while they are also working as a teacher. Once the NTL program is completed, the individual will take the Praxis® II: Principles of Teaching and Learning to assess the knowledge base of pedagogy and methodology that should have been gained during the two-year program.

**Required Mentoring**

The state has mandated that mentoring take place for novice teachers, those with less than one year of teaching experience, in order to improve retention and to provide the support that is needed in the initial years of teaching. According to the ADE (2007b) guidelines for induction, those required to be mentored include (a) traditionally trained teachers graduating from an accredited college or university teacher-education program, (b) non-traditional licensure program participants who are currently the teacher of record in a school district, and (c) teachers with a standard license who have less than one year of teaching experience.

Based on a study by Klug and Salzman (1990), formal induction, like the model used in Arkansas, is preferable to informal mentoring. In Klug and Salzman’s research, 26 novices were randomly assigned to one of two mentoring models, one formal and the other informal. A questionnaire and a teacher assessment instrument were used to evaluate the two groups and allowed the researchers to conclude that “structured induction programs incorporating delineated goals and expectations and opportunities for
formal observation and feedback will be viewed by participants as more successful in meeting the needs of beginning teachers” (p. 20).

**Funding**

In order to facilitate the mandate requiring mentoring, the state issues a grant for every novice teacher and mentor pair to provide a stipend for the mentor in the amount of $1200 and to provide money for resources for the novice teacher in the amount of $800, for a total grant of $2000 per pair. To justify the stipend, the mentor is required to spend a portion of the mentoring time during “off-contract” time. The novice teacher must prepare a professional growth plan to document how the money will be allocated for his or her professional development and to serve as a “framework for charting suitable activities . . . during the induction phase of initial licensure” (p. 1). Currently, according to the ADE (2007a) in its Allowable Expenditures Guidelines, the state allows money for the novice teacher to be spent in these ways:

- Membership (maximum of $100) to a professional organization that is related to the grade level or content area the novice teacher is assigned to teach
- Subscription to professional journal(s) that is related to the grade level or content area the novice teacher is assigned to teach
- Registration for a professional conference related to the novice teacher’s growth in the Mentoring/Performance Assessment criteria
- Travel to an Arkansas professional conference (mileage, meals, and hotel at the state approved per diem for novice teachers and mentor teacher if applicable)
• Payment for a substitute for the novice teacher’s and/or the mentor’s classroom in order to facilitate working together (up to three days of substitute pay)

• One college course (per school year) that is directly related to the content or instructional techniques specific to the age or grade level the novice teacher is assigned to teach

• Allowable materials including resource books, lesson planning guides, books about instructional techniques or strategies, materials for learning centers, and instructional aids

**Time**

The state model also includes required elements for both the mentor and the novice. These elements include: (a) the novice and mentor spending two hours every two weeks in mentoring related activities that are face-to-face, (b) the mentor spending 25 hours per semester in activities that support the novice, (c) the mentor being a Pathwise® Certified Mentor, and (d) the novice and mentor working together to complete the Pathwise® model’s formative observations in preparation for the Praxis III® Assessment.

**Use of Pathwise®**

Addressing the need for training in an effective model, the Pathwise® model utilized in Arkansas requires potential mentors to undergo an intense three-day training in order to understand and utilize the model (Lipsmeyer & Callahan, 2007). Emphasis is given to the 19 essential teaching criteria that are divided among four domains. The four domains of the Pathwise®/Praxis III model address essential teaching and professional functions. According to the Pathwise® Orientation Guide (ETS, 2001), Domain A is
“Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning” and is concerned primarily with teacher planning and organization prior to the actual act of instruction (p. 7). Domain B is “Creating an Environment for Student Learning” and focuses on the interactions between the students and the teacher as well as among students (p. 19). Domain C is “Teaching for Student Learning” and emphasizes the act of teaching and enabling the students to make connections with the learning goals using appropriate methods, materials, and activities (p. 31). Domain D is “Teacher Professionalism” and seeks to identify how reflective the teacher is at evaluating his or her own effectiveness in the classroom and how communication is utilized among colleagues and parents (p. 43).

These domains are further divided into criteria that enumerate the essential teaching skills into observable characteristics. ETS (2008a), both in Pathwise® and Praxis® III, uses the following areas and criteria:

1. Domain A – Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning
   a. Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students’ background knowledge and experiences
   b. Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate for the students
   c. Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future
   d. Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson
2. Domain B – Creating an Environment for Student Learning
   a. Creating a climate that promotes fairness
   b. Establishing and maintaining rapport with students
   c. Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student
   d. Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior
   e. Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible

3. Domain C – Teaching for Student Learning
   a. Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students
   b. Making content comprehensible to students
   c. Encouraging students to extend their thinking
   d. Monitoring students’ understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands
   e. Using instructional time effectively

4. Domain D- Teacher Professionalism
   a. Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met
   b. Demonstrating a sense of efficacy
   c. Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students
   d. Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning
Every novice teacher is paired with a mentor that is certified in the Pathwise® model of mentoring and who has been trained to utilize the domains and criteria to score an observation of the teacher planning, teaching, and reflecting upon a lesson. The Pathwise® certified mentor completes three observations of the novice teacher during the first year of induction and makes non-evaluative assessments using the four domains. Each domain has a unique scoring rubric based on a 3-point scale that allows for scores in half point increments from 1.0 to 3.0. Each incremented score is uniquely defined and requires observable evidence to substantiate the score. Pathwise® certified mentors are shown how to differentiate between these scores and how to look for specific pieces of evidence that support the score that is given. In addition to these observations, the mentor and the novice complete a professional growth plan for the novice that is based on weaknesses that might have been observed during an assessment.

During the course of the induction period, novices are observed by their mentor and assessed based on the four domains that are subcategorized into the 19 essential teaching skills. Mentors score the novice teachers using the 1.0 to 3.0 scale that require observable evidence. The mentors also provide a narrative of the strengths and weaknesses that were observed during the process of the lesson. During the Praxis III, a certified Praxis III assessor visits the novice’s school and completes an assessment that includes two interviews and the observation of a lesson. The novice teacher must pass this assessment in order to obtain a license in the state of Arkansas.

It should be noted that the process of mentoring does not necessarily guarantee success (Sullivan, 2004). However, the mentor should try to provide opportunities for success, especially in the area of licensure. Although there are no assurances about
performance on the Praxis III as the required assessment for Arkansas’s novice teachers, the opportunity to succeed must always be the primary focus of the relationship. In accordance with best practices, Arkansas has continued to develop its overall induction program by including the Pathwise® model, created by ETS (2002) to be a preparatory model for the Praxis III, as its method of delivery. Giebelhaus and Bowman (2002) confirm in their research that “cooperating teachers trained in the general principles and practices of mentoring . . . have a more positive impact on prospective teacher development than those with no training” (p. 12). When the model is properly followed, the novice should be well prepared for the assessment that will result in completion of the licensure process. That success should come to both those who have been traditionally prepared at the college or university level and to those who have been enrolled in the NTL program sponsored by the state department. Sindelar, Daunic, and Rennells (2004) compared novices that were traditionally trained and those trained by an alternative method similar to Arkansas’s NTL program. Using scores from the Praxis® III observational assessment, they noted that “although differences among the groups were evidenced on several criteria and summary scores, the relative strengths and weaknesses for participants within each program type follow a somewhat similar pattern” (p. 220). Even within Arkansas, Ezell (2005) conducted a study of the first cohort of NTL students in the state that completed the program and were then evaluated using the Praxis® III observational assessment. They were compared to their traditionally trained counterparts. Ezell concluded that the Praxis III mean test scores indicated that the NTL teachers are effective teachers.
The adequacy of NTL programs in comparison to those traditionally licensed is one dilemma, however, that remains in the broader educational spectrum. According to Ganser (2002), “The debate over the adequacy of non-traditional preparation programs most certainly will intensify today in light of the federal requirement that all teachers be fully certified, as mandated in the No Child Left Behind Act passed in December 2001” (p. 2). This legislation and each state’s interpretation of “highly-qualified” will most definitely force departments of education to look at the efficiency of NTL programs to be successful stopgap efforts in meeting the increasing need for teachers. Currently, ADE (2008) views NTL teachers as “highly-qualified” because they have passed the required Praxis II content test(s) and have been issued an initial license.

