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ABSTRACT

Cross-Race Mentoring within the Induction Year of New Teachers in an Independent School

Bradley L. Weaver, Dissertation Author and Doctoral Candidate

Dr. Elizabeth Twomey, Dissertation Director

New teachers arrive to our nation’s schools with a range of educational preparation and professional experience. Schools endeavor to alleviate these differences, build professional capacity, and guarantee the efficacy of new teachers (thus more quickly improving educational quality for children) most frequently through induction programs. Researchers identify mentoring as the most common means of inducting new teachers. The school reform movement and related law have influenced mentoring frequency, goals, and practices, as have recent advances in understanding how adults learn. With the number of new teachers expected in both public and independent schools within the current decade, the intense pressure of reform mandates, and public expectations on teacher quality, the effectiveness of new teacher induction and mentoring programs is paramount. Likewise, as the nation increases in its overall diversity, how mentoring programs address the race and ethnicity of new teachers and mentors, particularly when the vast majority of veteran mentor teachers for the near future will be White, is also critical to program success. This study examined the effect of a newly implemented induction and mentoring program on a cohort of new teachers during their
first year of service in an independent school. The school had a strategic initiative to diversify its faculty. Consequently, an essential element of the study was to investigate the experience of new teachers of color who were involved in cross-race mentor-new teacher relationships in contrast to the experience of their White counterparts involved in the same program for the same academic year. An overview of the study, a review of relevant literature, the study’s design, results, and discussion of findings and their implications are presented.
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CHAPTER ONE

Overview of the Study

Introduction

Hargreaves (2003) alleged “teaching is in crisis” and cites “demographic turnover,” “disillusionment with large scale reform,” “good teachers’ retiring early,” and “young teachers’ leaving for something… more emotionally uplifting” as primary causes (p. 160). Ingersoll (2001b) concurred stating, “While it is true that teacher retirements are increasing, overall turnover accounted for by retirement is relatively minor when compared to that resulting from other causes such as teacher job dissatisfaction” (p. 5). Ingersoll demonstrated that, while demand for teachers has increased steadily since the mid-1980s, the average national turnover rate for teaching exceeded that for other professions and that “hiring difficulties were not primarily due to shortages… driven by enrollment and retirement increases” (2001b, p. 14).

The 2004-05 Teacher Follow-up Survey (Marvel, Lyter, Peltola, Strizek, Morton, & Rowland, 2007) revealed how acutely new teachers are impacted. While the total percentage of teachers who left the teaching profession during the 2004-05 school year was 8.4% for public schools (Table 1, p. 7) and 13.6% for independent schools (Table 1, p. 7), 19.6% of novice (first-year) teachers left public schools (Table 2, p. 8) and 22.3% (Table 3, p. 10) left independent schools. The mobility rate for new public school teachers was equally startling. The percentage of all public school teachers who moved between schools was 8.1% over the same time period (Table 1, p. 7), while the percentage of new teachers was 17.1% (Table 2, p. 8). Mobility rates for 2004-05 were
not mirrored in independent schools and were actually lower for first-year teachers: 5.9% total (Table 1, p. 7) and 4.0% for novices (Table 3, p. 10). When attrition and mobility are considered together, nearly 2 out of 5 novice public school teachers and 1 out of 4 independent school teachers (Ingersoll, 2001b, Tables 2-3, p. 8-10) left their schools or the profession entirely during their first year, “disillusion[ed]” or “dissatisf[ied]” (Hargreaves, 2003, p. 160). These statistics make clear the highly publicized U.S. Department of Education estimates predicting that 2.4 million new public teachers and 568,000 independent school teachers are required during the current decade to sustain pupil/teacher ratios as the teacher force retires, moves to find better schools, or leaves the profession entirely (Hussar, 2007).

Despite these obstacles, Hargreaves challenged school communities “to improve learning” through “inspir[ing] good teaching and… retain[ing] good teachers” (2003, p. 161) and so have our nation’s lawmakers. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 for the first time in U.S. public school history has mandated a required level of training and quality for every teacher in a public school classroom. Public sentiment has followed the inclusion of teacher quality indicators on annual state reports. Our nation’s schools are at a convergence of significant legal, social, and demographic pressure with respect to teacher recruitment and retention.

Equally startling factors are impacting the demographics of the nation’s teacher force. Demographically, 40.7% of the K-12 public school student population were students of color during the 2003-04 school year, while only 16.9% of the teacher force were faculty of color (Strizek, et al., 2006). As a public policy goal, school officials have
aspired to reconcile these figures within their schools’ faculties to reflect the growing diversity of U.S. society. Independent schools are also striving to diversify their teacher force (NAIS, 2004; AISNE, 2007).

However, in all settings the trend is toward a widening racial divide between teachers and pupils (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). In 2004-05, the total number of public school teachers who identified as people of color was 15.2% (Marvel, et al., 2007, Table 2, p. 8). Of this cohort, 9.2% moved schools during the school year and 9.6% left the profession compared to their White colleagues at 7.9% and 8.2% respectively (Table 2). Teachers of color in independent schools were less stable – 11.2% of the private teacher force in 2004-05 were people of color; of those, 7.6% moved and 18.4% left (Table 3, p. 10).

All teachers, regardless of race or ethnicity, arrive to the schoolhouse with a wide range of educational preparation and professional experience. Schools endeavor to alleviate these differences, build professional capacity, and guarantee the efficacy of all new teachers, aspiring to retain the best for the long-term, most frequently through induction and mentoring programs (Achinstein & Athanases, 2006; Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999). In fact, NCLB requires all states to offer such support for teachers in their first year (NCLB § 6613, 2002), as do independent school principles of practice (NAIS, 2006). With the number of new teachers expected in all schools within the next few years, the efficacy of induction and mentoring programs is crucial.

According to Achinstein and Athanases (2006), schools employ mentoring programs for many purposes: (a) to ensure an effective transition from hire through the
first few years of service, (b) to prevent attrition, (c) to optimize new teacher efficacy, and even (d) to forward school reform initiatives. A clear understanding of how mentoring occurs effectively in cross-race contexts, particularly when the majority of veteran mentor teachers for the near future will be White, yet also while schools strive to diversify their faculties, is critical to the success of new teacher mentoring programs.

The dilemma posed by (a) attrition and mobility, (b) the need to diversify faculty, and (c) public pressure to ensure teacher quality represents a major challenge to school leaders endeavoring to build an educational community exemplified by a “guaranteed and viable curriculum” and effective teaching, factors indispensable to student success according to Marzano (2003, p. 3). Whether the confluence of these pressures will result in “The Perfect Storm” (Junger, 1997) or in a renaissance of the American teaching profession is unclear.

Statement of the Problem

A suburban independent elementary school in the northeastern US, The Eastern School, faced a similar dilemma. The school featured an aging core faculty, and retirement-driven turnover was an annual force in recruitment and hiring. Instability, struggle, and mobility in younger, recently-hired teachers were equally human resource issues. The school attempted to address these complex issues by designing and implementing a new teacher induction program with a primary focus on mentoring. Concurrently, the school also has worked to diversify its faculty with respect to racial identity, upon direction of its board of trustees.
The purpose of this qualitative research study was to investigate the experience of a diverse cohort of new teachers during their induction year, with a particular emphasis on new teachers of color participating in mentoring in cross-race contexts.

Research Questions

Using a qualitative research methodology, this research study was designed to answer three research questions:

1. **How did the induction program affect new teachers’ (a) connection to the school community, (b) professional satisfaction, and (c) sense of efficacy?**

2. **Which mentor characteristics did new teachers perceive as being helpful and supportive?**

3. **Did new teachers’ perceptions vary for cross-race mentoring relationships as compared to same-race mentoring relationships?**

Theoretical Rationale

This section introduces the primary theoretical frames that comprised the rationale for this research study. From the research questions emerged four frames: (a) new teacher induction, (b) mentoring as a vehicle for induction, (c) mentoring in cross-race contexts, and (d) qualitative research methodology. Two additional public policy frames connected the primary theoretical frameworks: (a) the school reform movement and its influence on the public policy debate surrounding teacher quality and (b) public policy goals for diversification of the teacher force and the legal context racial hiring preferences. Also, theory related to adult learning was implied across the primary frameworks. Mentoring in cross-race contexts, for which the literature base was found to
a large extent in business and social work fields, represented a research need in the education field. These frames are elaborated upon in greater detail in Chapter Two.

Mentoring and Induction

The Eastern School employed an induction program, of which mentoring was the primary vehicle, to develop new teachers professionally. The researcher-participant postulated that the induction program had influence on new teachers’ attitudes of professional satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and connection to the school community, ultimately contributing to new teacher retention. Mentoring was relied upon as the primary vehicle for induction. Mentors engaged in particular behaviors and display particular attributes that new teachers either did or did not find helpful, and the research study sought to identify and understand those.

Odell (2006) asserted mentoring is “a professional practice, much as teaching is a practice” (p. 203). As a professional practice, mentoring includes “dispositions and beliefs, conceptual and theoretical understandings, as well as skills for implementing the practice” (p. 203). Achinstein and Athanases (2006) stated mentoring and research on mentoring have historically focused on how teachers survive their first year of school with the aspiration of preventing teachers from leaving schools or the profession. The school reform and standards movement has caused a paradigm shift. As a result, the focus now is on (a) how mentoring can increase the rate at which new teachers develop their capacity to effectively impact student learning and school culture and (b) how new teachers can play leadership roles in reforming in the profession (Odell, 2006; Fletcher & Barrett, 2004; Wang, 2001).
The literature base on mentoring is extensive. For the purposes of this research study, a helpful classification strategy was to consider those studies that (a) deal with factors influencing the mentor, (b) those dealing with the protégé, (c) those describing school level factors, and (e) those examining external factors such as district programs and characteristics.

Ingersoll and Smith (2004) observed that research studies of induction programs measure either “teacher attitudes (e.g., teacher’s job satisfaction, efficacy, and commitment); [or] teacher retention or turnover” (p. 683). This research study examined the influence of an induction program, of which mentoring was a major component, on new teachers’ attitudes: (a) professional satisfaction, (b) sense of efficacy, and (c) connection to the school community at the conclusion of their first year. The Eastern School designed its induction and mentoring program with high structure and accountability. With respect to the literature base on induction, it was useful then to consider (a) effective induction program structure and (b) induction program effects on new teacher attitude: satisfaction, efficacy, and connection.

*Adult Learning*

Both induction and mentoring imply adult learning, and The Eastern School stated professional learning for new teachers and mentors was a primary goal of its newly re-designed program. Different from pre-service and in-service training, Smith and Ingersoll (2004) envisioned new teacher induction “as a bridge, enabling the ‘student of teaching’ to become a ‘teacher of students’” (p. 683). Mentoring, or “personal guidance provided usually by seasoned veterans,” increasingly has become the dominant form of
induction or most influential aspect of induction programs (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004, p. 683; Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999). This process of adults transitioning other adults from students of teaching to teachers of students involves adult learning processes.

Cognitive learning theory as it applies to adults is changing the way in which mentoring is perceived and conducted and how it applies to standards-based teaching (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983; Thies-Sprinthall, 1986; Thies-Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987). Mentoring has evolved to being viewed as “school-based teacher education” (Zeek & Walker, 2006, p. 280) and a natural extension/continuation of university pre-service training. Mentoring has meaningful and serious effects on the mentor exclusive of the protégé, as the mentor moves from being strictly a child educator to being a school-based teacher educator. Mentors display specific characteristics that new teachers find helpful.

School Reform

The school reform movement, which exists within the context of the law and ethical codes that have shaped and have been shaped by it, has had a dramatic impact on school-based mentoring and induction programs. There has been a major paradigm shift in the last decade as a result of the school reform movement and the reconceptualization of the role of the federal government in schools. While not a public setting, The Eastern School was influenced by similar trends in independent schools through principles of practice and the regional accreditation process.
Mentoring in Cross-Race Contexts

Diversity in the teaching force, both public and independent, is advocated as a means to “generate increased knowledge and creative ideas”, “enhance student and teacher learning, and enrich the national discourse on the significance of diversity in American public life” (Torres, Santos, Peck, & Cortes, 2004, p. 1-2). Increasing diversity in the teacher force requires broad partnerships between schools, universities, business, and government (Wormer, 1991). The Eastern School was engaged in two reform efforts concurrently: (a) the re-design and implementation of an induction program for new teachers and (b) and effort to diversify its faculty. These reform efforts were not necessarily related, but significant overlap occurred during the research study period when four new teachers of color were hired.

While many educators share a general sense of the importance of teacher diversity mirroring pupil diversity, limited research exists on cross-race mentoring as a means of supporting the diversification of the teacher force in K-12 school contexts. A theoretical framework for cross-race mentoring does exist in research on business environments, social work and counseling, and university teaching. The latter is almost exclusively restricted to self-examinations of single mentor-protégé pairs, and thus somewhat limited in its applicability to school-wide or district-wide K-12 settings. Research on social work, counseling, and mentoring as a support in the racial integration of business settings has greater utility for K-12 educators.
Qualitative Research

Qualitative social science research in education is philosophically grounded in the “view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds” (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). Within an “interpretive research” paradigm “education is considered to be a process and school is a lived experience” (p. 4). Meaning is “constructed socially by individuals” (p. 4), and the researcher’s role is to gather information and generate understanding using an “inductive… mode of inquiry” (p. 4).

Patton (1985) described qualitative research as “an effort to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a particular context and the interactions there” (p. 1).

The researcher-participant desired to understand the richness and complexity of induction and mentoring and cross-race mentoring relationships within a particular context, The Eastern School. He intended to develop this understanding through the experiences, interactions, and perceptions of teachers and mentors working together in The Eastern School induction program. Qualitative research methodology, therefore, was the most appropriate means to investigate the research questions.

Significance of the Study

This section explores why the study was of consequence, not only to The Eastern School, but also in a broader sense. At an internal level, this study benefitted The Eastern School’s efforts to attract and retain a diverse faculty. Recommendations for The Eastern School specifically, and for other schools more generally, provided guidance on how to structure induction and mentoring programs to offer the best support possible to new teachers of color.
On a broader level, the study contributed to research understanding in areas that have received limited attention to date. While the study built on an extensive qualitative research tradition related to the experience of mentors and new teachers engaged in school-based induction programs, it embarked in a relatively unexplored direction for educational settings with respect to the study of cross-race mentoring relationships. Limited research was available that examined the context of cross-race mentoring, particularly in K-12 settings, either public or private. The primary theoretical framework for cross-race mentoring is at the university level, if education-based, and, if not, in social work, counseling, and business contexts.

Likewise, Ballou and Podgursky (1998) stated that few comparisons exist between public and private settings on measures aside from student performance, such as new teacher induction and mentoring. Indeed, independent schools in general are not well studied, at least relative to public contexts. While the research study did not compare a private to a public setting specifically, it did offer insight into the experiences, interactions, and perceptions of teachers working together in an independent school. Independent schools are independent from state and federal education agencies and have freedom to innovate within the boundaries of principles of good practice and accreditation guidelines. The research study presented a unique approach to mentoring and induction and insight into the possibilities of teachers working together in cross-race contexts.
Research Design

This section introduces the research study design, a topic that will receive detailed treatment in Chapter Three. The researcher was a participant in the research study, as well as an administrator at the school who was responsible for induction and mentoring and provided leadership for the leadership project team reforming The Eastern School induction program. Throughout the research study, therefore, he is referred to as the researcher-participant for clarity and consistency.

The research occurred in an independent, suburban, nonsectarian, coeducational day school serving students in pre-Kindergarten through Grade 9 located in a suburb of a large northeastern U.S. city. The study examined the impact of induction, and most specifically cross-race mentoring, within the context of a leadership project to design and implement a induction and mentoring program. The study focused on a particular phenomenon, the experience of new teachers in their first year at an independent school and how their experience was influenced by mentoring and interactions within their formal support network.

The researcher-participant employed qualitative case study methodology to conduct the research. The study featured rich description, generated from a variety of sources, to illuminate the experience of new teachers in their first year. The study was heuristic with the goal being to understand the multiple factors that influenced new teachers’ feelings of efficacy, professional satisfaction, and connection to the school community within their first year of teaching. As stated, the researcher was a participant in the study, specifically an administrator within the school setting who recruited and
hired all new teacher participants within the study, and directly supervised three of the
participants and their mentors. The researcher-participant mentored the other primary
administrative participant, who was a new division administrator within the school. In
some instances, such as when the researcher–participant was engaged in coaching
techniques and meeting with the three new teachers he directly supervised, the researcher
was a participant and an observer.

At the study core was a non-random, purposive sample consisting of eight new
teachers and balanced by race, gender, and assignment. All new teachers were in their
first year of teaching at the school and were all engaged in the same induction program.
The next level of sampling was also purposive – the formally assigned support network
for each teacher. The mentor network included the administrators, instructional leaders,
and mentors formally assigned to support roles during a new teacher’s first year of
service. All participation in the study was voluntary and consensual; participants were
free to withdraw at any time with no bearing whatsoever on their performance or status at
the school and their identities were camouflaged and anonymous in this research study
report. The sample is discussed in more detail in Chapter Three.