Based on this research, educators must ask if a successful mentoring environment exists for novice teachers. If it does exist, how do educators measure “effectiveness” of the mentoring program? The perception of effectiveness is perhaps one method to lead to a better understanding of the usefulness or even the inadequacies of mentoring. Carnine (2007) raises these questions and suggests that further research be done in Arkansas on how these factors affect mentoring: the location of protégés and mentors in proximity to one another, the lack of common planning experiences, and whether or not sharing a common academic discipline is necessary.

**Economic Impact**

The ADE has requested and received an appropriation of $7,508,758 from general revenue for the 2009-2011 biennium for each year in the biennium to fund the mentoring and licensure program (ADFA, 2009). Having made appropriations similar to this one since the program’s inception, the state has spent over $50 million for teacher preparation.
in the form of mentoring. At this level of funding, legislators serving in the Arkansas House of Representative and in the Arkansas Senate might benefit from an examination of utilizations of these funds. Currently, funding for the mentoring and induction program in the state has not increased for over three biennium. Although this study can only focus on the perceptions of those involved in the process, it provides a starting place for discussions and a springboard for a dialog with ADE-OTQ as the need for increased funding becomes necessary.

**Conclusion**

In examining this topic, it has been discovered that little research has been conducted concerning the mentoring program initiated in Arkansas public schools. Ezell (2005) examined the first cohort of NTL completers in 2003 to see what supervising principals considered effective. She also compared NTL completers with their traditionally trained counterparts using the Praxis III assessment as an instrument for comparison. Since 2003, no additional studies have been done in the state of Arkansas that focus on examining the NTL program for the perception of its continued effectiveness nor have any studies been completed that seek to obtain perceptual feedback from those who have been involved in the induction program that the state has designed as a component for licensure. Those involved should be surveyed to see what the perceptions of mentors and novices are in relation to the mentoring program and the requirements related to the program. Mentors and novices could provide the data concerning their perceptions because they are the ones directly involved in the implementation of the model. Statistical tests of significance could be performed to see if there is a difference between the perceptions of the two populations—mentors and
novices. Likewise, further statistical tests could determine if there is statistical difference in the various groupings of the population including gender, age, and race.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

With its roots founded in Greek mythology, the process of mentoring has endured the test of time and has proven itself to be a worthy component of developing individuals into masters of their craft. Effective mentoring programs and models are essential to the proper development of novice teachers into master teachers. Petersen (2008) acknowledges the natural benefits of mentoring as a mentor provides assistance and counsel to the novice.

This study examined the perceptions of the effectiveness of the various components of the Arkansas mentoring model. The research hypotheses are as follows:

1. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the overall mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.

2. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the activities component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.

3. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the expenditures/stipends component of the mentoring/induction
program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in
the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.

4. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by
gender about the time requirements component of the mentoring/induction
program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in
the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.

5. There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by
gender about the Pathwise® training component of the mentoring/induction
program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in
the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.

The purpose of this chapter is to show how this study on the perceptions of mentoring
in Arkansas was designed. In addition, the methodology used to answer the related
research questions will be addressed. The chapter is divided into six sections: research
design, sample, instrument, data collection procedures, analytical methods, and
limitations.

**Research Design**

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences of how mentor
teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the various components of the
mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been
involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Quantitative, nonexperimental
methods were used in data collection and in the analysis process. According to Johnson
and Christensen (2008), this methodology is appropriate when “there is no manipulation
of an independent variable and no random assignment to groups by the researcher” (p.
Such was the case in this study where the independent variable, the roles of the teacher and their gender, were not manipulated nor was there an assignment to groups.

**Sample**

The quantitative study was based on collecting data from a sample of mentors and a sample of novice teachers who were involved in the mentoring process in the 2008-2009 academic year. To arrive at the size of the sample needed to collect the data, information regarding mentor-novice teacher pairs was secured from the ADE-OTQ in March 2009. It was determined that 2,048 mentor-novice teacher pairs existed in Arkansas during the 2008-2009 school year. According to Johnson and Christensen (2008), a sample of 322 mentors and 322 novice teachers would be required to generalize the data collected to its population given a population of 2,048. After the list of all mentor-novice teacher pairs was secured in March 2009, an Excel spreadsheet list was created that contained a unique number for each pair, the name of the mentor, the name of the novice teacher, the name of the school district, and an email address for each of the members of the pair. The list was organized alphabetically by school name and the unique number was assigned to each pair beginning with A and continuing to Z. In early April 2009, a sample was randomly selected from the list by using the Excel randomization program. The researcher matched up the random number list with the unique number for each mentor and novice. In mid-April, a new list was created in Excel that became the sample for the study. The researcher selected 380 mentors and 380 novice teachers for the sample list at the suggestions of Johnson and Christensen (2008) who advised that the final sample be adjusted by adding to the sample size and adjusting for the proportion likely to respond.
**Instrumentation**

The researcher designed a questionnaire for the purpose of the study (Appendix A). Because the study sought to find information about the model that was specific to Arkansas, no previously published instrument or instrument previously created by other researchers was appropriate to the study.

To develop the instrument, the researcher, based on the related literature, formulated questions that were related to the categories in which perceptual data were desired. The researcher consulted experts in the field of mentoring and in the field of statistics to examine the instrument and offer suggestions for improvement. Experts in the field were identified as individuals who had direct experiences using and formulating the Arkansas model and who were also actively involved in the entire process of mentoring and licensure by being Pathwise® and Praxis III trained mentors or assessors.

During March and April 2009, the researcher met informally with the experts in order to discuss the survey instrument and to record the suggestions that were made. In late March 2009, the researcher also formed a focus group of three mentors who were chosen because of their long-time roles as mentors having served as mentors on at least five or more occasions in the past ten years. Two novice teachers who were currently being mentored by two of the mentors were also added to the focus group. The focus group was asked to examine the instrument for readability and to ensure that the language of the instrument was understandable to this unique population.

In April 2009, a pilot group selected from the Arch Ford Educational Service Cooperative (AFESC) set of schools was formed. For ease of communication with members of the pilot and because AFESC was the home cooperative of the researcher,
the researcher chose to utilize pairs from AFESC. In reviewing the Excel list of mentor-novice teacher pairs that was created in March 2009, the reviewer found that 24 pairs were in the AFESC. All 24 pairs were sent the online survey to complete. The final pilot group was made up of 18 mentors and 14 novice teachers who actually completed the survey and offered suggestions for revisions. Members of the focus group were included in the pilot. However, neither members of the focus group nor members of the pilot were included in the final survey. Once the researcher revised the instrument with these suggestions, the instrument was emailed to the pilot group.

The members of the pilot were asked to answer the survey questions. In addition, each member was asked the following questions about each set of questions related to the four categories:

1. Was each of these questions easily understood? If you did not understand one of the questions, please explain.

2. Do you think any of these questions should be changed or reworded?

At the conclusion of the pilot survey, members of the pilot groups were asked:

1. If you had any difficulties with completing this survey, please explain.

2. Do you think there are any items/topics that should be included in the survey that the researcher may not have considered?

The researcher took the answers to these questions and made further revisions in the survey instrument. Revisions included placing some words in all caps or bold print so respondents would not be confused as well as the addition of one question that the pilot and focus group suggested. Likewise, a preliminary analysis of the data was performed including descriptive statistics, tests for normality, tests for reliability, and a 2 x 2
factorial ANOVA. Changes to questions were made as a result of that analysis that included rewording a set of questions to try to improve reliability.

The questionnaire contained 34 Likert scaled questions related to the Arkansas model. Specifically, there were 10 questions related to activities, 8 questions related to funding and stipends, 8 questions related to time, and 8 questions related to the Pathwise® model. Responses were on a 6 point scale: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Somewhat Disagree, 4- Somewhat Agree, 5- Agree, or 6- Strongly Agree. Some questions were reverse-worded in order to reduce the chance of response set. Johnson and Christensen (2008) advise that this technique be used “only when response sets are a major concern” (p. 186). At the suggestion of the dissertation committee, reverse-wording was used to avoid this type of questionnaire error. In addition, demographic data pertaining to the respondents were also collected. Respondents were asked to select their gender, role in teaching (mentor or novice teacher), age, level of teaching (elementary, middle/junior high, high school), and district size based on student population.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Following IRB approval, the researcher piloted the questionnaire and made relevant changes as a result. A list of all mentor-novice teacher pairs was generated from the pairing forms completed for ADE-OTQ by Pathwise® Project Directors in each local school district throughout the state. Permission to utilize these forms was granted by the legal counsel for ADE-OTQ. From the list, the researcher randomly selected participants for the sample using a random number list generated in Excel.
The randomly selected participants were sent a preliminary email explaining the study and presenting the IRB required information for research conducted with human subjects. This process also allowed the researcher to identify email addresses that were not valid and offered an opportunity to verify and correct the addresses that bounced back. On May 11, 2009, the survey launched, and respondents were sent an email generated by an online survey tool that again presented the required IRB information and asked the selected respondents to participate in the survey by clicking on a link in the email that took them to the online questionnaire. The invitation email, contained in Appendix B, notified the respondent that clicking on the link also indicated consent to participate in the research study. Respondents who had not completed the survey were sent reminder emails (see Appendix C) on May 14, May 21, and May 27 following the original solicitation for participation. The survey closed on June 1, 2009.

**Analytical Methods**

First, data were coded and entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). The following codes were used to identify data: gender (1 = male, 2 = female), role (1 = mentor, 2 = novice teacher).

Next, a pre-analysis of the data was conducted. According to Mertler and Vannatta (2005), data should be examined for accuracy, missing data, extreme values, normality, and homoscedasticity prior to conducting actual analysis. To review accuracy, the researcher examined descriptive statistics and found that all data were within the possible ranges. Data were checked for missing data. In those respondents who had skipped questions, the mean of the score of all respondents for that question was calculated and the mean score was entered into the missing values. Mertler and Vannatta
suggest using the mean score because “when no other information is available to the researcher, the mean score is the best estimate…” (p. 26).

Finally, a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was used to test for interaction effects between levels of independent variables gender and role. The interaction levels of independent variables and dependent variables as well as differences between the independent variables were examined first using a factorial ANOVA. Main effects of the independent variables were tested using a one-way ANOVA. This procedure in SPSS also checked for homogeneity of variances using the Levene’s statistic.

**Limitations**

In every research project, there are barriers, obstacles, and occurrences that are beyond the control of the researcher. The study had several potential limitations that may have implications for the ability to generalize the findings and that might be useful for refining areas of future research.

Perceptions about mentoring may vary from one location to another and from one time period to another. Because of that, this research is limited to the perceptions of those within the state of Arkansas. It could be beneficial for other states that have mentoring programs to be studied to see if perceptions vary across states. In relation to the time period, the results of the survey are limited to one academic year. A longitudinal study of subsequent years could provide for data that could address trends in the perceptions of those involved in mentoring. Likewise, perceptions may vary depending on the number of times a mentor has mentored and the experiences that are gleaned during the relationship with a particular novice. The results of this research are a
snapshot in time based on only one academic year’s pairings since pairing change from one year to the next.

The results of any research study are dependent upon the number of respondents who actually participate. Because of time constraints, the survey was conducted at the end of the academic year. This condition was possibly one reason for a low response rate because educators are extremely busy during this time. Although participation in the study was voluntary, individuals who chose to complete the web-based survey instrument may demonstrate higher levels of motivation and commitment to mentoring because they viewed mentoring favorably. This, too, could be a limitation of the study.

In the world of cyberspace, there are no guarantees to ensure that technology is always working and is available to individuals. In this study, there is no way to ascertain if everyone who was invited to participate actually received the invitation since it was sent by the online survey instrument website which may have been blocked by Internet and/or email filters. In the world of email filters, spamming, and other technological menaces, some who might have participated in the survey may not have actually had the opportunity. Likewise, intended respondents may not have had the access needed to complete the survey even if they received the invitation.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

First, the purpose of this study was to determine the differences of how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the overall mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Second, the purpose of this study was to determine the differences between how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the activities component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Third, the purpose of this study was to determine the differences between how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the expenditures/stipends component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Fourth, the purpose of this study was to determine the differences between how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the time requirements component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. Fifth, the purpose of this study was to determine the differences between how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the Pathwise® training component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ.
In this chapter, the researcher provides a summary of key findings, draws conclusions, and proposes recommendations based on the research data. In order to concisely present the data for the reader, the researcher organized the results and findings, as well as the conclusions, by the research questions. In the final sections, the implications of this study on future research and practices are presented.

**Results**

**Demographic Information**

Demographic information was collected from those who actually responded to the survey instrument. A survey was sent to 322 mentors and 322 novice teachers. The response rate for mentors was 158 mentors (49.1%) and 160 novice teachers (49.7%). The gender composition for the mentor sample was 22 males (13.9%) and 136 females (86.1%). The gender composition for the novice teacher sample was 37 males (23.1%) and 123 females (76.9%). Figure 1 details the mentor to novice teacher data by gender.

*Figure 1*

Gender Comparisons for Mentors and Novice Teachers
The ethnic composition for the mentor sample, see Figure 2, was as follows: 16 African-Americans (10.1%), 141 Caucasians (89.2%), and 1 American Indian (0.7%). The ethnic composition for the novice teacher sample was as follows: 9 African-Americans (5.6%), 149 Caucasians (93.1%), and 2 Hispanic/Latino (1.3%).