Ethnographic techniques for data collection included participant interviews and
questionnaires, participant observations, document review, and participant reflection
journaling. Triangulation of data was employed to improve validity and reliability. The
researcher maintained field notes and a leadership journal. Each new teacher and his or
her mentor network comprised an individual case for analysis. The eight new teachers as
a cohort then became the unit for a cross-case analysis. A more detailed presentation of
data gathering and analysis appears in Chapters Three and Four.

**Limitations of the Study**

This research study had a number of limiting factors that have potential effects on
its generalizability to other settings and had the possibility of impacting reliability and
validity during the research study period. Limitations included (a) attributes of the
research study context, (b) elements of the research study design, and (c) the position and
biases of the researcher-participant. This section presents limitations of the research
study. Greater detail on these limitations had the potential to affect validity and
reliability of the research study and specific strategies the research-participant employed
to enhance validity and reliability is presented in Chapter Five.

The research study occurred in an independent elementary school, a fact which
limits generalizability of findings to other settings, most notably a public school.
Teachers at The Eastern School, for example, were not required to hold teaching
credentials, but were expected to hold degrees in their content areas. The induction
program developed by the leadership project team was designed and implemented by
choice rather than in adherence to state or federal mandates. Its design had unique
features, such as distinct professional and social mentor roles, that may not be present in
other settings. Merriam (1998) explained external validity as “the extent to which the
findings of one study can be applied to other situations” (p. 207), and unique attributes of
this research study context influenced its external reliability.
Merriam defined internal validity as the degree to which “research findings match reality” and suggested triangulation, member checks, long-term observation, peer examination, and clarifying researcher biases as means to increase validity (pp. 201-204). The researcher-participant designed this research study with these strategies in place. Merriam (1998) framed reliability as “the extent to which research findings can be replicated” (p. 205) and suggested dependability and consistency were better terms to describe reliability for qualitative research. Again, the researcher-participant used triangulation as a strategy to enhance dependability and consistency.

The researcher-participant recognized his roles and responsibilities in the research study context had the potential to affect reliability and dependability. He was an administrator at The Eastern School and a participant in the leadership project to reform induction and mentoring, in addition to being the primary vehicle for data gathering. As an administrator in the research study context, the research-participant hired all new teacher participants and supervised all mentor participants. In some cases, this may have influenced participant responses despite measures taken to guarantee confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher-participant also recognized that simply drawing attention to the importance of induction and mentoring and mentoring in cross-race contexts had the potential to influence the research study outcomes. At every point, he took steps to reduce the effects of these limitations, as detailed in Chapters Three, Four, and Five.
Definition of Terms

Racial Identity

This qualitative research project examined experiences of new teachers engaged in an induction and mentoring program. The school under consideration had a strategic initiative to diversify its teacher force with respect to race. With the specific intent to identify factors and actions that teachers of color perceived as effective supports, the researcher-participant invited new teacher participants to categorize themselves by racial identity. Through this categorization, the researcher-participant contrasted new teacher participants’ experiences according to race.

However necessary it was to the research project, the researcher-participant fully acknowledges that racial categorization is problematic and terminology to describe race is imperfect. As Tatum (1997) asserted, “the original creation of racial categories was in the service of oppression” (p. 17). An open discussion of terms, therefore, used by the researcher-participant to categorize participants by racial identity and how these terms were employed in the research project is clearly imperative. Tatum simply and eloquently explains: “We have to be able to talk about it [race] in order to change it [racism]” (p. 17).

Tatum differentiated between race and ethnicity, stating that although the two terms “are often used synonymously… a distinction can be made between the two” (p. 16). Both classifications are “socially constructed” (p. 16). Race, for Tatum, is a social construction used to define people by physical criteria such as “skin color and facial
features” (p. 16). Ethnicity is also a social construction, although one based on cultural criteria such as “language, customs, and shared history” (p. 16).

A problem of a socially-constructed identifier is that it represents another’s simplification and reduction of an individual’s identity to a category. It does not capture the richness and depth of a human being. For example, for the purpose of the research project, one participant self-identified as Latino. However, she explained that she was Latin American by birth, adopted by White parents, and raised American. To others, she physically appeared Latino (her race), yet her ethnic identity was far more complex: upper middle class, suburban, American, adopted, White (new teacher preliminary interview). In another case, a study participant also self-identified as Latino. Her mother was American, and her father was Cuban. Although she had a Latino surname and treasured the Cuban dimensions of her ethnic identity, she grew up in the Rockies and identified most with ethnic traditions that were American, western, middle class, and rural (new teacher preliminary interview).

This reductive experience was not isolated to people of color in the research project. One White participant shared that she was a middle-age single mother, had worked in a trade before teaching, and had been raised poor in an urban area (new teacher preliminary interview). This was markedly different from another White participant who described herself as wealthy, a recent college graduate, and having been raised in an affluent suburban neighborhood (new teacher preliminary interview). The second White participant and the first participant of color discussed here shared a mutual friendship, across racial identity differences, more with each other on the basis of their age,
economic background, and suburban upbringing than did the two White participants mentioned here (new teacher interview). Race is an identifier that, among other oppressive consequences, reduces the richness and complexity of being human. Race attempts to tell a life story in one word. However, to repeat for emphasis, Tatum counseled “We have to be able to talk about it in order to change it” (p. 17).

Tatum clarified terms used to name a person’s racial identity, and her terms are used throughout the research project. White refers to “Americans of European descent” (p. 15). People of color “refer to those groups in America that are and have been historically targeted by racism” (p. 15). Black refers to “people of acknowledged African descent” (p. 15). Tatum interchanged Latino and Hispanic (pp. 15-16); for the purposes of this research project, Latino was used exclusively. “People of Asian [emphasis added] descent include Pacific Islanders [emphasis in original]” (p. 16). Tatum stated, “When quoting others I use whichever terms they use” (p. 16) and the researcher-participant applied the same standard in the research project. For example, one participant described herself as Mixed – her father was Black and her mother was Latino, so that term was used to describe her racial identity.

Tatum capitalized racial identities – White, Black, Asian, Latino – but does not capitalize the terms people of color or person of color, and the researcher-participant utilized the same conventions in the research project. Person of color was the predominant term used. The sample size was appropriate for a qualitative research project, but was not large enough to afford comparisons between various racial identities. Therefore, an individual’s specific racial identity was less critical than was the fact that
the individual self-identified as a person of color. Given this research project investigated educational phenomena and considered the experiences of teachers, the term *teacher of color* is used to identify a person of color who was a teacher. Likewise, the term *White teacher* clarifies that the particular teacher being discussed was White.

*Other Defined Terms*

For the purposes of this research study, the following definitions for important and commonly used terms were assumed.

**Cross-race mentoring relationship** – mentor-new teacher relationship in which individuals self-identified as being of different racial identities.

**Same-race mentoring relationship** – mentor-new teacher relationship in which individuals self-identified as being of the same racial identity.

**Professional/social mentor** – new employees (faculty and staff) at The Eastern School were assigned two mentors in their first year of service whose functions were as the titles imply – these roles are defined more fully in Chapter Three.

**New teacher** – in the literature base on new teacher induction and mentoring, new teachers are referred to as beginning teachers, novice teachers, new teachers, mentees, and protégés. The terms beginning and novice ignore the fact that many new teachers, especially in independent settings, have taught or assisted in another school prior to their first year of service. New teacher for the purpose of this research study referred to simply, teachers who were new to the school. Mentees and protégés imply a specific and traditional approach to mentoring. In the research study context, The Eastern School intended to take a collaborative approach to mentoring in which benefits were realized
for both the mentor and the new teacher. Therefore, the term new teacher also included the context of a mentor relationship.

Leadership project team – a team comprised of administrators and instructional leaders that redesigned and implemented the induction and mentoring program.

Division administrator – equates to a principal and responsible for the recruitment, supervision, and evaluation of teachers within her division.

Instructional leader – teacher in charge of a specific grade or content-area team and responsible for the supervision of curriculum and instructional strategies within that area.

Overview of the Study

Chapter One presents an overview of the research study including a statement of the problem, research questions, theoretical rationale, significance of the study, research design, limitations of the study, and definition of terms.

Chapter Two reviews the significant social science research and public policy literature that framed the research study. Studies most applicable and relevant to this research study are identified. Broadly, Chapter Two presents literature related to: (a) induction, (b) mentoring, (c) adult learning, (d) cross-race mentoring, (e) public policy debates surrounding teacher quality and teacher force diversification, and (f) qualitative research methodology.

Chapter Three explains the design of the study in greater detail. Included are presentations of (a) the research questions, (b) qualitative research methodology, and (c)
the research study sample. The Chapter also reviews procedures for (a) pilot testing, (b) data gathering, (c) data analysis, (d) reporting of data, and (e) discussing the findings.

Chapter Four reports data and introduces findings that emerged from data analysis. Chapter Four is organized according to the research study questions. Data is analyzed and presented using qualitative techniques: narrative, tables, and displays.

Chapter Five summarizes findings introduced in Chapter Four. The chapter features a discussion of the major findings and implications for practice, policy, leadership, and further research that emerged from findings. Limitations of the research study are also presented, and the chapter ends with a conclusion for the research study.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter Two is to frame this research study within a theoretical context by reviewing related public policy literature and social science research. This research study employed qualitative methodology to examine experiences of teachers new to a school with an induction and mentoring program. A particular focus was an investigation of the respective experiences and perceptions of new teachers of color in contrast to those of White new teachers participating in the same induction and mentoring program during the same academic year. From these lines of inquiry emerged four primary theoretical themes: (a) new teacher induction, (b) mentoring as a primary vehicle for induction, (c) mentoring in cross-race contexts, and (d) qualitative research methodology. Two broader themes encompassed primary themes a-c. First, national education reform mandates and related ethics codes and law have generated public policy dimensions to (a) induction and mentoring and (b) diversification of the teacher force. Thus, there is attention in this chapter to pertinent policy literature. Second, induction and mentoring of new teachers is predicated on adult learning, therefore, there is examination of adult learning theory relevant to this research study.

Of particular interest were literature and research that specifically addressed the research study questions:

1. How did the induction program affect new teachers’ (a) connection to the school community, (b) professional satisfaction, and (c) sense of efficacy?
2. Which mentor characteristics did new teachers perceive as being helpful and supportive?

3. Did new teachers’ perceptions vary for cross-race mentoring relationships as compared to same-race mentoring relationships?

Boote and Beile (2005) state a literature review “allows the author not only to summarize the existing literature but also to synthesize it in a way that permits a new perspective” (p. 4). Strike and Posner (1983) assert that a literature review identifies problems within a field and uses existing research to frame problems in new ways. Following each section, therefore, the researcher-participant summarizes themes and presents theoretical frameworks he used to inform the research project. Chapter Five connects these theoretical frameworks to findings of this research study, situating the study within social science research traditions related to induction, mentoring, and cross-race mentoring relationships and public policy debate around teacher quality and diversity in the teacher force.

Influence of Public Policy on Induction, Mentoring, and Teacher Force Diversity

Two public policy debates are germane to this research study: teacher quality and diversity in the teacher force. This section explores public policy literature as it relates to induction, mentoring, and race as a consideration in recruitment and mentoring of new teachers, in public and independent settings. The researcher-participant, wherever possible, examined primary sources to explore these topics.
Teacher Quality

Qualitative educational research does not occur in a vacuum – philosophically, it is grounded in the “view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds” (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). Educators’ social world has changed radically over the last two decades. The educational reform movement has impelled a major paradigm shift with respect to accountability to the public and reconceptualized the role of government in public schools. New teacher induction and mentoring as practices intended to guarantee efficacy, or teacher quality, are now a matter of public policy. Although the target of these policy forces has been public schools specifically, similar trends are mirrored in independent schools, as viewed through their ethical codes and accreditation practices.

For the first time in American educational history, the No Child Left Behind Act (2002) has specified federal requirements for public school teacher quality, stating the first purpose of the statute is to “ensure that high-quality… teacher preparation and training… [is] aligned with challenging State academic standards” (§ 6301.1). NCLB brings accountability to the primary stakeholders in schools – parents and children – to the forefront of public policy. Drawing on social science research that correlates student learning with teacher quality (Gladwell, 2008), lawmakers have forced all public schools to account for the quality of their teachers, including that of new teachers. Specific to induction and mentoring, the law stipulates teachers new to the profession receive “mentoring, team teaching, reduced class schedules, and intensive professional development” according to “scientifically based research” (NCLB, § 6613, 2.A).
NCLB (2002) holds schools accountable by raising public awareness, and thus the stakes, on teacher quality and by requiring public systems to publish standard teacher quality measures on annual report cards (§ 6311). The U.S. Department of Education (2006) defines “highly qualified teachers” as those who hold a bachelor’s degree, have full state certification, and possess “competency in the core academic subjects they teach” (p. 1). Through induction and mentoring requirements for new teachers and evaluation requirements for continuing teachers, NCLB (2002) considers teachers’ pedagogical quality as well as content-based qualification – how children are taught is as important as what they are taught. Relevant to this research study was the fact that The Eastern School was an independent school and not beholden to these federal mandates. As discussed later in this and subsequent chapters, The Eastern School was obligated to other external agencies and to defining quality and qualification within its own mission.

Ethics codes and principles are potential sources of public policy guidance to educators with respect to new teacher quality. The ethics codes for public school educators, however, offer limited direction. The NEA Code of Ethics (1975) states that public school educators “shall not assist any entry into the profession of a person known to be unqualified in respect to character, education, or other relevant attribute” (#3) and “shall not assist a non-educator in the unauthorized practice of teaching” (#5). The NEA Code of Ethics also offers advice on confidentiality to mentor teachers: they “shall not disclose information about colleagues obtained in the course of professional service unless disclosure serves as compelling professional purpose or is required by law” (#6).
The AASA Statement of Ethics (1981) advises public school administrators on mentoring and faculty diversity only by inference. AASA Statement 1 requires administrators to “make the well-being of students the fundamental value of all decision making and actions”. Certainly, an overarching purpose of induction and mentoring programs is to safeguard students’ well-being by enhancing new teacher efficacy thereby improving quality of instruction for students. AASA Statement 2 stipulates administrators “fulfill professional responsibilities with honesty and integrity” (1981), and a professional responsibility of administrators is to ensure induction of new teachers according to NCLB § 6613 (2002). Statement 5 states administrators will “implement the governing board of education’s policies and administrative rules and regulations,” which in many states now include the mentoring and induction of new teachers. Program implementation to support new teachers should be well-researched consistent with Statement 9: “Maintains the standards and seeks to improve the effectiveness of the profession through research and continuing professional development.”

The school considered in this research study was an independent school located in the northeastern U.S. An investigation of ethical guidelines and governing principles that pertain to independent schools is important to situating the reader in the research study context. Independent schools educators look to the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) *Principles of good practice* for ethical and practical guidance. Written mostly in the 1990s and revised since the millennium, the *Principles* reflect the tone and tenor of the standards movement. *Teachers and supervisors of teachers* (1990) directs the teacher to “participate in the establishment and maintenance of collegial support and
adherence to professional standards” (NAIS, Teachers, #8). The administrator should work to “ensure that faculty members new to the school receive orientation and support sufficient for them to work effectively and with confidence that they are carrying out the educational mission, policies, and procedures of the school” (NAIS, Teachers, #3). Likewise, the administrator has a duty “to improve the quality of teaching” by “inform[ing]” teachers “of both praise and criticism of their work” and making available “useful support and assistance” (#4). Heads of school specifically are directed to take responsibility for the retention of “qualified faculty and staff” (Heads, 2003, #4).

Diversity in the Teacher Force

The racial gap between children and their teachers is widening (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). School officials in both public and independent settings aspire to reduce this divide by diversifying the racial composition of teachers in their schools – a public policy goal. Another public policy goal is to enhance the educational experience for all children through cultivating a more diverse school climate. Race-based hiring preferences and programs intended to diversify the teacher force have public policy and ethical implications, therefore. Constitutional law and ethics codes offer a policy framework for school officials devising legal diversification strategies. A specific focus of this research study was mentoring in cross-race contexts, and this subsection deals with the constitutional framework related to race as a factor in new teacher recruitment and mentoring. The context of the research study was an independent school; thus a comparison of public and independent settings is relevant.
Racial diversity in the teacher and mentor force is an issue with public policy and ethical dimensions. While evidence regarding the correlation between student performance and instruction by same-race educators is inconclusive (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005), there is strong sentiment that the teacher force should mirror the racial and ethnic diversity of the greater U.S. population (Torres, Santos, Peck, & Cortes, 2004). NCLB (2002) is quiet on this topic, as are public school ethical codes (NEA Code of Ethics, 1975; AASA Statement of Ethics, 1981). With respect to recruiting, hiring, developing, and retaining a racially and ethnically diverse faculty, administrators simply must “protect the civil and human rights of all individuals” (AASA, 1981, #3) and “obey local, state, and national laws” (#4).