Figure 2
Ethnicity Comparisons for Mentors and Novice Teachers

The level at which mentors were employed was composed of 60 elementary (38.0%), 41 middle/junior high (25.9%), and 57 high school (36.1%). The level at which novice teachers were employed was composed of 65 elementary (40.6%), 43 middle/junior high (26.9%), and 52 high school (32.5%). Figure 3 details these data.
Finally, the age of the respondents is depicted in Table 1 and Figure 4.

Table 1

Respondents by Age Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Ranges</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>61-70+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teachers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistical Assumptions

The statistical assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances were checked prior to running the statistical analysis. A visual inspection of the box and whisker plots (see Appendix D) for scores on each of the areas revealed approximate normal distributions with only a few outliers on each of the ends of the plots after a correction was made for one respondent that lay beyond the acceptable level. In checking for extreme values, it was observed that one respondent (#244) was an outlier on four of the five scores. In reviewing the responses, it was observed that the respondent consistently responded the same to questions regardless of the measures put in place to prevent inconsistent responses. Mertler and Vannatta (2005) advise the researcher to determine whether or not the subject was “different from the rest of the sample,” and if so, it is “appropriate to drop the case from the analysis” (p. 29). The respondent was therefore deleted.
Prior to running the actual analysis, the researcher also checked in SPSS for normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality. When the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality with the Lilliefors significance correction was conducted rather than a visual inspection, the null hypothesis for normal distribution was rejected for male mentors ($p < .05$) and male novice teachers ($p < .05$) on all scores and for female mentors ($p < .05$) and female novice teachers ($p < .05$) on all scores except the overall score. On the overall score, the null hypothesis was not rejected for the female mentor group. In instances where the statistic was significant, the significance was determined to be due to the large sample size ($n > 50$) and can therefore be relaxed because of the law of large numbers (Sirkin 2007). The findings can be reviewed in Table 2.
Table 2

*Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality by Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathwise®</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

To determine homogeneity of variances prior to the data analysis, the Levene test was utilized. As presented in Table 3, the F value resulted in no violations of the assumption, and the ANOVA was continued.
Table 3

Results of Levene’s Test of Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathwise®</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type II Sum of Squares

Typically, ANOVA utilizes the Type III Sum of Squares model and assumes that cell sizes are equal. In this study, cell sizes were unequal because more females responded than males. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), Type III is an appropriate method for experimental research; however, since this research is nonexperimental and has unequal samples sizes, the Type II Sum of Squares should be utilized to avoid “loss of power with a nonexperimental design and perhaps interpretability and generalizability by treating all cells as if they had equal sample sizes” (p. 297). This method “imposes a hierarchy of testing effects where main effects are adjusted for each other…while interactions are adjusted for main effect…and for same- and lower-level interactions” (p. 297).

Bonferroni Adjustment

An alpha of .05 was used for all statistical tests. However, Huck (2008) indicates that if “researchers use the hypothesis testing procedure multiple times, an adjustment
must be made somewhere in the process to account for the fact that at least one Type I error somewhere in the set of results increases rapidly as the number of tests increases” (p. 195). Therefore, the Bonferroni correction was used to reduce the chance of committing a Type I error. Therefore, given that five statistical tests were conducted (one for each score), the adjusted alpha used to reject the null hypothesis was .05/5 or alpha = .01.

**Results for Hypothesis 1**

**Hypothesis 1: There Is No Difference In How Mentor Teachers And Novice Teachers Feel By Gender About The Overall Mentoring/Induction Program In Arkansas Public Schools For Teachers Who Have Been Involved In The Process As Outlined By The ADE-OTQ.**

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of each of the independent variables grouped together (gender and role) for the overall score.

**Table 4**

*Descriptive Statistics for Overall Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>148.77</td>
<td>13.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>150.08</td>
<td>12.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>153.73</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>156.09</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test this hypothesis, a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was conducted using role of teacher (mentor versus novice) by gender as the independent variables and the overall perception
of the program as the dependent variable. There was insufficient evidence based on the interaction of the variables to reject the first null hypothesis, $F(1, 313) = .096, p = .757, ES = .000$, as reported in Table 5. Since there was no significant interaction between the variables of gender and role, the main effect of each variable was examined separately.

Table 5

*Factorial ANOVA for Overall Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type II Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1711.457</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>570.486</td>
<td>4.342</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7505657.047</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7505657.047</td>
<td>57129.990</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>370.496</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>370.496</td>
<td>2.820</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1478.296</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1478.296</td>
<td>11.252</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role * Gender</td>
<td>12.649</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.649</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>41121.496</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>131.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7548490.000</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>42832.953</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

The main effect for role was not significant, $F(1, 313) = 2.820, p = .094, ES = .009$. The main effect for gender, however, was significant, $F(1, 313) = 11.252, p = .001$. The effect size ($ES = .035$), according to Huck (2008), is between small ($\eta^2 = .01$) and medium ($\eta^2 = .06$).
Results for Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2: There Is No Difference In How Mentor Teachers And Novice Teachers Feel By Gender About The Activities Component Of The Mentoring/Induction Program In Arkansas Public Schools For Teachers Who Have Been Involved In The Process As Outlined By The ADE-OTQ.

Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations of each of the independent variables grouped together (gender and role) for the activities score.
Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Activities Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>46.95</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>46.84</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>48.67</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test this hypothesis, a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was conducted with role of teacher by gender as the independent variables and the activities component as the dependent variable. There was insufficient evidence based on the interaction of the variables to reject the null hypothesis, $F(1, 313) = .505, p = .478, ES = .002$, as reported in Table 7.

Since there was no significant interaction between the variables of gender and role, the main effect of each variable was examined separately.

Table 7

Factorial ANOVA for Activities Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type II Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>135.094</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.031</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>728928.710</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>728928.710</td>
<td>31568.906</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>40.233</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.233</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>96.066</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.066</td>
<td>4.160</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role * Gender</td>
<td>11.659</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.659</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7227.196</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>23.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>736291.000</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>7362.290</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main effect for role was not significant, $F (1, 313) = 1.742, \ p = .188, \ ES = .006$. The main effect for gender was also not significant, $F (1, 313) = 4.160, \ p = .042, \ ES = .013$. Figure 6 depicts these findings.

**Figure 6**

Estimated Marginal Means of Activities Score

![Graph](image)

**Results for Hypothesis 3**

**Hypothesis 3: There Is No Difference In How Mentor Teachers And Novice Teachers Feel By Gender About The Expenditures/Stipends Component Of The Mentoring/Induction Program In Arkansas Public Schools For Teachers Who Have Been Involved In The Process As Outlined By The ADE-OTQ.**

Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations of each of the independent variables grouped together (gender and role) for the funding score.
Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Funding Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>37.19</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>36.39</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test this hypothesis, a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was conducted using role of teacher by gender as the independent variables and the expenditures/stipends component as the dependent variable. There was insufficient evidence based on the interaction of the variables to reject the null hypothesis, \( F(1, 313) = .055, p = .815, ES = .000 \), as reported in Table 9. Since there was no significant interaction between the variables of gender and role, the main effect of each variable was examined separately.