In independent schools, the *NAIS Principles* are explicit with respect to the policy goal of diversifying the independent school teacher force. *NAIS Principles* instruct schools to develop mission statements, strategic plans, policies, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, admissions, and hiring practices that demonstrate “a commitment to equity and justice” (*Equity and justice*, 2004, #1). Moreover, the *Principles* direct administrators to “value racial, cultural, and gender diversity” (*Teachers*, 1990, #2) and heads to “ensure that every element of school life reflects the principles of equity, justice, and the dignity of each individual” (*Heads*, 2003, #7). The board of trustees, both as a group and as individual members, supports the head of school in this effort by “exhibit[ing] best practices relevant to equity and justice” (*Board*, 2003, #11; *Individual trustees*, 2003, #2). Heads are directed to “seek a diversity of cultural, national, and ethnic backgrounds in the recruitment of teachers and administrators” (*Educating for a
The Principles advise schools to support these endeavors by “the ongoing education of the board, parents, students, and all school personnel as part of the process of creating and sustaining an equitable and just community” (Equity and justice, 2004, #4) and complying “with local, state, and federal laws and regulations that promote diversity” (#8). The Principles expect all school personnel “to model respect for all people and cultures and to address constructively instances of bias or disdain for nationalities, cultures, or religions outside their own” (#4).

Independent schools are held accountable for good practice through the regional accreditation process. In the northeast, independent K-9 schools are accredited by the Association of Independent Schools in New England (AISNE) and secondary schools and K-12 schools are accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). There is limited correlation between the AISNE Standards for accreditation and the NAIS Principles of good practice with respect to recruiting, inducting, and mentoring a diverse teacher force. AISNE membership criteria #4 simply requires a member school to be “non-discriminatory in all its policies as required by law” (2007). The AISNE Core values (2006) are more specific, but are non-binding, stating “AISNE values the diversity of its member schools” (Equity and inclusion, ¶ 1). AISNE states it will help and support member schools in their efforts to recruit, enhance, and retain all teachers, especially teachers of color, and “establish communities that are equitable and just” (Goal 6).
The New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Independent Schools is even less directive on diversification of faculty and mentoring of new faculty. Its primary objective is to verify that member schools practices are aligned with what is stated in their respective missions (2007). Thus, if a school has a strong orientation toward diversity, then it is held to that standard. But, if a school has no commitment to diversity, equity, and justice, then it is in theory allowed to hold itself to that low standard. There is also no mention of mentoring or induction within the NEASC Standards (2007).

In the absence of similar guidance from public school ethics codes, primary sources of law related to discrimination or classification on the basis of race provide direction to public school administrators. The core policy question is under what circumstances is state or official action, namely to take affirmative action, justifiable to remedy past racial inequity and the current racial imbalance between teachers and their pupils. School officials must craft goals for teaching force diversity with care to avoid violating an individual’s rights as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. Some laws are specific to public settings, others include private, and so all administrators regardless of employment setting should take direction from primary sources of law.

The Fourteenth, or Civil Rights, Amendment delineates individual privileges, immunities, due process, and equal protection rights stating: “No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges… of citizens of the United States… nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws” (Section 1). The official use of a raced-based classification - intentionally restricting a finalist
hiring pool or mentor program to candidates of a specific race - triggers strict scrutiny under the Fourteenth Amendment. Government action is allowable only if it is narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling state interest. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (1964) states “no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (§2000d). Title VII (1964) further bars discrimination in employment on the basis or race, color, or national origin. As a general welfare statute, Title VII applies to public and independent schools. Thus, a major requirement of NAIS membership for independent schools is a board-approved non-discrimination statement (NAIS, 2008). 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 provides public school employees or job candidates with declaratory, injunctive, and compensatory recourse if their rights are violated through state action.

Two landmark cases provide a framework for public school officials attempting to establish a compelling and narrowly tailored rationale for race-based hiring or mentor selection preferences. Independent school administrators should model their diversity programs on the same framework to ensure compliance with Title VII. In Grutter v. Bollinger (2003) and Gratz v. Bollinger (2003) the court ruled specifically on admissions policy and practice, but the same lessons apply to hiring and selection. The precedence established in Grutter and Gratz is that affirmative action programs intended to enhance the quality of a school environment must be narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling state interest, such as diversification for the purpose of enhancing educational experiences for the whole student body. In Gratz the court found the school’s use of race
(weighted point system) was not narrowly tailored enough “to achieve [its] asserted compelling interest in diversity” (2003, p. 7). In Grutter, the court found the use of race as “one factor among many” was clearly “an effort to assemble a student body that is diverse in ways broader than race” (2003, p. 10) and thus did not trigger a constitutional violation. In developing a program modeled on Grutter, a school must consider race-neutral alternatives, establish periodic review, and set a time limit. The program cannot cause undue harm to third parties – namely, reverse race discrimination is prohibited. Applicants’ files must be reviewed holistically, with race being only one of the attributes considered in determining contribution to a diverse school climate.

A review of policy literature reveals that school officials, regardless whether in a public or an independent setting, may not discriminate on the basis of race in the recruitment and hiring of teachers, nor in the assignment of mentors. Administrators may take affirmative action to diversify their teacher force when it serves a compelling interest such as enhancing the educational climate of the school or reducing the racial divide between students and their teachers. Race-neutral hiring criteria (a commitment to culturally responsive teaching practices, for example), periodic review, and a time limit are required elements of affirmative action programs. NAIS Principles of good practice clarify the compelling interest, a commitment to equity and justice, of teacher diversification in independent schools. Public school ethics codes do not reveal similar clarity, although individual systems vary widely in their commitment to equity and justice.
The contemporary educational reform movement has brought public scrutiny to teacher quality. State educational reform laws and NCLB at a national level set expectations and accountability measures for public schools. The NAIS Principles of good practice and regional accreditation agencies set standards for independent schools. Ethics codes provide an additional set of guidelines. While NCLB requires public school systems to offer induction to new teachers, public reporting mandates draw greater attention to teacher qualification at time of hire than teacher quality. Independent school policies indicate the opposite; greater focus is placed on school officials’ responsibility to develop high quality teachers.

Adult Learning

Different from pre-service and in-service training, Smith and Ingersoll (2004) envision new teacher induction “as a bridge, enabling the ‘student of teaching’ to become a ‘teacher of students’” (p. 683). Mentoring, or “personal guidance provided usually by seasoned veterans,” increasingly has become the dominant form of induction or most influential aspect of induction programs (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004, p. 683; Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999). This process of adults transitioning other adults from students of teaching to teachers of students implies adult learning.

Cognitive learning theory as it applies to adults has changed the way in which mentoring is perceived and conducted and how it applies to standards-based teaching (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983; Thies-Sprinthall, 1986; Thies-Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987). Mentoring has evolved to being viewed as “school-based teacher education” (Zeek & Walker, 2006, p. 280) and a natural extension/continuation of
university pre-service training. The authors contend that mentoring has meaningful and serious affects on the mentor exclusive of the new teacher, as the mentor moves from being strictly a child educator to being a school-based teacher educator.

Mentor efficacy is enhanced with training in adult learning. Mentoring “does not emerge naturally from being a good teacher”; in many ways expert teachers can be novices when it comes to responding to issues presented by mentees (Orland-Barak, 2001, p. 75; Orland- Barak & Yinon, 2005; Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1993). Little and Nelson (1990) stated:

A teacher is selected as a mentor principally on the basis of accomplishments with children; the teacher is subsequently accepted as a mentor on the basis of accomplishments with fellow teachers and administrators. (p. 307)

Likewise, being “reform-minded” as a teacher does not “necessarily guarantee effective mentoring to support teacher learning and teaching reform” (Wang, 2001, p. 51; Yendol-Hoppey, 2007). Smithey and Evertson (1995) showed that mentors need support in understanding that new teacher growth is not a “linear process” (p. 33). Training in adult cognitive development can help mentors coach novices to successfully grow through reflecting and reaching their own understandings (Strong & Baron, 2004; Veenman, Denessen, Gerrits, & Kenter, 2001; Wang & Paine, 2001).

In business settings, Lave and Wenger (1991) emphasized the significance of learning by doing in new employees’ development and the influence of mentoring
interactions between veteran employees and new employees in guiding this development. New employees learn by watching veteran employees and through dialogue. Lave and Wenger’s model of legitimate peripheral participation described how new employees practice and learn without assuming full responsibility for outcomes – best applied to education as the rationale for student teacher experiences prior to hire.

In educational settings, Harrison, Dymoke, and Pell (2006) studied how new teachers learned best and how mentors could facilitate this learning most effectively. The researchers observed a learning cycle of (a) experience, (b) reflection, (c) learning, and (d) further experimentation. Mentors play key roles at each stage of the cycle and especially offering challenge and support for risk-taking in a safe environment. Schools that are effective places of learning for adults have certain characteristics, according to the authors. Such schools a) actively cultivate a culture where new teacher mentoring and induction is valued, b) promote new teachers feeling safe to innovate and learn from their mistakes, and c) expect professional development of everyone.

From the review of literature related to adult learning theory, it is clear that induction and mentoring, such as the program present at The Eastern School, are premised upon the ability of adults to learn. For the new teacher, induction-based learning shifts the individual from a student of teaching to a teacher of students (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). For the mentor, learning shifts the individual from a teacher of students to a teacher of teachers (Little & Nelson, 1990; Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1993). Each of these transitions involves learning. The primary vehicles for adult learning are (a) induction activities such as orientations, workshops, and seminars and (b) interpersonal
interactions between a mentor and a new teacher (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999). Contemporary approaches to mentoring involve a learning cycle drawn from cognitive learning theory (Harrison, Dymoke, & Pell, 2006).

New employees learn by observing and emulating veteran employees and through purposeful dialogue intended to generate meaning from their new experiences (Lave and Wenger, 1991). The learning cycle involves a new teacher engaged in: (a) experience, (b) reflection, (c) learning, and (d) further experimentation (Harrison, Dymoke, & Pell, 2006). Mentors play key roles at each stage of the cycle and especially offering challenge and support for risk-taking in a safe environment. This is the model The Eastern School developed. New teachers were observed by mentors, and they met to discuss the observations. New teachers also observed their mentors and met to make meaning from those experiences. New teachers and mentors each met with division administrators to reflect and make meaning from their experiences.

Mentor training, which includes adult cognitive development theory, can help mentors coach novices to successfully grow through reflecting and reaching their own understandings (Strong & Baron, 2004; Veenman, Denessen, Gerrits, & Kenter, 2001; Wang & Paine, 2001). The Eastern School model involved training for mentors.

**New Teacher Induction**

Ingersoll and Smith (2004) observed that research studies of induction programs measure either “teacher attitudes (e.g., teacher’s job satisfaction, efficacy, and commitment); [or] teacher retention or turnover” (p. 683). This research study examined the influence of an induction program, of which mentoring was a major
component, on new teachers’ attitudes: (a) professional satisfaction, (b) sense of efficacy, and (c) connection to the school community at the conclusion of their first year. The researcher-participant hypothesized these attitudes contributed to new teacher retention. While retention of research study participants was not a research question, attention was given to retention post-study and will be discussed in Chapter Five.

There is general consensus that induction does have a positive impact on new teachers’ transition into the classroom (Ingersoll and Smith, 2004) and improves the experience of students placed in new teachers’ classrooms (Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, and Cowan-Hathcock, 2007). Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, and Cowan-Hathcock asserted “high-quality induction programs support qualified teachers for every child.” For the authors, “ensuring a qualified teacher in every classroom is a central part of the latest agenda to strengthen public education and maximize student achievement” (p. 137).

Conversely, when unmitigated by effective guidance and support, the transition into teaching can be difficult for new teachers. For example, participants in a study conducted by Flores (2006), whose schools did not offer an induction program, described their experiences as “being in the dark and lost” (p. 2032). Flores concluded, “New teachers felt overwhelmed by the amount and variety of duties that they were expected to perform at school, which, along with a lack of support and guidance, forced them into ‘learning by doing!’” (p. 2047). Schlichte, Yssel, and Merbler (2005) found lack of mentoring relationships and support by colleagues and administrators, present in effective induction programs, contributed to new teacher attrition. Cooke and Pang (1991)
compared first-year experiences of trained and untrained teachers, which indicated clearly the need for pre-service training and induction for all new teachers.

This section reviews literature related to induction programs and their impact on new teachers. For the purposes of the literature review, the researcher-participant included peer-reviewed social science research focused on traditional induction programs since these practices best matched those of the school and program that comprised the subject of this research study. Alternative certification programs and university graduate-level training partnerships, as two examples, were not included.

**Induction Program Structure**

Researchers have examined the effects of induction program structure on new teachers’ professional success and their retention by schools. Structure refers to the specific practices employed by a school to carry out new teacher induction. Ingersoll and Smith (2004) identify common induction practices to include “classes, workshops, orientations, seminars, and especially mentoring” (p. 29). This research study examined how specific induction practices affected new teachers’ (a) professional satisfaction, (b) sense of efficacy, and (c) connection to the school community and, within the study sample, whether new teachers’ perceptions varied according to their racial identity. A review of social science research that has investigated induction program structure and new teacher effects is pertinent.

Feiman-Nemser (2001a) devised a continuum of “central tasks of learning to teach,” arguing that “learning continues for thoughtful teachers as long as they remain in teaching” (p. 1039). She divided the continuum into tasks inherent to pre-service,
induction, and continuing professional development and considered induction to encompass the first three years of service. According to the author, during the induction period an effective new teacher needs to instill five broad areas of professional knowledge and skill: (a) knowledge of students, curriculum, and school community, (b) ability to develop a responsive instructional program, (c) ability to create a classroom learning community, (d) understanding of a beginning repertoire, and (e) development of a professional identity (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a).

Ingersoll and Smith (2004) conducted one of the first large-scale survey studies of new teacher induction and its effects on retention. The researchers recommend specific induction practices as influential in retaining new teachers (p. 38). A combination of effective practices, namely working with a grade/subject-alike mentor and engaging in collaborative planning with colleagues, was most influential. Less influential on retention were assistive practices such as reduced schedules, reduced “preparations,” or “extra-classroom assistance” (p. 38). Kelley (2004) tracked ten cohorts of new teachers through their fifth year of teaching and examined induction program characteristics that contributed to retention. Mentor quality ranked first among principals and new teacher participants alike. New teachers’ attitudes and approaches toward on-going professional learning were also important: “When new teachers research ways to influence student learning and assess the effectiveness of new techniques, their perceptions of self-efficacy are enhanced” (p. 446).

Nielsen, Barry, and Addison (2007) asserted that to promote teacher effectiveness, induction programs must have the following features: (a) high structure, (b)
mentoring, (c) a focus on adult learning, and (d) an emphasis on collaboration. In a longitudinal study of a particular induction program, the researchers discovered new teachers valued most their interactions with their mentors, their collaborative work with colleagues, and individualized professional development that addressed their specific needs. Klug and Salzman (1991) contrasted induction programs with high and low structure. Results related to teaching skill development and changes in new teacher perceptions indicated greater success from high structure programs. Lazovsky and Reichenberg (2006) examined the structure of an Israeli induction and mentoring program and its effectiveness, as perceived by new teacher participants. The researchers found the induction program in its entirety was perceived by new teachers as more effective than its discrete parts. Mentoring, in particular, was considered by new teachers as critical to developing teacher professionalism, pedagogical knowledge and skills, and connection to the school community (“ecological dimension,” p. 60). The researchers concluded that, given the substantive influence of the mentor, induction programs should “include mandatory training for all mentor teachers… and standardization of mentoring procedures” eventually leading to “professionalizing mentoring” (p. 67). Turley, Powers, and Nakai (2006) likewise found these induction program practices developed new teacher confidence, and they added “opportunities for reflection” (p. 27) as an important feature. Gibson’s study (1995) found (a) clarity of the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in new teacher induction and (b) “regular, supportive, structured feedback” (p. 255) to be vital induction program elements. Napper-Owen and Phillips
(1995) also discovered regular constructive feedback was critical to the development of new physical education teachers.

Other studies have indicated that new teachers selecting the kinds of support offered through an induction program to be influential in new teacher development (Wilkinson, 1994). New teachers perceived the freedom to self-select mentors, usually subject/grade-alike, based on their respective needs for practical information was valuable (Christensen & Conway, 1990-91). Cho and Kwon (2004) found induction programs that (a) focused on specific areas of need such as strategies for teaching students with special needs and with learning differences and (b) continued over a two year period were more effective in enhancing teaching quality.

Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, and Cowan-Hathcock (2007) separated induction practices into three categories – (a) activities, (b) assistance, and (c) support – and examined new teachers’ perceptions of their respective influences on their first year of service. New teachers rated “individual, focused, and specific opportunities… more favorably than … diffuse, collective, and diverse” ones (p. 139). New teachers preferred induction practices that were tailored to fit their particular circumstances and needs. Examples of effective activities were (a) observations and feedback by administrators and mentors and (b) a “school-specific orientation” (p. 141). New teachers responded negatively to (a) planning cooperatively with colleagues; (b) “release time to observe a mentor’s classroom;” and (c) having “fewer preparations,” a “reduced load,” or “no extracurricular activities” (p. 141). New teachers indicated practical assistance was valuable: (a) “locating materials, supplies, equipment, or books;” (b) “understanding
school policies and rules;” (c) “planning for instruction;” and (d) “effective use of different teaching methods” (p. 141). They responded negatively to (a) cooperatively “assessing student work,” (b) “determining the learning levels and styles of students,” and (c) “time management” advice (p. 141). Support to which new teachers responded positively centered on colleagues welcoming them to the community and offering their support in managing stress choosing and teaching content (p. 141). Mentors were valued who (a) treated new teachers as “respected colleagues;” (b) were available, open, and proactive; and (c) provided “constructive” feedback on teaching (p. 141). Mentors who had the same teaching style or had a grade/subject-alike assignment were not considered by new teachers as useful in this study.