Table 9

Factorial ANOVA for Funding Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type II Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>212.422</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.807</td>
<td>5.678</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>434269.050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>434269.050</td>
<td>34821.376</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>194.528</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>194.528</td>
<td>15.598</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>33.088</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.088</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role * Gender</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3903.528</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>12.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>438385.000</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>4115.950</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
The main effect for role was significant, $F(1, 313) = 15.598, p = .000$. The effect size ($ES = .047$), according to Huck (2008), is between small ($\eta^2 = .01$) and medium ($\eta^2 = .06$). The main effect for gender, however, was not significant, $F(1, 313) = 2.653, p = .104, ES = .008$. Figure 7 indicates the estimated marginal means of funding score by gender.

*Figure 7*

Estimated Marginal Means of Funding Score

![Graph showing estimated marginal means of funding score by gender.]

**Results for Hypothesis 4**

**Hypothesis 4:** There Is No Difference In How Mentor Teachers And Novice Teachers Feel By Gender About The Time Requirements Component Of The Mentoring/Induction Program In Arkansas Public Schools For Teachers Who Have Been Involved In The Process As Outlined By The ADE-OTQ.

Table 10 presents the means and standard deviations of each of the independent variables grouped together (gender and role) for the time score.
Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics for Time Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>32.46</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test this hypothesis, a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was conducted with role of teacher by gender as the independent variables and the time requirements component as the dependent variable. There was insufficient evidence based on the interaction of the variables to reject the null hypothesis, $F(1, 313) = .028, p = .866, ES = .000$, as reported in Table 11. Since there was no significant interaction between the variables of gender and role, the main effect of each variable was examined separately.

Table 11

*Factorial ANOVA for Time Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type II Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>252.481$^a$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84.160</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>337273.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>337273.186</td>
<td>14033.745</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>69.819</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.819</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>154.234</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154.234</td>
<td>6.418</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role * Gender</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7522.333</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>24.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>345048.000</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>7774.814</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Figure 8, the main effect for role was not significant, $F(1, 313) = 2.905, p = .089, ES = .009$. The main effect for gender was also not significant, $F(1, 313) = 6.418, p = .012, ES = .020$.

*Figure 8*

Estimated Marginal Means of Time Score

### Results for Hypothesis 5

**Hypothesis 5:** There Is No Difference In How Mentor Teachers And Novice Teachers Feel By Gender About The Pathwise® Training Component Of The Mentoring/Induction Program In Arkansas Public Schools For Teachers Who Have Been Involved In The Process As Outlined By The ADE-OTQ.

Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations of each of the independent variables grouped together (gender and role) for the Pathwise® score.
Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics for Pathwise® Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>34.91</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Novice Teacher</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Novice Teacher</td>
<td>37.03</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test this hypothesis, a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was conducted using role of teacher by gender as the independent variables and the Pathwise® training component as the dependent variable. There was insufficient evidence based on the interaction of the variables to reject the null hypothesis, $F(1, 313) = .207, p = .649, ES = .001$, as reported in Table 13. Since there was no significant interaction between the variables of gender and role, the main effect of each variable was examined separately.

Table 13

*Factorial ANOVA for Pathwise® Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type II Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>150.549*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.183</td>
<td>3.223</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>417482.700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>417482.700</td>
<td>26816.901</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>53.491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.491</td>
<td>3.436</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>109.747</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109.747</td>
<td>7.050</td>
<td>.008*</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role * Gender</td>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4872.751</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15.568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>422506.000</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>5023.300</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .01
The main effect for role was not significant, $F (1, 313) = 3.436, p = .065, ES = .011$. The main effect for gender, however, was significant, $F (1, 313) = 7.050, p = .008$. The effect size ($ES = .022$), according to Huck (2008), is small ($\eta^2 = .01$). Figure 9 provides a graphic depiction.

*Figure 9*

Estimated Marginal Means of Pathwise® Score

![Graph showing estimated marginal means for role and gender](image-url)
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Various components of the Arkansas model for induction and mentoring were studied to gain more insight into the perceptions of mentors and novice teachers who were involved in the process. As a practitioner of mentoring and education, the researcher sought to gain valuable information that might influence programming and funding related to these initiatives in Arkansas. In addition, data were examined to determine if differences existed between gender and roles within the program.

The study surveyed 158 mentors and 160 novice teachers in a quantitative study utilizing a questionnaire containing 34 Likert scaled questions. Data from the online survey were used to assess the perceptions of the participants.

In Chapter IV, data from the surveys were analyzed by examining mentor and novice teacher perceptions and testing the existing hypotheses. In this chapter, conclusions, recommendations, and implications are presented.

Conclusions

A 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was calculated to compare the scores for the two roles (mentor and novice teacher) and for gender (male and female) on a questionnaire seeking perceptual input. The following hypotheses were tested, and these conclusions were formulated.
Hypothesis 1

There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the overall mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. There was no significant interaction between the independent variables of gender and role and the dependent variable of the Overall score. Gender and role did not work together as a factor affecting how individuals scored the questionnaire overall. The respondents had medium to high mean scores indicating that they tended to answer questions throughout the survey in the “somewhat agree” range. Overall, the respondents somewhat agreed with the various aspects of mentoring presented in the survey instrument. Additional techniques were utilized to test for main effects for the two independent variables. A significant main effect for gender in the Overall score was found. Further analysis revealed that females scored questions in the questionnaire higher than males.

Mentors and novice teachers perceived the overall mentoring process relatively the same with their mean scores being in the “somewhat agree” range. However, these results indicate that females perceived the overall mentoring process in a more positive light than their male counterparts did. In her study concerning support networks for beginning teachers, Bainer (1998) suggested that males and females do vary in their ideas and needs concerning mentoring and its functions. Her findings suggested that “male and female teachers may need different considerations and resources for support to develop healthy, comprehensive networks” (p. 7). In this study, these perceptions took into account all of the scores including those for activities, time, funding, and Pathwise® use and indicated that females value the process of mentoring and induction and its
components more than males. Specifically, females rated all of the areas higher than males with the highest scores occurring in the area of activities.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the activities component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. There was no significant interaction between the independent variables of gender and role and the dependent variable of the Activities score. Gender and role did not work together as a factor affecting how individuals scored the questionnaire in the area of activities. Additional techniques were utilized to test for main effects for the two independent variables. No significant main effects were found. In this area, all respondents answered the survey items with medium to high mean scores that would have fallen in the “somewhat agree” to the “agree” range.

These results indicate that regardless of role (mentor or novice teacher) or gender (male or female), perception in the area of activities were relatively the same. The mean of the responses in this area were higher than in all of the other areas that were surveyed. Hirsch and Emerick (2007), in a study of North Carolina teacher working conditions, indicated that novice teachers perceived that mentoring activities that included information about district procedures, instructional strategies, and classroom management provided helpful opportunities for them. Perceptually, these groups, like those surveyed in North Carolina, viewed activities contained in the Arkansas model such as collaborating on lessons, preparing for the Praxis III, and professional development, as important and necessary aspects of the mentoring model. This result suggests that
mentors and novice teachers expect the mentoring model to have required activities that
should be an integral part of the novice teacher’s growth. Activities that might be
expected here would include instruction by the mentor to enable the novice teacher to be
better at classroom management, to be better equipped to maneuver the district’s
unwritten channels, and to be better able to collaborate with peers.