Andrews, Gilbert, and Martin (2007) compared perceptions of induction practices held by new teachers in contrast to those held by school administrators. In their study, new teachers indicated “opportunities to collaborate” (p. 9) to be of most value as well. Working with a mentor was also important, as was receiving non-evaluative feedback. Discrepancies between new teacher and administrator feedback revealed intention and implementation were not always aligned with respect to these practices. Administrators perceived that opportunities to observe and collaborate had occurred whereas new teachers did not. For example, an administrator might have seen a planning meeting as collaborative work while the new teacher viewed it “to be more about business” (p. 10). Differences between expected and actual outcomes also emerged in a study conducted by Biott and Spindler (2000). The researchers found that despite high program structure focused on “performance management,” new teachers and mentors centered their work
on “belonging” and “new teachers’ contributions to the development of their schools” (p. 275). McKeen (1996) also found “fundamental differences between what new teachers need and what administrators who supervise them actually do” (p. 330).

Attentive and thoughtful leadership at the building level is critical to induction programs and new teacher success (Wood, 2005). Wood asserted the principal has important roles in (a) recruiting, advocating for, and retaining new teachers, (b) supervising mentor teachers, (c) serving as school instructional leader, and (d) cultivating a school culture that supports new teachers. Brock and Grady (1998) discovered that principals often failed to perceive the significance of their role in successful new teacher induction and overlooked the need for induction to continue throughout new teachers’ first year of service at a minimum. Quinn and Andrews (2004) also studied the role of principals and found that their leadership and example were significant factors in establishing a school climate oriented toward the support of new teachers. Sabar (2004) compared new teachers to immigrants arriving to a new country and found principals’ leadership and example to be critical factors in shaping veteran teachers’ attitudes toward the newcomers. Eldar, Nabel, Schechter, Talmor, and Mazin (2003) realized a significant function for principals is to align and integrate support for new teachers.

Developing Efficacy

This research study considered factors that influenced new teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy as it related to teaching at the conclusion of their first year of service. Researchers have suggested attention to developing new teachers’ pedagogical expertise contributes to their sense of efficacy. Stallion and Zimpher (1991) examined a
classroom management training program for new teachers that occurred at the beginning of their first year. They found that, with or without mentor support, the training program increased new teacher confidence and efficacy with respect to management. The researchers suggested that administrator knowledge of and participation in the training program increased its effectiveness.

Lee, Brown, Luft, and Roehrig (2007) divided pedagogical knowledge into (a) “knowledge of student learning” and (b) “knowledge of instructional strategies” (p. 52). The authors suggested that pedagogical knowledge, especially knowledge of student learning, “was built through experience and had the potential to develop over time” (p. 57). Examining the experience of science teachers, a group in which content knowledge is highly valued, the researchers found that strong content knowledge did not correlate with strong pedagogical knowledge. Induction, for the authors, had a clear role to play in fostering new teachers’ understanding of pedagogy.

McCormack, Gore, and Thomas (2006) held that “becoming a teacher requires not only the development of a professional identity but the construction of professional knowledge and practice through continued professional learning” (p. 95). The researchers used Feiman-Nemser’s Central Tasks in Learning to Teach (2001a) as an analysis framework. Fostering a “professional identity” and “a beginning repertoire” were among the most challenging tasks for the teacher participants in their study (McCormack, Gore, & Thomas, pp. 109-110). While formal mentoring and induction activities aided new teachers, “informal unplanned conversations and sharing of ideas and concerns” with peers were found to be significant in fostering new teachers’ professional
identity (p. 110). Assignment of difficult classes, classes outside new teachers’ area of training, or significant additional duties were found to hinder new teachers’ development, as was lack of “positive feedback, recognition, or praise” (p. 109). The researchers concluded that many new teachers in their study ended their first year “questioning their position in the school and their success as a teacher,” (p. 110). Thus, “feedback and confirmation as to their value within the school” were critical beyond the first year (p. 110). Without this, the authors believed new teachers were less likely to engage in the ongoing professional learning critical to their development as a new teacher.

Likewise, San (1999) found that new teachers perceived the experience they gained through actual practice to be more influential than pre-service preparation or induction activities. In this study, the researcher discovered first-year teachers’ perceptions and attitudes were more positive than teachers in the second or third years.

These findings underscore (a) the importance of the mentor role in working with the new teacher to generate meaning from experience and (b) the need for mentoring to continue beyond the first year of teaching, as is common practice currently.

Connection to School Community

Few research studies have dealt with new teachers’ feelings of connection to the school community. This researcher-participant postulated that strong connection and self-identification as a member of the school community would positively influence new teachers perceptions of success at the conclusion of their first year, particularly where the research study context was an independent school. Independent schools, in general, have a strong focus on community and culture (NAIS, 2006).
Harrison (2001) examined the experiences of new teachers in isolated rural public schools. Teachers who were successful in this context shared a commitment to rural communities and/or had lived in small communities previously. Retention was promoted by “professional development, supportive colleagues, and stable employment conditions” (p. 23). Thompson and Hawk (1996) evaluated a video-conferencing program designed to support new teachers working in isolated rural communities. Employing technology, the induction program connected new teachers and site mentors with an off-site university professor. Participants found this program to have limited effectiveness.

Oplatka and Eizenberg (2007) investigated factors that influenced new kindergarten teachers’ “task accomplishment, success, and well-being” (p. 339). The researchers identified three sources of influence: (a) assistant, especially where the assistant had more experience, (b) supervisor, and (c) their students’ parents. Through informal feedback and collaborative experiences, these sources served mentoring roles and helped new kindergarten teachers “discover” whether “their new profession was compatible with their self” (p. 339). Yandell and Turvey (2007) found new teachers derived significant meaning from their students and their students’ academic and personal growth. The researchers stated: “The development of professional knowledge involved, for them, the reworking of subject knowledge in a dialectical relationship with social interactions of the classroom” (p. 548).

In the relative absence of studies specifically attending to new teachers’ connection to the school community, the researcher-participant found it helpful to examine studies dealing with school culture and new teachers. The researcher-participant
postulated that school culture played a role in new teachers’ feelings of connection. Williams, Prestage, and Bedward (2001) found that school cultures centered on mutual collaboration and learning as opposed to isolation and individualism fostered new teachers’ success.

The review of social science research related to induction programs indicates that program structure is significant to its effectiveness. Common induction program structure features a combination of “classes, workshops, orientations, seminars, and especially mentoring” (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004, p. 29). Induction programs offer activities, assistance, and support to new teachers (Algozzine, Grete, Queen, & Cowan-Hathcock, 2007). Feiman-Nemser (2001a) identified central tasks of learning to teach. The leadership project team at The Eastern School likewise developed goals for its induction program and designed high structure, high accountability program elements to achieve these goals.

Successful induction programs are characterized by high structure (Nielsen, Barry, & Addison, 2007; Klug & Salzman, 1991) and accountability (Gibson, 1995). Other important elements include: (a) mentor quality (Kelley, 2004); (b) emphases on collaboration (Andrews, Gilbert, & Martin, 2007), adult learning (Nielsen, Barry, & Addison, 2007), and new teachers’ specific needs (Cho & Kwon, 2004); (c) opportunities for reflection (Turley, Powers, & Nakai, 2006); and (d) regular constructive feedback (Gibson, 1995; Napper-Owen & Phillips, 1995).

The role of the principal is critical to induction program and new teacher success (Wood, 2005; Brock & Grady, 1998). Primary leadership functions of principals are (a)
to instill an ethic of support for new teachers (Quinn & Andrews, 2004), (b) to cultivate broad investment in new teachers’ success (Sabar, 2004), and (c) to align and integrate support for new teachers (Eldar, Nabel, Schechter, Talmor, & Mazin, 2003).

An induction program’s focus on developing new teachers’ pedagogical expertise contributes to their sense of efficacy (Stallion & Zimpher, 1991). Pedagogical expertise includes both knowledge of how students learn and knowledge of teaching strategies, and new teachers can develop such expertise over time (Lee, Brown, Luft, & Roehrig, 2007) through experience (San, 1999). Growth of pedagogical expertise influences new teachers’ sense of efficacy (McCormack, Gore, & Thomas, 2006). Positive, informal, unplanned interactions with peers are a major influence in new teachers’ efficacy development, as is frequent and authentic affirmation of new teachers’ value and contribution to the professional community of the school (McCormack, Gore, & Thomas, 2006).

There is evidence that teachers working in a unique community, an independent school for example, are more successful when they are committed to that community or have prior experience living in a similar community (Harrison, 2001). Parents and students can influence new teachers’ sense of connection and well being (Oplatka & Eizenberg, 2007; Yandell & Turvey, 2007). School cultures that center on collaboration and learning as opposed to isolation and individualism cultivate new teachers’ feelings of connection (Williams, Prestage, & Bedward, 2001).
**Mentoring as Professional Practice**

The school under consideration in this research study developed an induction program wherein the primary vehicle for induction was the mentoring relationship between a new teacher and a professional mentor. Social science research related to mentoring as a professional practice is germane to this research study. This section reviews literature related to mentoring as a professional practice and to mentor characteristics that new teachers perceive as effective.

New teacher mentoring as a practice has been well researched and reflects shifts in its orientation. Little and Nelson (1990) explored mentoring as “help-giving” leading to a form of “teacher socialization” (pp. 324-331). Mullen (2005) described an evolution from traditional mentoring, in which the venerable mentor passed on knowledge and skills to the novice protégé, to contemporary mentoring in which mentoring is a collaborative mutual learning relationship. Odell (2006) asserted mentoring is “a professional practice, much as teaching is a practice” (p. 203). As a professional practice, mentoring includes “dispositions and beliefs, conceptual and theoretical understandings, as well as skills for implementing the practice” (p. 203). Odell outlined the evolution of mentoring practice in education with respect to its orientation – humanistic, educator as companion, and standards-based mentoring.

Employing Odell’s historical categories and Mullen’s evolution for mentoring as practice, it is clear that research on mentoring reflects a similar evolution. Early studies dating from the 1980s generally reflected the humanist/traditional orientation, with the focus on veteran teachers helping and guiding novice teachers to survive the first year of
teaching. The late 1980s and early 1990s revealed a move toward an educator as companion orientation – mentor teachers helping to induct new teachers into the profession. The mid 1990s and later featured studies that began to examine how mentors and new teachers can collaboratively improve their schools and the education profession more broadly.

Achinstein and Athanases (2006) examined the same paradigm shift, stating mentoring and research on mentoring have historically focused on how teachers survive their first year of school with the aspiration of preventing teachers from leaving schools or the profession. The school reform and standards movement has caused a paradigm shift, according to the authors. As a result, the focus now is on how mentoring can increase the rate at which new teachers develop their capacity to effectively impact student learning and school culture and how new teachers can play leadership roles in reforming in the profession (Odell, 2006; Fletcher & Barrett, 2004; Wang, 2001).

Another classification strategy is to consider the focal point of research: (a) mentor teacher factors, (b) new teacher factors, (c) school level (internal) factors, and (d) district-wide (external) factors. The following section will discuss social science research classified according to each of research areas.

*Mentor factors*

Feiman-Nemser & Parker (1992) referred to mentor roles as “local guides”, “educational companions”, and “agents of cultural change” (pp. 1-3). Ballantyne and Hansford (1995) and Jones (2001) demonstrated that mentors need to be expert enough to adapt to the role needed by new teachers. Ballantyne & Hansford delineated different
roles: “personal support; task-related assistance and advice; problem-related assistance and advice; critical reflection and feedback on practice” (1995, p. 297). Teachers simply new to a school have different needs in comparison to those also new to the profession and should receive a different mentoring approach as compared to novices, according to Trenta, Santos, Peck, and Cortes (2002). Mentors whose conceptual, ego, and moral judgments are more complex are better able to match role with new teachers’ needs, are more likely to collaborate, and are more apt to view new teachers as colleagues (Johnson & Reiman, 2006).

Ganser (1999a) asserted veteran teachers play critical roles in mentoring. Mentoring has been found to have a significant positive impact on mentors’ professional development as teachers (Giles & Wilson, 2004; Hawk, 1986-87; Stanulis, 1995) and sense of collegiality and efficacy (Kline & Salzman, 2006). McCorkel, Ariav, and Ariav (1998) found this to be particularly true when mentoring is accompanied by “training and opportunities for ongoing support” (p. 91) and opportunities for reflection. Journaling as a reflection tool helps mentor “role reconceptualization” (teacher of children shifting to teacher of adults) and mentee efficacy (Silva, 2000, p. 2; Tillman, 2003). Vonk (1993) and Zeek, Foote, and Walker (2001) held reflection caused mentors and new teachers to make meaning from their experiences. Whitehead and Fitzgerald (2006) found video was an effective reflection tool.

Mentors who display specific attributes or engage in certain behaviors are considered more effective. Being more directive at the start is helpful with novices, according to Vonk (1996). Bullough and Draper (2004) argued that mentors often
assumed a detached professional demeanor. The researchers found that when mentors provided new teachers with greater honesty and insight into the challenges of teaching and mentoring, benefits to the new teacher increased. Kanan and Baker (2002) studied the “professional, academic, and personal attributes” (p. 38) new teachers desired in a mentor. New teachers expressed mentors should teach in the same subject area, be more expert (advanced degree), and be more experienced. In the researchers’ study, male new teachers preferred to have a male mentor while gender match was not important to female new teachers. New teachers agreed a mentor should be older and “genuine, giving, and show an interest in the professional growth of the protégé” (p. 40). Sense of humor, patience, tact, and good communication skills were also preferred.

Mentor programs, like induction programs, benefit from high structure and accountability. When mentor roles are not well framed and mentors are not well trained, mentoring can become “an obstacle to reflection rather than an enhancement” according to Sundli (2007, p. 201), particularly in cross-race mentoring contexts (Tillman, 2001). Carver and Katz (2004) discovered mentors regularly did not seize opportunities to address deficiencies in new teachers’ practice. The authors recommend integrating mentoring as guidance with standards-based assessment in order to facilitate new teacher development.

New Teacher Factors

Mentoring (a) impacts new teachers’ perceptions of students (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004), (b) focuses new teachers on “individual student learning and growth” (Athanases & Achinstein, 2003, p. 1486), and (c) increases “development of professional
knowledge” (Gustafson, Guilbert, & MacDonald, 2002, p. 281; Huffman & Leak, 1986). Certo (2005a) argued that challenge in addition to support contribute to new teachers’ growth. “Reflective practice” is a well supported means to develop new teacher efficacy (Saka & Saka, 2006, p. 168).

Bandura (2000, 1993) has studied the effects of self-efficacy on the development of new teachers and the critical role mentoring plays. Tied closely to a feeling of self-efficacy is the new teacher’s development of a teacher identity (McCann & Johannessen, 2004; McCormack, Gore & Thomas, 2006). Odell and Ferraro (1992) found emotional support is a key element to development of identity and long-term retention of new teachers.

New teachers benefit when the mentoring relationship is reciprocal or mutual (Certo, 2005b, Johnson & Reiman, 2006) and when the relationship is based on trust (Stanulis & Russell, 2000). When novice teachers are given a leadership role, such as serving as one of two mentors in their second year (a mentor-triad), self-efficacy is increased (Hayes, 2006). New teachers will go outside of the formal mentor network to obtain help (Ballantyne & Hansford, 1995; Hertzog, 2002; Marso & Pigge, 1990), self-selecting faculty whom they perceive as “friendly” or “caring” (Tellez, 1992, p. 214).

School Factors

School climate is an important factor in novice teacher success. Angelle, (2002) found that the overall effectiveness of a school correlated to the effectiveness of the mentoring experiences within that school. A collaborative school culture centered on distributed leadership “most strongly relate[s] to higher morale, stronger commitment to
teaching, and intentions to remain in teaching” (Weiss, 1999, p. 861; Williams, Prestage, & Bedward, 2001). Students, parents, colleagues, and school context all impact novice teacher induction and retention (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, & McLaughlin, 1989). Climate must allow for and even encourage risk-taking and a perception that it is safe for novices to make and learn from mistakes (Yendol-Hoppey & Dana, 2006). Novices need to believe the climate is safe to make mistakes and seek help; they can be reluctant to impose on veteran teachers (Osgood, 2001). Kardos, Johnson, Peske, Kauffman and Liu (2001) found that schools with an integrated orientation that balances the professional needs of veterans with those of novices are most conducive to new teacher success. The principal plays a large role in fostering such a climate. Overall school climate also is a major factor in the retention of faculty of color (Thomas, et al., 1995).