Hypothesis 3

There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender
about the expenditures/stipends component of the mentoring/induction program in
Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined
by the ADE-OTQ. There was no significant interaction between the independent
variables of gender and role and the dependent variable of the Funding score. Gender and
role did not work together as a factor affecting how individuals scored the questionnaire
in the area of funding. Additional techniques were utilized to test for main effects for the
two independent variables. A significant main effect for role in the Funding score was
found. Additional analysis revealed that novice teachers scored questions in the
questionnaire higher than mentors.

In this analysis, both males and females perceived items involved with funding in
a positive way with mean scores being in the “somewhat agree” range. Males and
females were agreeable that stipends and the purchasing of instructional materials were
being funded at an appropriate level. However, novice teachers perceptually ranked items
higher than mentors did. Although mentors ranked items in the “somewhat agree range,”
novices ranked items closer to the “agree” range. These rankings included items about
mentors being paid a stipend and providing funding for novice teachers to purchase
instructional materials and to attend professional development. Hirsch (2001) recommended enabling in-class support of novice teachers by assisting them in providing resources for their classrooms and own professional development. This finding indicates that mentors and novice teachers in Arkansas agree with Hirsch’s idea of providing financial assistance to novice teachers. Although this was statistically significant, it could be expected that both of these groups would view receiving a stipend and being allowed to spend money for materials as being a positive aspect in the mentoring model.

**Hypothesis 4**

There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the time requirements component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. There was no significant interaction between the independent variables of gender and role and the dependent variable of the Time score. Gender and role did not work together as a factor affecting how individuals scored the questionnaire in the area of time. Additional techniques were utilized to test for main effects for the two independent variables. No significant main effects were found.

The time category questions focused on components related to how much time mentors and novice teachers spend together to accomplish the requirements of the Arkansas model. All four subgroups perceptually viewed time in comparable ways by ranking questions in the “somewhat disagree” to “somewhat agree” ranges. All groups agreed that the amount of time required by the model was adequate and should be an exact amount of time. The groups further agreed, although at a modest level, that the required amount of time for training and recalibration was appropriate. In this area,
respondents scored items lower than anticipated by the researcher. Although the researcher acknowledges that a large amount of time is required for training and recalibration, the researcher thought that respondents would value the training and the need for recalibration at a higher level. Part of this low score in this component could be due to some of the mentors having needed to attend several recalibrations that in essence covered the same set of material that had already been learned by the mentor.

**Hypothesis 5**

There is no difference in how mentor teachers and novice teachers feel by gender about the Pathwise® training component of the mentoring/induction program in Arkansas public schools for teachers who have been involved in the process as outlined by the ADE-OTQ. There was no significant interaction between the independent variables of gender and role and the dependent variable of the Pathwise® score. Gender and role did not work together as a factor affecting how individuals scored the questionnaire in the Pathwise® area. Additional techniques were utilized to test for main effects for the two independent variables. A significant main effect for gender in the Pathwise® Score was found. Additional analysis indicated that females scored items higher than males.

In this analysis, respondents were asked about their perceptions related to the required use of the Pathwise® model. Perceptually, both novices and mentors were no different in their views and tended to rank the items in a positive light. Males responded to the questions in the “somewhat agree” range, and females approached the “agree” range. Females perceptually rated items in this area higher indicating that they valued the required use of Pathwise® more than the corresponding male group. This result confirms Klug and Salzman’s (1990) and Giebelhaus and Bowman’s (2000) conclusions related to
formal mentoring being a preferred method. Formal mentoring, the utilization of a model like Pathwise® and the utilization of definite rules and guidelines, is preferred to informal mentoring, a loosely constructed relationship where novices and mentors are free to do whatever they deem necessary to build camaraderie and to increase skills. Likewise, Giebelhaus and Bowman further indicated that providing training in the general principles and practices of mentoring within a specific framework like Pathwise®/Praxis III should have a more positive impact on developing teachers. Their research focused on the performance of novice teachers on the Praxis III after having been mentored using the Pathwise® model. The research of Giebelhaus and Bowman did not indicate that females value this training more or benefit from it more than males do. Female performance on the Praxis III was not statistically different from male performance. The research here, however, seems to indicate that females do value the structure and training from the Pathwise®/Praxis III model more than males do. Female perceptions about mentoring were higher in all areas than the perceptual ratings of males.

**Recommendations**

Although the study identifies areas of statistical significance and identifies significant main effects in three areas, the effect size to all of the results either is considered small or between small and medium. Continued research would need to be performed by looking more intently at the items comprising the Funding score and the Pathwise® score to determine if causal relationships exist. Likewise, additional information would have been helpful to understand what caused these perceptions. This additional information could have contained a set of qualitative responses produced by focus groups where groups could have been questioned about the reasons they responded
the way they did on the survey instrument. In the Overall score, females scored items higher than their male counterparts did. When the Overall score was broken down into the various components, it was revealed that females scored items higher in all of the categories than males. In the category of Pathwise®, novice teachers tended to score items higher than mentors did. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to know why this increase in perceived score exists. Some insight might have been ascertained if a qualitative component had been added to this study. Therefore, it is suggested that future research in this area contain qualitative inquiries to attempt to gain more understanding of the data.

In examining the Overall score and the high mean of this score for all groups, this study shows an overall positive perception of the mentoring process in the state of Arkansas. Mentoring and its various components should continue to be utilized in the state of Arkansas. This research indicates that mentors and novices value the process of mentoring and the model that has been implemented by the state of Arkansas. While Arkansas has made a substantial appropriation to mentoring amounting to almost $8 million each biennium, this amount may not be sufficient to continue to meet the needs of the ever increasing number of novice and non-traditional teachers that will require training. To allow for appropriate training and to retain good mentors, stipends for these mentors will need to be continued and perhaps increased. In addition, the cost of training can reasonably be expected to increase as costs increase due to the economy.

Because the overall perception regarding mentoring is positive, funding for the Arkansas model should continue. This research as well as the previous writings by Hirsch (2001) indicates the continued need for mentors and novices to have financial support. In
order to retain quality mentors and to support novice teachers in their initial year of
teaching, a stream of financial support must remain in place. Consideration should be
given to increasing the amount of money allocated to mentors and to novices since it has
not significantly increased since the program’s inception. Mentors are still paid a $1200
stipend, and novice teachers are allowed to expend $800 on materials, professional
development, or other allowable expenditures. With the cost for Praxis III assessments
estimated at $500 per novice, the total cost expended for each novice is about $2,500.
The state has remained loyal to this effort and is reaping the benefits by being recognized
as a leader in teacher preparation. To continue forging ahead in this area, an increase in
funding might be appropriate.

Additional research should be conducted to ascertain how to best utilize the
funding that is appropriated by the Arkansas legislature to ensure that perceptions
regarding mentoring remain at a high level. In the year examined in this study, $2,500
was expended in costs directly related to the novice. Of the approximately $3,660 per
novice that was allocated for the year, that would leave $1,160 per novice for
administrative and training related expenses. While administrative costs are necessary to
appropriately direct the program, where possible, money should be utilized in ways and
means that directly benefit novice teachers and their remaining in the profession. Where
this research has indicated lower levels of agreement in perception, future researchers
might find a starting place for additional research that could guide improvement efforts in
the Arkansas model. In turn, funding could be re-appropriated to help in those identified
areas so improvements could be made to the model.
Additional research in a mixed-methods approach should be undertaken to identify why females’ perceptions were higher than males’ perceptions concerning the various aspects of mentoring. Gender roles and gender matching are items that deserve additional research in light of the perceptions that have been noted in this research endeavor. Going beyond the quantitative-only approach that was used by this researcher, future researchers might consider incorporating a qualitative component to address the issues presented in focus groups or individual interviews.

Implications

Significance and Expansion of Knowledge Base

This research has provided some perceptual data that will help to fill the void in the knowledge base that was voiced by Petersen (2008). This study opens the door for continued research in the area of mentoring and induction. Future studies could probe deeper to find causal relationships that may exist in the areas identified in this study as being statistically significant. Additionally, other demographics could be probed for statistical significance including district size and age. The study also creates an opportunity for discussion by all parties involved in the process to explore the reasons for the differences that exist. In addition, research could be undertaken to continue the justification of the biennial apportionment that is made by the state to fund this endeavor. The research here indicates a positive perception about the process, but future research might examine what portions of the process are most helpful and look also at what portions of the process need to be reexamined or eliminated.

Future Research Considerations
Future researchers seeking to replicate or in some way build on this study might consider pairing this quantitative study with a qualitative component and produce a mixed-approach model study. Some of the conclusions of this study might have been framed in more definitive and concrete ways had the research contained a qualitative component where randomly selected novices and mentors were questioned in focus groups. Questions could have sought for additional clarification about the various components of the Arkansas model and could have provided deeper and richer meaning to the statistical information presented by the quantitative component. Carnine (2007) posed these questions and suggested further research be done in Arkansas: the location of protégés and mentors in proximity to one another, the lack of common planning experiences, and whether or not sharing a common academic discipline is necessary. Although this study did question the perception of respondents about some of these ideas, Carnine’s suggestions still remain as viable additions to the study or as independent research topics related to the area of education.

Marx (2006) pointed out that teacher shortages and teacher retention would continue to plague education with a variety of problems. Additional research in a longitudinal format could be conducted to see if these educators were retained in the field of education and whether or not their mentoring and induction as novices had any effect on that retention. The results of that information would help those in the field know whether or not mentoring and induction are an invaluable part of the process or if it has no significant bearing at all on teacher retention.

Potential Policy Changes
As indicated by Bauer and LeBlanc (2002), lawmakers have raised the stake in mentoring by mandating the novice teacher-mentor relationship. Arkansas has definitely joined this group. This study and continued research could aid legislators and employees of ADE-OTQ by creating a situation where the maximum utilization of the funding made available to the program is guaranteed. By examining perceptions of those truly active in the process and focusing on the grass-roots idea that change should begin with those involved, this research is a springboard for asking the questions necessary to ensure that the Arkansas model actually contains the components necessary to produce excellent educators.
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APPENDIX A

Online Survey Instrument

Perceptions of Mentors and Novice Teachers in Arkansas

Use the following scale:

6 - Strongly Agree
5 - Agree
4 - Somewhat Agree
3 - Somewhat Disagree
2 - Disagree
1 - Strongly Disagree
Perceptions of Mentors and Novice Teachers in Arkansas

1 Please rate your perceptions related to ACTIVITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1-The mentor and the novice teacher should conduct their mentoring activities during the school day.

A2-The mentor and the novice teacher should conduct their mentoring activities during "off-contract" time.

A3-The mentor and the novice teacher should NOT collaborate to plan lessons.

A4-The mentor and the novice teacher should collaborate to help students.

A5-The mentor should assist the novice teacher in preparing for the Praxis® III assessment.
Perceptions of Mentors and Novice Teachers in Arkansas

2 Please rate your perceptions related to ACTIVITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A6 - The mentor and the novice teacher should attend professional development together.

A7 - The mentor and novice teacher should be located in the same building.

A8 - The mentor and the novice teacher should teach in the same discipline.

A9 - Each district should form a support group for its novice teachers.

A10 - A district support group of mentors and novice teachers should meet a minimum of once a month.
### Perceptions of Mentors and Novice Teachers in Arkansas

#### 3 Please rate your perceptions related to FUNDING and STIPENDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>The novice teacher should receive funding for instructional materials.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>The state legislature should provide funding for the mentoring program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>The novice teacher should receive funding for professional development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>The mentor should be paid a stipend.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4 Please rate your perceptions related to FUNDING and STIPENDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
F5-The $1200 stipend for mentors is adequate.  
F6-The $800 allowance for novices is NOT adequate.  
F7-Local school districts should fund the mentoring program.  
F8-The novice teachers should be allowed to spend their allotted funds on items other than “allowable expenditures” (i.e. – professional development, resource books, materials for learning centers, membership to a professional organization, etc.).
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5 Please rate your perceptions related to TIME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1-A novice teacher and mentor should spend at least 2 hours together every 2 weeks.

T2-A mentor should spend 25 hours per semester in additional time with the novice teacher.

T3-Twenty-five (25) hours additional time per semester is too MUCH time to spend together.

T4-Novice teachers and mentors should be required to spend an exact amount of time together.
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6 Please rate your perceptions related to TIME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Two (2) hours every 2 weeks is an adequate amount of time to spend together.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Three (3) days for training in the Pathwise® model is too MUCH time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Documentation of the time spent together should be required.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>One day for the “recalibration” of mentors is NOT enough time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7 Please rate your perceptions related to PATHWISE® REQUIREMENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P1-A Pathwise® expert should be available from the Arkansas Department of Education to answer questions.

P2-Mentors and novice teachers should be required to follow the Pathwise® model for classroom observations.

P3-A project director in your district is NOT necessary.

P4-A mentor with three years or more of teaching experience is necessary.
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8 Please rate your perceptions related to PATHWISE® REQUIREMENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P5 - A mentor with training in the Pathwise® model is NOT necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 - The criteria in the Pathwise® model are vague.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 - It is important to require the recalibration of mentors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 - The forms required by Pathwise® are easy to use.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Demographic Information:

What is your gender?

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female
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10. What was your role in the mentoring process?
- Mentor
- Traditionally Trained Novice Teacher
- Non-traditional Novice Teacher (NTL program or M.A.T. program)

Perceptions of Mentors and Novice Teachers in Arkansas

11. At what level were you involved in teaching or mentoring?
- Elementary
- Middle School/Jr. High
- High School
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1. What is the approximate size of your district based on student population?

0-1000
1001-2000
2001-3000
3001-4000
4001-5000
5001-6000
6001-7000
7001-8000
8001-9000
9001-10000
10001-11000
11000+
Perceptions of Mentors and Novice Teachers in Arkansas

13 Which range best describes your age?
- under 21
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- 36-40
- 41-45
- 46-50
- 51-55
- 56-60
- 61-65
- 66-70
- 70+

Survey Page 14

Perceptions of Mentors and Novice Teachers in Arkansas

14 Which category best describes your race/ethnicity?
- Black/African-American
- White/Caucasian
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- American Indian
- Hispanic/Latino
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APPENDIX B

Letter of Consent

PERCEPTION OF MENTORING AND INDUCTION IN ARKANSAS
Letter of Consent

May 2009

Dear Teacher:

You have been selected to participate in this study because you were either a mentor or a novice teacher during the 2008-2009 academic year. As a former teacher and a current building administrator, I know how busy you are, and your time in completing this survey is greatly appreciated.