The principal plays a critical role in the cultivation of a climate that supports new teachers by providing the context, purpose, and support for mentors and new teachers to meet. Left on their own, mentor pairs met less than they intended and tended to focus on “policy and procedures” and “support and encouragement” (Ganser, 1999b, p. 2), as opposed to student learning (Youngs, 2007). Principals must hold mentors accountable for following through on their responsibilities (Lindgren, 2005, Youngs, 2007). Principals can help with appropriately “matching” school-based mentor pairs (Gray & Gray, 1985, p. 37; Osgood, 2001). Mentor self-perception as a subject specialist can override the need for mentor to be more generalist when mentoring (Halai, 2006) – a trend the principal can help mitigate.
External factors

Wide variation exists in mentor quality and follow-thru even within a school (Arnold, 2006; Flores, 2006; Young, Bullough, Draper, Smith, & Erickson, 2005) and certainly within a district or among districts (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992; Hughes, 2006). Mentors must be held accountable for following through on district and state expectations; Anctil (1991) found that many do not. Training and development of mentor expertise directly increases new teacher effectiveness (Evertson & Smithey, 2000; Grove, Strudler, & Odell, 2004). Without such guidance mentoring may not produce desired growth or “focus on standards-based teaching” (Wang, Odell, & Strong, 2006, p. 126). How mentors define their purpose and what they are imparting to a new teacher should be guided by school/district – otherwise it is likely to be idiosyncratic (Feiman-Nemser, 2001b; Prestine & Nelson, 2005). Evaluation is critical to determining mentor program outcomes (Kilburg & Hancock, 2006; Trenta, Santos, Peck, & Cortes, 2002).

Arends and Regazio-DiGilio (2000, p. 1-2) established that “clarity of purpose,” “sufficient time,” and constituent commitment all critical to district-level success. Programs should be aligned with beginning teachers’ needs (Basile, 2006). The success of first-year mentoring can impact teachers decisions to move or stay at the end of the year (Elfers, Plecki, & Knapp, 2006) and influence longer-term retention (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Mills, Moore & Keane, 2001; White & Mason, 2006), particularly when employed in combination with other coordinated and well-planned induction activities (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Wang & Odell, 2002). Taking advantage of new technologies
is increasing. On-line mentoring groups can positively impact new teachers’ feelings of isolation, capacity for reflection, and efficacy (DeWert, Babinski, & Jones, 2003).

A review of social science research related to mentoring as a professional practice demonstrates several paradigm shifts in the purpose and practice of mentoring (Mullen, 2005; Odell, 2006). The school reform and standards movement has focused contemporary mentoring practice on increasing the rate at which new teachers develop their capacity to impact student learning and how new teachers can play leadership roles in reforming in the profession (Odell, 2006; Fletcher & Barrett, 2004; Wang, 2001). Mentoring as a professional practice has positive effects on the mentor and the new teacher and is influenced by school level and external factors.

Mentors need to fulfill a variety of roles based on new teachers’ needs and must be expert enough to adapt to meet those needs (Ballantyne & Hansford, 1995; Jones, 2001). Mentors whose conceptual, ego, and moral judgments are more complex are better able to match role with new teacher need and are more likely to behave collegially toward the new teacher (Johnson & Reiman, 2006). Mentors need opportunities to reflect and learn according to the learning cycle discussed previously (McCorkel, Ariav, & Ariav, 1998; Silva, 2000; Tillman, 2003). Routine reflection and support for mentors allow them to make meaning and learn from their experiences (Vonk, 1993; Zeek, Foote, & Walker, 2001). Mentors need support and training to be able to seize teachable moments to address deficiencies in new teachers’ practice (Carver and Katz, 2004).

Specific attributes or behaviors are considered more effective: (a) honest about the challenges of teaching (Bullough & Draper, 2004), (b) teach in the same subject area,
(c) more expert (advanced degree), (d) more experienced, (e) older, (f) genuine, (g) giving, (h) show an interest in the new teacher’s professional growth, (i) sense of humor, (j) patience, (k) tact, (l) good communication skills (b-l, Kanan & Baker, 2002), and (m) emotional support (Odell & Ferraro, 1992).

In addition to developing professional expertise, mentoring has positive effects on feelings of self-efficacy of new teachers (Bandura; 2000, 1993) and on new teachers’ development of a teacher identity (McCann & Johannessen, 2004; McCormack, Gore & Thomas, 2006). Benefits to new teachers increase when the mentoring relationship is collaborative, reciprocal, or mutual (Certo, 2005b, Johnson & Reiman, 2006) and when the relationship is based on trust (Stanulis & Russell, 2000). New teachers will go outside of the formal mentor network to obtain help (Ballantyne & Hansford, 1995; Hertzog, 2002; Marso & Pigge, 1990), self-selecting faculty colleagues whom they perceive to be helpful (Tellez, 1992).

Students, parents, colleagues, and school context all impact novice teacher induction and retention (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, & McLaughlin, 1989). The effectiveness of the school correlates to the effectiveness of the mentoring experiences within the school (Angelle, 2002). A collaborative school culture contributes to new teacher retention (Weiss, 1999; Williams, Prestage, & Bedward, 2001), as does a culture that balances the needs of veterans and novices (Kardos, Johnson, Peske, Kauffman & Liu, 2001). School climate must allow for new teachers making and learning from mistakes (Yendol-Hoppey & Dana, 2006; Osgood, 2001). The principal plays a large
role in fostering such a climate (Ganser, 1999b; Youngs, 2007; Lindgren, 2005; Gray & Gray, 1985; Osgood, 2001).

Wide variation exists in mentor quality and follow-thru within schools (Arnold, 2006; Flores, 2006; Young, Bullough, Draper, Smith, & Erickson, 2005) and within a district or among districts (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992; Hughes, 2006). Mentors must be held accountable for following through on district and state expectations (Anctil, 1991). Without training for mentors, mentoring may not produce desired new teacher or student growth (Wang, Odell, & Strong, 2006). Critical to realizing mentor program outcomes are (a) program evaluation (Kilburg & Hancock, 2006; Trenta, Santos, Peck, & Cortes, 2002), (b) clear purpose, (c) time, (d) commitment (b-d, Arends & Regazio-DiGilio, 2000), and (e) alignment with new teachers’ needs (Basile, 2006).

**Cross-Race Mentoring**

Diversity in the teaching force, both public and independent, is advocated as a means to “generate increased knowledge and creative ideas”, “enhance student and teacher learning, and enrich the national discourse on the significance of diversity in American public life (Torres, Santos, Peck, & Cortes, 2004, p. 1-2). Increasing diversity in the teacher force requires broad partnerships between schools and university teacher training programs, businesses, and state and federal governments (Wormer, 1991). While many educators share a general sense of the importance of teacher diversity mirroring pupil diversity, limited research exists on cross-race mentoring as a means of supporting the diversification of the teacher force in K-12 school contexts. A theoretical framework for cross-race mentoring does exist in research on business environments, social work
and counseling, and university teaching. The latter is almost exclusively restricted to self-examinations of single mentor-new teacher pairs (Tillman, 2001), and thus somewhat limited in its applicability to school-wide or district-wide K-12 settings. Research on social work, counseling, and mentoring as a support in the racial integration of business settings has greater utility for K-12 educators. In these literature bases, the term protégé is used extensively, so that term is also used here when summarizing studies.

Cross-race mentoring “requires extra sensitivity”, familiarity with diversity work, “reflection on the meaning(s) of white privilege [lower case in original]”, and “is built on a relationship”, a sense of responsibility, the ability to take perspective, “help[ing] others achieve their goals”, and being an ally (Stanley & Lincoln, 2005, pp. 40-42). The “ability of entry-level employees is increased by mentoring”, particularly when the workforce is diverse (Athey, Avery, & Zemsky, 2000, p. 765; Salomon & Schork, 2003; Wanguri, 1996). Protégés express greater satisfaction when they perceive interpersonal similarities with their mentors (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Ensher, Grant-Vallone, and Marelich (2002) found that “perceived attitudinal similarity was a better predictor of protégés’ satisfaction with and support received from their mentors than was demographic similarity” (p. 1407).

Mentoring for an employee of a specific racial or ethnic type increases when there are more management-level employees of similar race or ethnicity (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Promotions follow a similar pattern (Athey, Avery, & Zemsky, 2000). Dreyer and Cox (1996) found that MBA graduates of color and female graduates were less likely than their White counterparts to form mentor relationships with White men and that the
establishment of such a relationship had a “compensation advantage of $16,840” (p. 297). Mentoring among social workers, which often is cross-race in nature, demonstrates a “strong bias… toward ‘like mentoring like,’ or same-race relationships” (Collins, Kamya, & Tourse, 1997, p. 145).

When considering a variety of mentor-supervisor factors, such as diversity training, ethnic self-identity, and personal experiences that lead to identity development, White mentors/supervisors were found to be more effective working with people of color when they had a clearer sense of their own ethnic identity (Chrobot-Mason, 2004) and fostered a broad (organization-wide) sense of responsibility for diversity (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Responsibility also enhanced the effectiveness of diversity training and mentoring. Trust and acknowledgment of White privilege is critical to successful cross-race mentoring (Johnson-Bailey, Cervero, & Baugh, 2004). “Ethnic-specific” support and affinity-group network opportunities increase teacher of color recruitment and retention (Case, Shive, Ingebrestson, & Spiegel, 1988, p. 54) as well as retention in business settings (Thomas, 1990) due to opportunities for “enhanced mentoring” (Friedman, Kane, & Cornfield, 1998, p. 1155). Individual and group concepts of mentoring vary by culture (Kanan & Baker, 2002).

Researchers have found that Black employees experience particular difficulty in the mentoring process. Viator (2001) found that Black accountants experienced greater difficulty developing informal mentor relationships than their White counterparts, resulting in increased job dissatisfaction and greater likelihood of leaving the profession. Simon, Bowles, King, & Rof (2004) also found Black social workers reported, although
successful, they did not experience mentoring in their early development. These difficulties are also revealed in the results from *The Teacher Follow-up Survey*, where Marvel et al. (2007) found that Black teachers had the highest departure rate from the profession in 2004-05 at 11.0% and the second highest mobility rate at 9.7% (Table 2, p. 8). The number of Black teachers entering the profession is not improving, either. Zumwalt and Craig (2005) reported that teachers of Latino and Asian racial identity were most likely to have 5 or less years of experience while Black teachers were most likely to have 20 or more years of experience.

A review of social science research related to cross-race mentoring revealed little related research in the education field; studies typically focused on individual mentor-new teacher pairs in university settings. Studies were more prevalent in business and social work fields. While these studies offered a useful framework for understanding mentor-protégé relationships within organizations, there exists a serious need for study within K-12 contexts and between mentors and new teachers. These contexts and relationships have unique characteristics that are not completely mirrored within business or social work settings.

In business settings, protégés express greater satisfaction when they perceive interpersonal similarities with their mentors regardless of racial identity (Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Marelich, 2002). In social work settings, on the other hand, there exists a preference toward same-race mentoring (Collins, Kamya, & Tourse, 1997). The presence of management-level employees of color is an important
correlate to mentoring program success (Ensher & Murphy, 1997) and to promotions into management (Athey, Avery, & Zemskey, 2000).

Cross-race mentoring requires the mentor to possess specific attributes and engage in certain behaviors, particularly with the respect to the topic of privilege (Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Johnson-Bailey, Cervero, & Baugh, 2004). Mentoring varies by culture (Kanan & Baker, 2002). White mentors and supervisors are more effective working with people of color when they have a clearer sense of their own ethnic identity (Chrobot-Mason, 2004) and foster a broad (organization-wide) sense of responsibility for diversity (Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). Same race affinity-group network opportunities increase teacher of color recruitment and retention (Case, Shive, Ingebrestson, & Spiegel, 1988) as well as retention in business (Friedman, Kane, & Cornfield, 1998; Thomas, 1990). Black employees experience greater difficulty developing informal mentoring relationships in some settings (Viator, 2001).

**Qualitative Research**

Merriam (1998) asserts within an “interpretive research” paradigm, “education is considered to be a process and school is a lived experience” (p. 4). Meaning is “constructed socially by individuals” (p. 4), and the researcher’s role is to gather information and generate understanding using an “inductive… mode of inquiry” (p. 4). Patton (1985) describes qualitative research as “an effort to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a particular context and the interactions there” (p. 1). Merriam (1998) outlines several defining characteristics of qualitative research. The central focus of inquiry is the “participants’ perspectives, not the researcher’s” (p. 6), yet “the
researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (p. 7). This fact affords the researcher several advantages, particularly the ability to adjust methods to the setting and events as they unfold.

However, an essential caution for qualitative researchers is controlling for personal bias and preconceptions and maintaining objectivity. Research questions, the study design, and a sample must be carefully formulated. Qualitative research, embedded in a specific context, requires fieldwork, where the researcher immerses in the context through participant interviews, observations, surveys, journals, focus groups and analysis of documents. Data must be “triangulated” (p. 204), or confirmed by a variety of sources and means, and verified and analyzed according to a thoughtful and purposeful plan. Finally the results of qualitative research are arrived upon inductively and are “richly descriptive” (p. 8).

For studying a number of varied units of analysis that co-exist in a “complex setting” (p. 172), Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend a cross-case analysis. Cross-case analysis offers several benefits to qualitative researchers: “enhanc[ing] generalizability” and “deepen[ing] understanding and explanation” (emphasis in original, p. 173). The authors assert it is critical to fully understand each case first before embarking on an analysis across cases. In all qualitative research, validity, reliability, and ethical conduct are primary concerns.

Chapter Three presents the design of the study and details the qualitative methodology employed by the researcher-participant. Chapter Five returns to the
theoretical frameworks presented here and offers a discussion of the findings in relation to these frameworks.
CHAPTER THREE

Design of the Study

Introduction

Chapter Three presents the design of the research study and explains why this design was best suited to respond to the guiding research questions within the context of the study. The research study context, The Eastern School, was a suburban, independent, co-educational elementary day school engaged in the design and implementation of a formal new teacher induction program and reform of its pre-existing new teacher mentoring program. The Eastern School community was predominantly White, and the school, under direction of its board of trustees, had made a strategic effort to diversify the faculty and student body according to racial identity. Thus, the guiding research questions considered the experiences of new teachers of color in contrast to those of new White faculty engaged in the same induction and mentoring program. The researcher was an administrator at the school and a participant in both reform initiatives.

*New teacher*, rather than *beginning* or *novice*, is used throughout this chapter to identify the induction and mentoring program and new teacher participants because all teachers new to the school were served, not only beginning teachers.

The overall research design was a qualitative case study, and the researcher-participant utilized evaluative, inductive, and emergent participant-observer methodology. The researcher-participant functioned as the primary instrument for data gathering, investigation, and analysis. Data gathering tactics were questionnaires, interviews, observations, journals, and review of relevant records. The primary unit of
analysis was the triad formed by a new teacher and his or her professional and social mentors. The cohort of eight new teachers and their respective professional mentors together comprised the sample for a secondary, cross-case level of analysis.

Research Questions

This section presents the guiding research questions and the rationale for these questions within the research study context. The questions that guided this research study were:

1. **How did the induction program affect new teachers’ (a) connection to the school community, (b) professional satisfaction, and (c) sense of efficacy?**

2. **Which mentor characteristics did new teachers perceive as being helpful and supportive?**

3. **Did new teachers’ perceptions vary for cross-race mentoring relationships as compared to same-race mentoring relationships?**

Through the new teacher mentoring and induction program, research study participants were being socialized into the norms and culture of a school. This process occurred primarily through interactions between new teachers and their mentors and the planned induction activities during their first year of teaching. Mentor networks extended beyond the individuals formally assigned to mentor new teachers, indicating a culture in which all members of the community invested themselves in the success of new teachers.

New teachers also changed the social fabric and culture of the school through their engagement in the mentoring program and interactions within their formal and
informal support networks. As a result, the research study was heuristic: within this complex context, the goal was to understand the manifold factors that shaped new teachers’ perceptions of efficacy, satisfaction, and connection during their first year of teaching in a new community. Given that new teachers’ first-year experience was mitigated by induction and mentoring, the researcher-participant’s investigation encompassed both effects of the induction program and interactions between mentors and new teachers.

*Research Methodology*

This section presents the research methodology and the scientific rationale for utilizing a qualitative methodology within the context of the research study.

The overall design of the research was a qualitative case study, utilizing an evaluative, inductive, and emergent participant-observer approach. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006) asserted that qualitative methods can produce “in-depth understandings about the way things are, why they are the way they are, and how the participants in the context perceive them” (p. 14). Miles and Huberman (1994) stated that qualitative data allow the researcher to “see precisely which events led to which consequences, and derive fruitful explanations” (p. 1). Merriam (1998) indicated that “qualitative inquiry…focuses on meaning in context” (p. 1). To investigate the influence of the complex processes of induction and mentoring on new teachers and to contrast the experiences of new teachers working in cross-race mentoring contexts with same-race contexts, qualitative methodology offered the most effective approach to developing rich meaning and deep understanding.
Merriam stated that “case studies focus on a particular situation, event, program, or phenomenon. The case itself is important for what it reveals about the phenomenon and for what it might represent” (p. 29). This research study focused on the particular experience of new teachers in their first year at an independent school: how a school-based induction program and how mentoring and interactions within their formal support networks influenced their respective experiences. The research study featured rich description, generated from a variety of sources, to illuminate the experience of new teachers in their first year. Mentoring interactions are complex and the experiences of new teacher within a school community are shaped by a multitude of variables. Merriam stressed the benefits of a case study approach because they “include as many variables as possible and portray their interaction, often over a period of time” (p. 30).

The researcher was a participant in the initiatives that undergirded the research study context, again an advantage within a qualitative research framework. Specifically, he was an administrator within the school setting who recruited and hired all of the new teacher participants in the research study, and who directly supervised three of the new teacher participants and their mentors. The researcher-participant also mentored the other primary administrative participant, who was a new division administrator within the school. In some instances, the researcher-participant engaged in mentoring techniques and meetings with the three new teachers he directly supervised. The researcher served as a participant and an observer in those situations.
**Sample**

This section describes the research study sample and scientific rationale for using this sample. Miles and Huberman (1994) stated that a sample is a “frame to help you uncover, confirm, or qualify the basic processes that undergird your study” (p. 27). The authors further asserted, “multiple-case sampling adds confidence to findings” (emphasis in original, p. 29).

The sample in this research study was purposive and comprised eight individual cases. Each case consisted of a new teacher and the professional and social mentors assigned to him or her. All were working together in new teachers’ first year at an independent, suburban, co-educational elementary day school in the northeastern United States. Table 1 displays the eight individual cases. Additional data to describe the research study context and the sample cases are presented in Chapter Four.

All research study participants were volunteers and did not receive compensation for their participation. In a preliminary meeting, the researcher-participant described the research study and invited each prospective participant to consider volunteering. All prospective volunteers consented to enter the research study. Participants signed an informed consent form approved by the sponsoring university, which is included as Appendix A. The researcher-participant protected participants’ confidentiality and anonymity by camouflaging their names and identities and the name and location of the school. As a key line of inquiry was the effect of racial identity on the mentor-new teacher relationship, the research study described participants by racial identity; participants volunteered to have such a classification used.
Table 1

Sample by Individual Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Teacher</th>
<th>Professional Mentor</th>
<th>Social Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Teacher of Color</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Lori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Betty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Deirdre</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White New Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Sally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Oscar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Lourdes&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> John was a new lead teacher and was also mentoring her assistant, Rachel. <sup>b</sup> Jennifer served as an assistant for two years prior to her promotion and chose to only work with a professional mentor. <sup>c</sup> Lourdes was a new lead teacher and also mentored her assistant, Fred.

As mentioned previously, the researcher-participant recruited and hired all eight of the new teachers, and he directly supervised three of the new teachers and their mentors. At the preliminary meeting, the researcher-participant stated explicitly to all prospective participants, as well as in writing via an informed consent document (see Appendix A), that volunteering for, participation in, and/or withdrawal from the research
study would not impact job performance or status in any manner. The researcher-participant reminded participants of these protections in advance of each formal data gathering activity.

The sample included all new teachers of color (n = 4) who started at the Eastern School during the period under consideration. To provide racial balance to the sample and offer a race-based comparison, an equal number of White teachers were included. The sample included three female teachers and one male teacher of color, and three female teachers and one male teacher who were White. The sample included three lead teachers and one teaching assistant of color and three lead teachers and one teaching assistant who were White. All lead teachers who were new in the year under consideration were included, and two teaching assistants were included to balance the sample with respect to racial identity, gender, and assignment. Five White new teaching assistants, who were also new in the year under consideration, were not included, as they did not fulfill the purpose of balancing the sample. Further details describing the sample are included in Chapter Four.

New teachers at The Eastern School worked with two mentors, a professional mentor and a social mentor, forming a triad. The school administrative team assigned mentors during the spring prior to a new teacher’s start. Professional mentor assignments were deliberately grade-alike and/or job-alike. Social mentor assignments were based on similarity of interests and/or life station. Mentors were volunteers and unpaid. All teachers in the school expected to serve as a mentor at some point during their tenure – this was an embedded dimension of school culture. Professional mentors tended to be
experienced teachers, whereas social mentors may have been at any point in their careers. All mentors received training in a half-day workshop facilitated by administrators and a handbook of mentor expectations prior to the start of the school year under consideration. Additional information related to mentor training is featured in Chapter Four.

For the purpose of this research study, data was gathered about new teachers’ perceptions of both the professional and social mentors. Given that the professional mentor carried the primary responsibility for new teacher induction at The Eastern School, data gathering from mentors was focused on professional mentors assigned to new teacher participants.

**Pilot Testing**

This section describes pilot testing that occurred in preparation of the data gathering instruments. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006) described face validity as “the degree to which a test appears to measure what it claims to measure” (p. 135). In order to increase validity, a panel of experts reviewed the questionnaire, interview protocols, instruments, and reflection journal procedures. The researcher-participant revised questions, rating scales, and activities as specified by the reviewers.

The authors stated pilot testing allows the researcher “to identify unanticipated problems or issues” (p. 91). The questionnaire, instruments, and the new teacher and professional mentor interview protocols were pilot-tested on an educator who was not a participant in the research study, then discussed. The researcher-participant utilized this experience to clarify interview and questionnaire prompts. The reflection journal protocol was expert-reviewed, but not pilot-tested due to time constraints.
Data Gathering Procedures

This section presents the specific procedures for gathering and maintaining data and details instruments used to gather data.

Merriam (1998) identified that two key underpinnings of all qualitative research are (a) “the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” and (b) “it usually involves fieldwork” (p. 7). While the researcher may employ tools such as questionnaires, interview protocols, and other instruments, Merriam argued that “data are mediated through this human instrument, the researcher, rather than some inanimate inventory” (p. 7). Through fieldwork, Patton (1990) stated the qualitative researcher collects data comprised of “direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings, and knowledge” and “detailed descriptions of people’s activities, behaviors, actions” (p. 10). Merriam (1998) described the most common instruments or methods to collect qualitative data are conducting interviews, observing, and reviewing documents (pp. 69-70).

Data Gathering Methods

This research study involved the researcher-participant immersing himself in the study setting, seeking to illuminate the complex interactions that occurred in new teacher induction and mentoring, particularly in the cross-race contexts presented by the sample. As an administrator in the school, the researcher-participant was in a unique position to obtain an “emic, or insider’s perspective” (p. 6), which Merriam described as a significant attribute of qualitative research. To collect data, the researcher-participant
### Table 2

**Data Gathering Methods by Participant Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Observation of meetings</td>
<td>Summer preceding research study and throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project team</td>
<td>Review of planning documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent hires</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>Summer preceding research study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary interview</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor network instrument</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New teachers</td>
<td>Observation of mentor-new teacher interactions</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of induction activities</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection journal</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of training</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New teacher interview</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor network instrument</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Mentor interview</td>
<td>February/March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentors</td>
<td>Observation of mentor-new teacher interactions</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of induction and mentoring activities</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of training</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social mentors</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New teacher interview</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor network instrument</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New teacher questionnaire</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division administrators</td>
<td>Observation of mentoring and admin meetings</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>Observation of induction and mentoring activities</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator interview</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research-participant field notes and leadership journal</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
employed interviewing, both in person and through questionnaires, participant journaling, observing, and reviewing documents pertinent to the

Miles and Huberman (1994) asserted it is “desirable… to integrate case-oriented and variable-oriented approaches” (p. 176) when conducting qualitative cross-case analysis. The primary unit of study was the triad formed by a new teacher and his or her professional and social mentors, although most attention was paid to the professional mentor-new teacher relationship. As a secondary level of investigation, the cohort of the eight individual cases comprised the sample for cross-case comparisons. Through investigating the research study context and the cases described in the preceding section and employing the methods outlined in Table 2, the researcher-participant gathered data on the following variables:

1. The pre-intervention context
2. The new induction and mentoring program
3. New teacher background information
4. New teachers’ perceptions of their connection to the community
5. New teachers’ perceptions of their professional satisfaction
6. New teachers’ perception of self-efficacy
7. Mentor characteristics
8. Perceptions of new teachers in cross-race mentor-new teacher pairs

The researcher-participant first considered the above variables for each individual case, then compared among the cases to engender understanding with respect to cross-race as contrasted to same-race mentoring relationships.
Merriam (1998) stated “triangulation strengthens reliability as well as internal validity” (p. 207). For each variable, the researcher-participant collected data from multiple sources and employed different instruments to triangulate data. Likewise, whenever the researcher-participant observed or interviewed a research study participant, he provided the participant with transcripts of these interactions for verification and review. Following each stage of data collection, the researcher-participant engaged in an initial analysis to allow themes to emerge. The researcher-participant tested themes in subsequent data-collecting activities.

The following sub-sections describe the researcher-participant actions, instruments, and protocols employed to gather data on each variable.

Pre-intervention context. The researcher-participant gathered data about the condition of new teacher induction and mentoring at The Eastern School prior to the implementation of the new program by (a) examining historical documents describing induction and mentoring prior to the intervention, (b) interviewing a focus group of recently-hired teachers using a semi-structured format, (c) holding semi-structured interviews with mentor teacher participants in the research study, and (d) participating in the intervention design and implementation.

New induction and mentoring program. The researcher-participant gathered data about the new Eastern School induction and mentoring program through (a) examining and participating in planning meeting agendas, materials, and minutes; (b) observing mentor training; (c) administering a questionnaire to new teacher participants; (d)
holding semi-structured interviews with new teachers and their professional mentors respectively; and (e) observing induction and mentoring activities as a participant.

**New teacher background information.** The researcher-participant (a) analyzed resumes of the new teacher participants to determine experience and (b) discussed racial self-identity during preliminary interviews.

**New teachers’ perceptions of connection to the community.** The researcher-participant gathered data about new teachers’ perceptions of connection to the community by (a) administering a questionnaire; (b) holding semi-structured interviews with new teachers; (c) collecting rich description from new teachers using an instrument designed to generate reflection about mentor-new teacher relationships (Mentor Network Instrument); and (d) having participants respond in reflection journals.

**New teachers’ perceptions of professional satisfaction.** The researcher-participant gathered data about new teachers’ perceptions of professional satisfaction through (a) administering a questionnaire; (b) holding semi-structured interviews with new teachers; and (c) having participants respond in reflection journals.

**New teachers’ perceptions of self-efficacy.** The researcher-participant gathered data about new teachers’ perceptions of self-efficacy through (a) administering a questionnaire; (b) holding semi-structured interviews with new teachers; (c) observing interactions between professional mentors and new teachers; and (d) having participants respond in reflection journals.

**Mentor characteristics.** The researcher-participant gathered data related to effective mentor characteristics via (a) semi-structured interviews with new teacher and
mentors respectively, (b) the Mentor Network Instrument, (c) new teacher written journal responses, (d) observations of mentor-new teacher interactions, and (e) the new teacher questionnaire.

*New teachers’ perceptions in cross-race pairs.* The researcher-participant gathered data related to the specific perceptions of new teachers of color about their experience during the first year of service via (a) semi-structured interviews with new teachers, (b) the Mentor Network Instrument, (c) teacher written journal responses, (d) observations of mentor-new teacher interactions, and (e) the new teacher questionnaire.

*Data Gathering Instruments*

The following sub-sections will provide details on the design, intended implementation, and storage of data instruments and protocols.

*Document review.* The researcher-participant recorded data that he collected via document review in narrative form on a password-protected computer in his office.

*Researcher-participant field notes.* The researcher-participant recorded notes from meetings with various participants and observations of induction and mentoring activities in narrative form on a password-protected computer in his office. Notes were loaded on End Note software for ease of searching and analysis.

*Researcher-participant leadership journal.* The researcher-participant recorded self-reflections on, insights into, and relevant learning about his leadership throughout the research study in narrative form on a password-protected computer in his office. The journal was loaded on End Note software for ease of searching and analysis.
**Questionnaire.** New teacher participants completed a final questionnaire at the end of the school under consideration. The questionnaire was reviewed and pilot-tested. The researcher-participant designed, administered, and collected responses electronically via the Survey Monkey on-line program. The program was password protected; the researcher-participant stored paper copies of questionnaire responses in a secure filing cabinet in his office. The full questionnaire is included as Appendix G.

**New teacher and mentor interview protocols.** The researcher-participant conducted semi-structured interviews with new teachers and professional mentors respectively. Interview protocols were reviewed and pilot-tested. The researcher-participant held interviews in his office and audio-recorded and transcribed results. Transcripts were stored on a password protected searchable electronic database, End Note. The researcher-participant stored audio tapes and paper copies of interview transcripts in a secure filing cabinet in his office. The new teacher interview protocol appears as Appendix C1 and mentor interview protocol as Appendix D.

**New teacher-mentor interaction observation protocol.** The researcher-participant observed at least one representative interaction for each mentor-new teacher case. Examples included interactions such as observation feedback meetings or meetings to seek guidance on dealing with specific issues. The researcher-participant conducted and audio-recorded observations in participants’ classrooms or offices, then transcribed the recordings onto a password protected searchable database, End Note. Audio tapes and paper copies of the transcriptions were stored in a secure storage cabinet in the researcher-participant’s office. For new teachers who were under the direct supervision
of the researcher-participant, the researcher was a participant-observer in the interactions. The observation protocol was reviewed, but not pilot-tested before use, and appears as Appendix F.

*Mentor network instrument.* During the New Teacher Interview Protocol, new teachers completed a Mentor Network Instrument developed by researcher-participant. Each participant was presented with a graphic display of the formally assigned mentor network and the new teacher, which included the professional and social mentors, the division administrator, and the head of school (see example and protocol in Appendix C2). The rich description resulting from the reflection activity comprised a data source for new teachers’ perceptions of connection to the community, mentor characteristics, and sources of mentoring. The Mentor Network Instrument was reviewed, but not pilot-tested.

*New teacher journal protocol.* Participants recorded reflections on their experiences with the induction program and mentoring in journals and submit these to researcher-participant three times during research study period. Not only free reflections were requested, but also guided reflection activities. The journal protocol was reviewed, but not pilot-tested, and the protocol appears as Appendix E.

*Methods of Data Analysis*

This section explains methods the researcher-participant used to analyze gathered data. Miles and Huberman (1994) stated that qualitative data “analysis includes selecting, condensing, and transforming *data*; displaying these data in an organized way; and drawing and verifying conclusions from the condensed, displayed data” (emphases in
Qualitative research generates a vast amount of data. Analysis is the process of linking discrete data points into categories and classifications, seeking through this activity to generate meaning and deeper understanding. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006) distilled the analysis process to reading notes and memos, rich describing, and classifying (pp. 470-471).

Miles and Huberman (1994) stated that cross-case analysis allows the researcher to “enhance generalizability” and “deepen understanding and explanation” (p. 173). The authors suggested that, while the researcher engaged in cross-case analysis is challenged “to draw well-founded conclusions from multiple networks” (p. 207), this methodology offers opportunity to augment qualitative research. The purpose for employing a cross-case approach to this research study was to generate a racial identity-based comparison between the experiences of new teachers involved in the induction and mentoring program. The researcher-participant aspired to identify and understand factors that contributed to differences based on racial identity.

Merriam (1998) ardently suggested an advantage of qualitative research is that “the researcher can process data immediately, can clarify and summarize as the study evolves” (p. 7). Likewise, qualitative research “employs a primarily inductive research strategy” (p. 7). The researcher constructs “tentative hypotheses” (p. 8) while she collects data and can test these with participants in future data-collecting sessions. In this sense, qualitative research is emergent; subsequent levels of data gathering are informed and altered by what comes before. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006) concurred: “the
qualitative researcher often works collaboratively with participants in the study, and that collaboration can extend to the data analysis process” (p. 473).

As stated, the eight new teachers, together with their mentor networks, comprised eight individual cases. In order to maximize credibility, the researcher-participant transcribed all interviews and observations as they were completed, and sent the transcriptions to the respective participants for verification and comment. Trochim (2006) defined credibility as “establishing that the results of qualitative research are credible or believable from the perspective of the participant in the research” (p. 1).

Yusko and Feiman-Nemser (2008) offered a model for data gathering and analysis in that progressed from general to specific. Data gathering in this research study progressed similarly: from examining general characteristics of the new induction and mentoring program to exploring specific perceptions held by new teachers and observing their interactions with their mentors. Yusko and Feiman-Nemser advocated three stages of data analysis, also utilized in this research study. As this researcher-participant reviewed school documents and materials, conducted and transcribed interviews, and collected other data, he engaged in a first level of analysis, recording preliminary thoughts and developing themes in the reflective journal. The researcher-participant invited research study participants to review interview and observation transcripts for verification and discussed emerging impressions with them for refinement. Upon completion of data collection, the researcher-participant conducted a second level of analysis by re-reading notes and transcripts to identify and code patterns and by synthesizing questionnaire responses in charts and displays. The researcher-participant
contrasted data collected by various instruments, identifying and analyzing congruence among data sources. The primary focus of the research study and its findings discussed in Chapter Four was on the third level of analysis: a cross-case comparison intended to understand the experiences and perceptions of new teachers of color in contrast to those of their White peers.