As a part of my doctoral studies at Harding University, I am interested in discovering the perceptions of mentors and novice teachers about the current model for mentoring and induction in Arkansas. Your opinions and perspectives will enable me to provide an accurate picture to stakeholders regarding perceptions about the Arkansas components of the mentoring process.

Since the validity of the results depends on obtaining a high response rate, your participation is crucial to the success of this study. The completion of the online questionnaire will last approximately ten minutes. Please be assured that your responses will be held in the strictest confidence. You will not be identified by name, so I would appreciate your honest response to each question. As soon as questionnaires are collected, they will be stored in a secure online database that will be password protected. Once the study is complete, the information in the database will be deleted. If the results of this study were to be written for publication, no identifying information will be used.

I would like to thank you in advance for your time and effort in bringing this study to a reality. If you are interested in the results of this survey, please indicate that you would like a copy of the results on the final question in the questionnaire.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate and discontinue your participation at any time with no penalty and without loss of benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

If you agree to participate in this survey, you may proceed to the web address below and begin. The deadline to complete the survey is May 31, 2009. Your accessing this link will demonstrate that you have read this consent form, that you freely and voluntarily choose to participate, and that you consent to participate.

<web address of online surveying tool linked directly to the survey>

Sincerely,

Bruce W. Bryant, Principal Investigator
Professor
Ed.D. Candidate – Harding University
303 S. Morrill
Morrilton, AR 72110
bryantb@sccsd.k12.ar.us
501-977-6215

Dr. David Bangs, Associate
Harding University
Box 12261
Searcy, AR 72149
dbangs@harding.edu
501-279-4514
APPENDIX C

Reminder Email

TO: [recipient list]
FROM: bryantb@scsdd.k12.ar.us
SUBJECT: Reminder: Harding University—Survey about Perceptions of Mentoring in Arkansas

Dear Educator:

I appreciate your willingness to read this reminder and once again consider participating in this survey which closes on May 31st. Since the validity of the results depends on obtaining a high response rate, your participation is crucial to the success of this study. Your opinions and perspectives will enable me to provide an accurate picture to stakeholders regarding perceptions about the Arkansas components of the mentoring process.

It would certainly be appreciated if you would take a few moments from your busy schedule to help by completing the survey. It should take ten minutes or less to complete. Thanks again for your assistance in helping discover the answers to these important research questions.

Sincerely,

Bruce Bryant, Ed. D. Candidate

Dr. David Bangs, Associate Professor - Harding University

LINK TO THE SURVEY:
APPENDIX D
Box and Whisker Plots for Scores

Box and whisker plots for Overall Score

Box and whisker plots for Activities Score
Box and whisker plots for Funding Score

Box and whisker plots for Time Score
Box and whisker plots for Pathwise® Score
I came into this world in May of 1971. Richard Nixon was the president, at least for a little while longer. Dale Bumpers had just become the governor after upsetting Winthrop Rockefeller’s run for re-election having been the first Republican elected to the office since Reconstruction. Roy and Marian Bryant would soon start working on a new house because their home with this first son, Harold, was too small to raise their burgeoning family that was about to grow from three to five in just a few minutes on the eighteenth day of the month. Bruce and Brian Bryant, their twin sons, were about to make their entry into the world.

Most people enter the world alone having been formed in solitaire. I, on the other hand, had to learn to share early on. Even in the womb, my life was a life of sharing. My twin and I shared a room. Later on, we shared a three-wheeler. As teens, we shared a car. Sharing my things, thoughts, ideas, family, and knowledge with others has been a trait of mine from the beginning. This trait has guided my career path in becoming a person who could share, first as a teacher, then as an administrator in the world of education.

Hard Work and Honesty

My formative years were spent on a Grade A dairy farm in the north end of rural Conway County, Arkansas. From my parents, I learned the value of hard work and the necessity to earn an honest living. They taught me that everyone was worthy of respect.
so long as they weren’t afraid of hard work. My father instilled in me the importance of a
good education. He knew all along that I would never be a dairy farmer, and if I were to 
succeed in the world, he knew that I would need to be educated. My mother realized that 
I was a person who could easily get to know others and saw within me the ability to 
communicate with a wide variety of people in all walks of life. She encouraged me to 
use my talents to teach, not only a subject matter at school, but also the gospel message 
of Jesus. Her mother, my Granny Williams, and she became the rock and foundation of 
my faith and service in the church that would lead me to be a preacher, a deacon, an 
elder, and an educator.

I was educated in the Nemo Vista Public Schools, an enormous school district 
where I was the valedictorian from a mammoth class of twenty-nine. As a Governor’s 
Scholar, I was able to afford, at least for the first two years of my college education, to go 
to Harding University. My degree plan in business education necessitated a transfer to 
the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville where I finished my degree and met and 
made my wife, the former Lisa Mills.

Trust in the Master

After graduating in May and marrying my beautiful wife in June of 1993, I wasn’t 
sure where my life was headed. I had a new wife who was still working on a degree. We 
had new bills to pay…remember my father, he had always promised that marriage would 
bring on new responsibilities, and he carried out his part of that bargain by making sure 
car and health insurance premiums were transferred over to my name soon after marriage. 
We had no place of our own to live. And, I had no job.
Within a two week period, I had been offered a job at my alma mater in Center Ridge. I had contacted an elderly lady from the church I had grown up in about renting her home in Formosa for us to live in. She wouldn’t let me rent it, but she would let me live there…free of charge. On the first Sunday that we went to church after moving, the preacher at the local church resigned, and I was offered a job preaching at the church. Just before school started, the superintendent called and wanted to know if I would drive a bus for the route in my area. Stupidly and out of need for money, I said yes. Simply stated, in just over a month, I went from having no job and no home--to living rent free and employed at three different tasks -- teacher, preacher, and bus driver. This part of my life quickly taught me that if I would put my trust in God, He would always take care of me and my family and would provide for our every need. He has never failed me, and I have tried my best to do His will and keep His commands. I continue to preach and also serve as an elder in our local church.

In time, I completed a Master’s degree at the University of Central Arkansas while working as a teacher at Nemo Vista and then at Perryville. I was offered and accepted a job as a business instructor at the University of Arkansas Community College in Morrilton in 2002. In 2005, I became the director of the River Valley Technical Center, a secondary career center teaching six vocational – technical programs of study and serving four area high schools. In 2007, I went back to a grade level that I thought I would never encounter again and became the principal of Morrilton Junior High School, a 7th and 8th grade campus.
Today

My wife, Lisa, and I are the proud parents of two wonderful boys, Haydn and Mills. We share our lives with them and strive to be good parents in the hopes that they will become fine men, good fathers, and excellent leaders in the Lord’s church. They understand my need to complete this chapter in my life – by completing my doctorate. I understand the need to be there as their father and guide in this life in spite of my fulfilling my own goals. I understand the need to continue to be a loving husband who shares in the responsibilities of our family. Somewhere in between, there is a middle ground where everyone benefits and grows into the people they need to become. I know that by sharing, by working hard and honestly, and by trusting the Master, we will find the middle ground and become what He wants us to become.