Specifically, then the researcher-participant organized the verified transcriptions; along with participant journal entries and questionnaire results; according to the original research questions. The researcher-participant read and reviewed these documents, noting themes, patterns, and relationships and reflecting whether the data answer the original research questions. He transferred the transcriptions to End Note software to allow for ease of searching for words and phrases. Formal analysis included coding of all data collected for each case – interviews, observations, and journal entries. The researcher-participant collected questionnaire data using Survey Monkey, an online survey database, and conducted an initial level of analysis of questionnaire data using the program.

The researcher-participant based coding schemes on the original research questions. Coding was also emergent, meaning categories surfaced from transcription and review. Data collected from the focus group activities was also coded and analyzed. The researcher-participant then compiled data in matrices developed for each research question, allowing categories to emerge. Where appropriate and useful, the researcher-participant visually displayed categorized data. In Chapters Four and Five, the researcher-participant endeavored to construct theories to explain the findings – to derive
meaning from the data. As Merriam (1998) stated, “data analysis is a process of making sense out of the data… analysis is moving toward the development of a theory to explain the data’s meaning” (p. 192).

Merriam stressed the importance of engendering a complete understanding of individual cases, or “within-case analysis” (p. 194), before moving to a second stage of cross-case analysis. In this research study, cross-case analysis methodology identified general patterns and themes across all cases, again allowing for a higher level of classification to emerge. Merriam explained, “a qualitative, inductive, multi-case study seeks to build abstractions across cases” (p. 195). The specific purpose of the cross-case analysis was to compare the experiences of same-race mentor-new teacher pairs with those of cross-race mentor-new teacher pairs. The key to cross-case analysis, then, was determining differences and similarities in the findings for each variable.

*Format for Reporting Data*

This section describes the method for reporting the data and the findings of the research study, which appear predominantly in Chapter Four. The original research questions provided the scaffolding for reporting the data. Miles and Huberman (1994) recommended “condensing” (p. 299) data and developing matrices to display data. Displayed data, assert the authors, ease the researcher’s task of “drawing and verifying conclusions” (p. 299). In this research study, data was reported using rich descriptive, narrative text, and data displays. The researcher-participant focused data reporting on the cross-case analysis.
Merriam (1998) described three levels of rich description: particular, general, and interpretive (p. 235), and this researcher-participant employed these three levels to report data in Chapter Four. Particular description included quotes from a variety of sources and attempted to offer a sample of “everyday life” (p. 235) in the research study setting and context. Using general description, the researcher–participant identified “whether the vignettes and quotes are typical of the data as a whole” (p. 235). Interpretative commentary, the third level of rich description for Merriam, provided “a framework for understanding” (p. 235) the previous two and comprised the basis for the discussion in Chapter Five.

Framework for Discussing Findings

This section presents the approach to discussing the research study findings, which appear in Chapter Five. The original research questions comprised the starting point for discussing findings, most importantly the degree to which data collected answered these guiding questions. Conceptual frameworks identified in the literature review presented in Chapter Two further elucidated the discussion of findings. As described in the preceding section, “interpretative commentary” (Merriam, 1998, p. 235) illustrated the researcher-participant’s findings. The researcher-participant drew upon the leadership journal he maintained during the research study to provide reflections on implications resulting from the leadership project team, the research study, and the learning he experienced during the research process.

Another key element to a discussion of the findings is a consideration of limitations of the research study.
Limitations of the Study

This section presents the framework for discussing limitations of the research study, which appears as a more complete discussion in Chapter Five. Candidly acknowledging limitations, in the researcher-participant’s opinion, enhances the quality of the research study outcomes.

Merriam (1998) argued strongly that the strength of qualitative research lies in the researcher acting as the central data collector and analyzer. Merriam cautioned that the researcher serving as a participant and data collector/analyst also had potential limitations: “the investigator as human instrument is limited by being human – that is, mistakes are made, opportunities are missed, personal biases interfere” (p. 20). Trochim (2006) referred to this phenomenon as “dependability” and “confirmability” (p. 1). If a researcher serves as the primary instrument and allows emerging understandings to guide his investigations, then this is a potential threat to dependability and confirmability. Trochim asserted the qualitative researcher must “account for the ever-changing context within which the research occurs. The researcher is responsible for describing the changes that occur in the setting and how these changes affected the way the researcher approached the study” (p. 2).

Trochim suggested several strategies to enhance study confirmability. In this research study, the researcher-participant asked participants to verify interview and observation data. The researcher-participant also identified “negative instances that contradict prior observations” (p. 2) and discussed these instances in Chapters Four and Five. The researcher-participant’s status also has the potential for bias – to cloud
impressions and allow bias to impede deriving clear meaning from the data. Trochim argued that the researcher should “take a ‘devil’s advocate’ role with respect to the results” (p. 2) and document this process.

The participants are also a limitation of a study, as Merriam indicated, for “being human” (p. 20). They do not record every thought or reflection in their journals and their responses are influenced by their own biases and their perceptions of their relationships with the researcher as a participant in the school setting. Faculty of color, who might feel vulnerable in a predominantly White school, may moderate answers based on the sense of trust and safety in the interview setting. History may play a role, for example, in the development of teaching efficacy – some other factor aside from the school’s induction and mentoring program.

The unique setting of an independent school potentially limited the transferability and generalizability of the research study findings. There are some aspects of independent schools that are different from public settings, and the researcher-participant clarifies these in Chapters Four and Five. Additional discussion related to limitations of the research study and how the researcher-participant addressed limitations is presented in Chapter Five.

Chapter Four presents data collected in the research study and introduces findings that emerged from data. Chapter Five elaborates on the findings and presents discussion and implications of the research.
CHAPTER FOUR

Findings

Introduction

This qualitative research study examined the experiences of teachers new to a school with an induction and mentoring program. Of particular focus was an investigation of the respective experiences and perceptions of new teachers of color in contrast to those of White new teachers participating in the same induction and mentoring program during the same academic year. This line of inquiry was intended to explore and better understand relationships of new teachers and mentors working in cross-race contexts and to address a deficiency in research dealing with cross-race mentoring in K-12 educational settings. The purpose of Chapter Four is to present data collected during the research study, providing evidence for and elaborating findings that emerge from this data.

Merriam (1998) indicates qualitative data are “particularistic,” “descriptive,” and “heuristic” (pp. 29-31). Data in this research study were “particularistic” in that they represented a specific school’s induction and mentoring program and experiences of a specific cohort of newly-hired teachers with that program during their common first year of service at the school (p. 29). Data were “descriptive” in that they portrayed phenomena under consideration broadly from multiple perspectives, including the researcher-participant’s, and in that data are reported through narrative and displays (pp. 29-30). Data were “heuristic” in that they depicted these particular experiences with the aspiration of engendering the reader’s understanding about mentoring as a form of
induction in cross-race contexts under conditions present in the research study (pp. 30-31).

During the period leading up to the research study, administrators and faculty leadership at the school ascertained shortcomings of the preceding orientation and mentoring process. In an effort to improve program functionality and new teacher quality, a school-based team led by the researcher-participant designed and implemented a new induction and mentoring program. The team is hereafter referred to as the leadership project team and the new program development is referred to as the leadership project. Data presented in Chapter Four was gathered during the 2006-2007 academic year and encompassed the leadership project design and implementation, unique experiences and viewpoints of members of the first cohort of teachers to participate in the new induction and mentoring program, and interactions between new teachers and their mentors.

Specifically, Chapter Four is organized as follows:

1. A description of the site with sufficient detail regarding the community, relevant school policies and strategic initiatives, faculty, and administration to afford the reader familiarity with the context of the leadership project as it pertained to the focus of the research study.

2. A description of the leadership project planning and implementation process to enrich the reader’s understanding of the context.

3. A presentation of collected data and findings organized according to the research study questions:
a. How did the induction program affect new teachers’ (i) connection to
the school community, (ii) professional satisfaction, and (iii) sense of
efficacy?

b. Which mentor characteristics did new teachers perceive as being
helpful and supportive?

c. Did new teachers’ perceptions vary for cross-race mentoring
relationships as compared to same-race mentoring relationships?

4. A summary of findings at the end of each section of this chapter.

In Chapter Five, the researcher-participant (a) summarizes findings, (b) discusses
findings through the lens of research study questions and frameworks generated by the
literature review, (c) considers implications for policy, practice, and future research, and
(d) reflects on his leadership learning during the course of the leadership project and
research study.

Chapter Four exhibits data collected from six sources: (a) participant
questionnaires, (b) participant semi-structured interviews, (c) participant semi-structured
journals, (d) observations of representative participant interactions and relevant induction
events, (e) review of documents associated with the induction and mentoring program,
and (f) the researcher-participant’s reflective journal, in which he recorded his
experiences as a researcher and as a participant. Multiple sources of data enrich the
descriptive nature of the research study as well as facilitate triangulation, which Merriam
(1998) indicates “strengthens reliability as well as internal validity” (p. 207). Following
a model similar to one employed by Yusko and Feiman-Nemser (2008) in a comparative
study considering teacher evaluation as a component of induction programs, data
gathering and analysis in this research study progressed from general to specific: from
examining general characteristics of the new induction and mentoring program to
exploring specific perceptions held by new teachers and observing their interactions with
their mentors.

Yusko and Feiman-Nemser advocate three stages of data analysis, also utilized in
this research study. As this researcher-participant reviewed school documents and
materials, conducted and transcribed interviews, and collected other data, he engaged in a
first level of analysis, recording preliminary thoughts and developing themes in the
reflective journal. The researcher-participant invited research study participants to
review interview and observation transcripts for verification and discussed emerging
impressions with them for refinement. Upon completion of data collection, the
researcher-participant conducted a second level of analysis by re-reading notes and
transcripts to identify and code patterns and by synthesizing questionnaire responses in
charts and displays. The researcher-participant contrasted data collected by various
instruments, identifying and analyzing congruence among data sources. The primary
focus of the research study and its findings presented here is on the third level of analysis:
a cross-case comparison intended to understand the experiences and perceptions of new
teachers of color in contrast to those of their White peers.

The Site Context

This section describes the school community under consideration and its attributes
that are relevant to the research study. Merriam (1998) asserts that qualitative description
should be “rich” and “thick” enough “so that readers will be able to determine how closely their situations match the research situation, and hence, whether findings can be transferred” (p. 211). A thorough, detailed presentation of pertinent site characteristics aids the reader in developing such depth of understanding.

The researcher-participant was an administrator in the school setting, and he had a variety of professional and personal associations with other participants. Not all interactions between the researcher-participants and new teachers were observed and/or recorded for research study purposes, nor all interactions between new teachers and their mentors. The researcher-participant also provided leadership for the leadership project team and collaborated to design and implement the new induction and mentoring program. Information presented in this section originated from the researcher-participant’s direct experience as a researcher, a leader, and a school administrator, as recorded in the reflective journal, in addition to document review: specifically, the school directory, handbook, and website; the board of trustees policies and by-laws; and the most recent school strategic planning document. Demographic data for the external community summarized information for 2005, one year prior to the school year under study.

The Eastern School was an independent, suburban, co-educational, elementary, day school situated outside a major metropolitan area of the northeastern United States and established in the early 20th century. For The Eastern School, “independent” connoted that the school was not supported by public funds and was not affiliated with a church or religious order; rather, it was not for profit and governed by a private board of
trustees. Independent status also meant regulatory freedom from state and federal public education agencies and most education policies established by those agencies. Germaine to this research study was the fact that The Eastern School teachers were not required by the board of trustees to hold a degree in education or a teaching license, nor was the school required to offer induction and mentoring to comply with state or federal mandates. Teacher training in The Eastern School was typically gained through assistant or apprentice programs in other schools, prior graduate-level work, or, for those teachers new to the profession and the school, on-the-job. Thus, for the leadership project team examining weaknesses of the old program, induction and mentoring simply as principles of good practice were all the more significant to new teacher transition and performance.

The Eastern School mission was to provide an academically challenging educational program in a nurturing, child-centered environment. In 2006-2007, the school was highly regarded in the external community for the quality of its academics, had a competitive admissions process, and enjoyed full enrollment with wait lists for openings. The board of trustees was predominantly comprised of parents who had children in the school at the time of their service. The school was a member of its national organization and accredited by its regional independent school association.

Families in The Eastern School community were predominantly upper middle class to upper class and well educated. In 2005, the immediate external community population was slightly below 40,000 and nearly 96% White, non-Hispanic (city-data.com, 2007). In 2006-2007, The Eastern School’s student body was comprised of children from 34 communities living within driving distance of the school. The median
income of the greater community was slightly above the state average ($57,184) in 2005 (city-data.com, 2007); the school community was well above that average. However, The Eastern School had a need-blind admissions process and a major strategic initiative to seek diversity of all forms in its student body, including socio-economic diversity. During the 2006-2007 academic year, 7% of families received financial assistance to attend The Eastern School. Ninety percent of residents aged 25 years and older in the greater community held a high school diploma and 36.5% held at least a Bachelor’s degree in 2005 (city-data.com, 2007). Again, the educational level of adult members within the school community itself was greater – nearly all parents held a Bachelor’s degree or greater.

At full enrollment in 2006-2007, The Eastern School had approximately 450 students. The school was divided into elementary and middle level divisions, each led by a division administrator. A head of school served in a similar capacity to a superintendent in a public setting. Division administrators were responsible for recruitment, hiring, supervision, and evaluation of faculty and staff within their respective divisions. Faculty instructional leaders were responsible for supervising and evaluating the curriculum and instructional practices within their content areas. Thus, the work of improving and implementing new teacher induction and mentoring was within the job responsibility of division administrators, with support by faculty instructional leadership.

Elementary division teaching assignments were one of three positions: lead homeroom teacher, special subject teacher, or assistant. Teaching assignments in the middle school division were departmentalized by content area. Learning specialists
supported students with learning differences. During the 2006-2007 academic year, the faculty consisted of 57 full-time and two part-time teachers. The elementary division included 14 lead teachers, nine assistants, three learning specialists, and six special subject teachers. The middle division included 20 teachers, one assistant, and one learning specialist. Five teachers worked with both divisions.

Three years prior to the research study period, the board of trustees introduced a major strategic initiative regarding diversity for The Eastern School, herein referred to as the diversity initiative. The diversity initiative outlined specific action items and indicators of success with respect to composition of the student body, the faculty and staff, and trustees. At the opening of 2006-2007, the board of trustees had two people of color among its 22 members; a third joined the board in the spring, which brought the total percentage to nearly 14%. Three returning teachers in 2006-2007 self-identified as people of color – all had been hired within the preceding five years. Four newly-hired teachers – three lead teachers and one assistant – self-identified as people of color, which brought the total percentage of faculty of color to 12% in 2006-2007. While the student body was also largely White, its racial and ethnic diversity, at nearly 12% students of color in 2006-2007, exceeded that of the surrounding community, at 4% (city-data.com, 2007).

The diversity initiative also specified actions and benchmarks related to fostering an inclusive environment, including professional development for faculty, staff, and trustees, as well as expectations for curricular and instructional supports at division and classroom levels. Likewise, anti-discrimination policies were a prerequisite to
membership within the school’s national organization and a self-imposed requirement of accreditation, in that the regional association held the school to standards that it established for itself. Division administrators, according to the diversity initiative, needed to consider these factors in hiring – both in applicant pool composition as well as in skill sets, attitudes, and professional behaviors of all applicants, White and of color. All applicants were expected to be active allies in advancing the school diversity initiative, and this was an explicit element of recruitment and hiring protocols. Once hired, all new teachers participated in a one-day diversity training facilitated by a nationally-recognized diversity training organization. By the 2006-2007 school year, all mentors, administrators, fellow teachers, and even a majority of trustees had participated in this training within the preceding two-year period. The diversity initiative stated the expectation that all faculty and administrators continue their training and encouraged outside professional development. Each year, the Eastern School sponsored a school-based diversity professional development group to afford that opportunity.

The researcher-participant underscores the importance of The Eastern School diversity initiative in developing a full understanding of school culture and research study context. Simply, new teachers, both White and of color, entered a setting at The Eastern School where values such as respect for human difference, anti-discrimination, diversity, and cultural responsiveness were board-mandated. Faculty, staff, parents, and trustees were trained, encouraged, and even expected to discuss openly the importance of diversity to fulfilling the school mission. White mentors working in cross-race mentor-protégé pairs were trained in recognizing and being sensitive to their own privilege and
communicating and working across lines of difference. These are presented here as attributes of the school as an organization and its cultural values; the degree to which individuals exhibited these attributes varied as it might for any organizational goal or norm. The researcher, however, emphasizes that The Eastern School diversity initiative both informed and influenced the research study, its findings, and potential generalizability of its outcomes.

Four newly-hired teachers of color and four newly-hired White teachers comprised the research study sample, and the researcher-participant endeavored to balance the sample according to teaching assignment and gender. Table 3a depicts research study participants by racial identity and gender and matches new teachers with their mentors.

New teachers at The Eastern School worked with two mentors during their first year of service: professional and social mentors. Assistants were generally mentored professionally by their lead teachers; thus in the research study context, Lourdes mentored Fred and Jennifer mentored Rachel. Classifying the research study sample by racial identity was vital, as this research study in large part dealt with experiences of new teachers of color in contrast to those of new White teachers, and participants volunteered to have such a classification used.

Table 3b displays research study participants classified by experience, and Table 3c shows research study participants by assignment.

These tables reveal that new teachers were distributed between divisions and represented a range of positions within the school. The new teacher participants also
Table 3a

Research Study Participants by Racial and Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Teacher Identity</th>
<th>Professional Mentor</th>
<th>Social Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John A, m</td>
<td>Alan W, m</td>
<td>Lori W, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes M (B/L), F</td>
<td>Amy W, F</td>
<td>Betty W, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle L, F</td>
<td>Deirdre W, F</td>
<td>Jackie W, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel L (M/W), F</td>
<td>Jennifer W, F</td>
<td>Kelly W, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie W, F</td>
<td>Sandra W, F</td>
<td>Sally W, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine W, F</td>
<td>Patricia W, F</td>
<td>Oscar W, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer(^a) W, F</td>
<td>Jay W, m</td>
<td>N/A(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred W, m</td>
<td>Lourdes(^c) M (B/L), F</td>
<td>Mel W, m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.  B (Black heritage), L (Latino heritage), A (Asian heritage), M (Mixed racial/ethnic heritage), W (White, not Latino heritage), m (male), F (female)

\(^a\)Jennifer was a new lead teacher and was also mentoring her assistant, Rachel.  \(^b\)Jennifer served as an assistant for two years prior to her promotion and chose to only work with a professional mentor.  \(^c\)Lourdes was a new lead teacher and also mentored her assistant, Fred.

were balanced with respect to being White or of color, and between those classifications, by gender. New teachers generally were inexperienced: they were new or recent to the teaching profession as well as new to The Eastern School. Given that Lourdes was a
### Table 3b

**Research Study Participants by Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Teacher</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Professional Mentor</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Social Mentor</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deirdre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lourdes c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. 1 (less than 3 years experience), 2 (3-10 years experience), 3 (more than 10 years experience)

*Jennifer was a new lead teacher and was also mentoring her assistant, Rachel.  bJennifer served as an assistant for two years prior to her promotion and chose to only work with a professional mentor.  cLourdes was a new lead teacher and also mentored her assistant, Fred.*

Professional mentor to Fred, there were five cross-race mentor-protégé relationships in the research study. With the exception of Lourdes, the professional mentors were all White and, including Lourdes, six of the eight professional mentors were female and generally more experienced. For example, Alan, Deirdre, Sandra, and Jay each had more
Table 3c

Research Study Participants by Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Teacher</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Professional Mentor</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Social Mentor</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>Deirdre</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>E, TA</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>E, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>M/E, S</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer(^a)</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>N/A(^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>E, TA</td>
<td>Lourdes(^c)</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>E, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.  E (elementary level division), M (middle level division), T (lead teacher), TA (assistant), S (special subject teacher), a (administrator)

\(^a\)Jennifer was a new lead teacher and is also mentoring her assistant, Rachel.  \(^b\)Jennifer served as an assistant for two years prior to her promotion and chose to only work with a professional mentor.  \(^c\)Lourdes was a new lead teacher and also mentored her assistant, Fred.

than 20 years teaching experience. The Eastern School did not place as much priority on experience with respect to social mentor assignment, so social mentors tended to be mixed in terms of experience. Social mentors were all White, and with the exceptions of Oscar and Mel, all female.
The significance of data displayed in Tables 3a through 3c is that new White teachers at The Eastern School tended to receive guidance and support during their first year of teaching from veteran teachers of the same race or ethnicity, while new teachers of color received mentoring from someone of different race or ethnicity. New teachers tended to be also new to teaching relative to their mentors resulting also in generational differences in many situations, especially for professional mentor pairings.

*Planning and Implementation*

This section describes briefly the context of mentoring and induction prior to the new initiative, the rationale for efforts to improve induction and mentoring, participants in the process, and steps taken to implement, monitor, and evaluate the re-designed program. A discussion of these items is important to the research study because it sets the stage for the year under consideration. To enhance internal validity, Merriam (1998) advocates “clarifying the researcher-participant’s assumptions, worldview, and theoretical orientation at the onset of the study” (p. 205). To this end, this section reviews conditions prior to the leadership project and research study, outlines program planning and implementation leading up to and during the first year, and clarifies the researcher-participant’s role in new program development and implementation.

The researcher-participant gathered information presented in this section through document review, observations, participation in events related to leadership project planning and implementation, as well as a focus group interview of recently-hired teachers who experienced their first year of service prior to implementation of leadership project. During interviews with professional mentors, the researcher-participant also
asked mentors to compare the new program with the prior conditions of mentoring and induction at the school.

Prior to 2006-2007, The Eastern School employed a brief orientation program before the opening of school and assigned each new teacher two mentors: a professional and a social mentor. Administrators recruited mentors during the summer, but provided no position description or training nor gave much consideration to a mentor’s capacity to fulfill expectations effectively. At that time, the mentor job description was limited to a brief paragraph in the faculty handbook:

One mentor is assigned to assist the new teacher in adjusting to the North Shore community area… the second mentor is a teacher with a similar teaching assignment. This mentor is responsible for assisting the new teacher throughout the year in curricular concerns and academic policies. (document review)

Similarly, there existed no accountability protocols to verify that mentors and new teachers met or to guarantee content of their meetings, if they even occurred. The brief orientation included a meeting with the head of school to discuss mission and philosophy, a school tour, a meeting to discuss employee policies, a technology orientation, and a short meeting with division administrators to cover assignment-specific procedures, grading practices, and rules and expectations for student behavior.

As a component to gathering data in preparation for re-designing the induction and mentoring program, the researcher-participant invited recently-hired Eastern School
lead teachers to participate in a focus group. The researcher-participant defined recently-hired as hired within the last five years, but prior to development of the new induction and mentoring program. Six teachers among The Eastern School faculty met these qualifying criteria, and five were available to participate. The sixth teacher had a scheduling conflict with the focus group. Three participants were White teachers and two were teachers of color, three were elementary- and two were middle-level. One was hired as an assistant and later promoted to a lead teacher capacity. The recent hire focus group protocol was elaborated in Chapter Three and included as Appendix B.

Recently-hired teachers described the experience of being a new teacher:

I was just generally overwhelmed. There were so many names to learn, as a special subjects teacher, not only the kids but the parents and the other teachers, my colleagues. And then, I just felt like [my predecessor] didn’t leave me much, the teacher before me. So, I was just constantly trying to figure out what the curriculum was supposed to look like, and how I can shape it.

I was exhausted all during my first year of teaching.

Well, I had a lot of feelings, but I think maybe the one that caught me most off guard… was feeling quite sad for a boy I had whose mother passed away from cancer. And, having to talk with the class about it before it happened, as per our counselor’s help… to talk to the class and prepare them for that; that was just the
last thing I thought I would ever go through. On top of managing time, figuring out the curriculum.

I guess one of my feelings was, I wouldn’t necessarily call it confusion, but working with two teachers as [an assistant] and not knowing exactly how much I was needed in virtually all situations and not necessarily knowing when it was a good place for me to step in and when it was a good time for me to sit back and listen to the lead teachers… and I can think of one instance which was borderline terrifying as a new teacher, which was often when a lead teacher is sick for the day, [an assistant] needs to step and be the lead teacher for a day…. I remember one day I had; there was a child who was known to have some difficulties with how they deal with their emotions, I guess. This child decided to take off from school in the middle of the day, and I caught him basically walking out the front pillars of the school. The moment that was terrifying for me was not actually the fact that he was taking off and leaving through the front pillars of the school, but it was more not knowing whether it was my job to stay with the class because it just happened so quickly or whether I just needed to take off after the child… it was uncomfortable just leaving a group of children on their own as a first-year [assistant] and not knowing what to do about the situation.

My first year I remember being very anxious because I felt like there was so much information thrown at me and I felt like that, especially in the first week or so,
that a lot of people were talking at me…. the parents… comparing you to the last teacher, things like that. I remember the first year was just very; the feeling that I have to prove myself; it was not a good thing. (recent hire focus group)

The recently-hired teachers confirmed the experience of new teachers in many settings. When unmitigated by an effective program of induction or mentoring recently-hired teachers experienced many negative feelings: apprehension, anxiety, confusion, uncertainty, being overwhelmed, being unprepared for the real challenges of teaching, or even terror when faced with a decision in which one’s job or the children’s well being was perceived to be at stake. More importantly, to one recently-hired teacher the preceding orientation program amounted to “a lot of people talking at” the new teachers and too much information being “thrown” at them at once (recent hire focus group).

Orientation was being done to the new teachers rather than done with. In tackling a new job characterized by unpredictability, lack of structure, and a need to make innumerable complicated decisions daily, trying to manage without structured guidance, a context for information being received, or a voice in the process was, at best, a daunting and, at worst, a demoralizing and terrifying prospect.

With respect to their relationships with their mentors, the recently-hired teachers said:

There wasn’t any particular time I remember seeing her as my professional mentor as far as title.
I felt like our relationship was very much, like nurturing, mother-daughter. That was not in terms of our age, but they just treated me really like a daughter… we had great times talking and laughing about random things.

Both of my relationships were quite informal I would say. I knew I could go to either of them if I needed to for questions. [Professional mentor] would check in with me…. it would be kind of like popping in a little before conferences, ‘Do you feel good? Do you have any questions?’…. I’d call it informal because I don’t think there was a structure really.

I’m racking my brains trying to figure out who my professional mentor was. I can’t remember!

I don’t really remember [my mentors] coming to check on me all that much; our schedules just didn’t mix, so I ended up talking a lot to the person across the hall. (recent hire focus group)

With no defined roles and responsibilities, no meaningful content to the mentoring relationship, and no accountability protocols to ensure mentoring occurred, the mentoring process was a haphazard enterprise prior to new program implementation. One recent hire could not recall who her professional mentor was, as an extreme
example. Even in the seemingly successful nurturing “mother-daughter” relationship, in and of itself self-described as maternalistic rather than collaborative or collegial, the recently-hired teacher reflected that it was mostly about “talking and laughing about random things” (recent hire focus group). The teacher expressed this sentiment with a cheerful tone, so the researcher-participant believed that the teacher generally held a positive view of the relationship. However, “random things” certainly did not constitute a comprehensive program of induction intended to foster instructional success for the new teacher and learning success for her students. Without purpose, structure, and a culture of collective caring for the fate of new teachers, new teachers and mentors alike floundered. Mentors did not know what information and guidance to offer and new teachers did not know what to seek. Mentors and new teachers both did not know how to approach their relationships in a way that produced mutual learning and promoted efficacy with respect to working with children. Substantial opportunities for ensuring curriculum viability and student learning and for cultivating adult growth were being squandered.

The division administrators also speculated that lack of effective induction and mentoring contributed to at least one difficult case of a new teacher struggling within the first three years. In a leadership project planning meeting, a division administrator commented:

I worry that [new teacher] would have had a much better year and possibly even been able to remain at Eastern if we had mentoring support that focused on [the
new teacher]’s teaching and student learning. Instead we just got to the end of last year and [the new teacher] wasn’t cutting it and couldn’t even figure out why, didn’t realize it. I think we could point to a couple of other examples where things might have gone better, too. (division administrator planning meeting)

Instructional leadership at The Eastern School too sensed that, as job demands increased, so did new teachers’ level of need. Patricia, an instructional leader and mentor, stated, “The needs are just increasing; it takes a lot more of my time to mentor people” (mentor interview). Sandra, a mentor, said, “I think the more we add to the schedule, or the more requirements that are put on teachers, it certainly [pause], like the whole advisor program is a new layer we didn’t have a couple years ago” (mentor interview). Some faculty leaders also perceived an increase in the number of new teachers annually, as an aging faculty core began to retire at The Eastern School but while new teachers remained only for a short tenure before leaving. An instructional leader and mentor, Alan, observed, “Recently, [turnover] has felt, for the last two or three years, I think it has felt particularly heavy” (mentor interview). Another instructional leader concurred and reflected more deeply on reasons for increased turnover:

The change is in the number first; the new teachers who are staying two years, maybe three, when they come to Eastern [pause]. There’s a difference also between the people seeking a teaching [pause]; they have the heart, and they want to change the world, but they don’t have the full term commitment as a life, as a
person in this career for the real career. I don’t feel they have the same sense that I did. I was going to be a teacher for all my days. (mentor interview)

During spring of 2006, the researcher-participant, working with the other division administrator, identified this emerging situation as a significant problem. The two collaborated with a leadership project team – members of the administrative team and instructional leadership – through late spring and into summer to identify desired outcomes of induction and mentoring, develop a structure to achieve outcomes, and determine means of assessing whether outcomes were achieved. The leadership project team established the following belief statements:

1. The Eastern School induction and mentoring program is foremost about teaching and learning.
2. After an initial orientation, induction is accomplished primarily through the mentoring process.
3. Mentoring relationships are mutual, collaborative, and collegial. Mentors and other colleagues benefit from the process as much as new teachers.
4. Mentoring adults is different from teaching children. Mentors require unique training and support.
5. Support for new teachers is most effectively achieved through a team approach. Everyone in the school community must be invested in new teachers’ success.
6. New teachers learn from each other and the school should foster connections among new teachers. (leadership project team meeting observation)

With respect to teaching and learning, the leadership project team identified the following key areas for the school to instill its expectations for excellent practice:

1. Attributes of excellent teaching / principles of good practice
2. Motivating students
3. Organization for the classroom / student management
4. Accommodating individual learning differences
5. Cultural responsiveness / respect for human differences
6. Assessing student learning
7. Relationships with parents
8. Understanding school culture / mission / philosophy
9. Professional growth / mentoring support / evaluation (leadership team meeting observation)

The leadership project team acknowledged induction at The Eastern School was primarily conducted through the mentor-new teacher relationship and decided the existing professional and social mentor roles were useful, but required much greater delineation. Based on leadership project planning meetings, division administrators created a mentor handbook, which outlined mentor roles and responsibilities:
The primary goals of the professional mentor relationship are to guarantee quality in the following areas:

1. Respect for human differences at the classroom level
2. Curriculum, instruction, evaluation, and student learning
3. Classroom management
4. Parent relations and communications
5. Efficiency and time management

The primary goals of the social mentor are the following:

1. Understanding of school community
2. Connection to resources
3. Overcoming isolation
4. Interaction with colleagues (leadership project team meeting observation)

Also included in the mentor handbook was a monthly schedule of professional events. Mentors and administrators were assigned responsibility for specific events to address with new teachers in advance of new teachers needing to prepare. Division administrators committed to holding responsible individuals accountable for executing the program expectations. Table 4 details the major elements of the new Eastern School induction program, as envisioned by the leadership project team (leadership project team meeting observation).
Table 4  
Primary Components of the New Eastern School Induction Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-service contact</th>
<th>Pre-service orientation</th>
<th>On-going induction</th>
<th>Accountability measures</th>
<th>Evaluative exercises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Summer contact from mentors and division administrator</td>
<td>2. Teaching and learning</td>
<td>2. Frequent formative walk-thrus and observations by division administrator</td>
<td>2. New teachers</td>
<td>2. Regular meetings between instructional leaders and division administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Diversity training</td>
<td>4. Formative observations by professional mentor and follow-up</td>
<td>2. Instructional leadership</td>
<td>4. Feedback survey administered to all faculty by division administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Sufficient employee “rules and regs” to get started, but not to overwhelm</td>
<td>5. New teacher observations of professional mentor and colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Introductions to potential support network: librarian, division secretaries, tech staff</td>
<td>6. Relevant professional development in advance of parent conferences, report writing, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The leadership project team devised a mentor training workshop and scheduled it for employee training week prior to start of school. A primary workshop goal was to elicit mentor recollections of what they felt like as new teachers and examples of effective and ineffective support they received. Then, the leadership project team endeavored to have mentors contrast their experiences with new program beliefs and goals. Amy, a mentor, reflected:

There was a conscious effort to talk about what you do when you are a mentor. That little meeting we had at the beginning of the year felt different to me. Up ‘til now we have been informal about it. There was just a little more, ‘Here’s what a mentor is, here’s what we expect.’ (mentor interview)

Division administrators continued support for mentors throughout the year by meeting routinely one-on-one and e-mailing reminders. Patricia expressed:

Specific dates of things to do, which really helped. And, when you check in and you say, ‘Don’t forget to this,’ that really helps. Because we all get really busy, and we need to remember to do things. The level of support at Eastern in my eyes has only increased this year. (mentor interview)
Division administrators informed the entire faculty and staff of the leadership project team’s efforts, emphasizing that all community members should feel invested in and responsible for the success of new teachers (faculty meeting observation, instructional leadership meeting observation). Appendix H details planning and implementation stages for the leadership project.

An examination of site context and program planning and implementation revealed a suburban elementary school faculty in transition from being predominantly White to being more diverse with respect to racial identity. This transition was both impelled by and supported by a major board-level strategic diversity initiative. School personnel were also engaged in a leadership project to improve induction and mentoring for new teachers, moving from a rudimentary program marked by low accountability, low support, and low attention to a comprehensive program marked high accountability and significant support and attention. The previous program appeared to exert low positive influence on the experience or viewpoints of new teachers, and evidence existed of negative impact in the form of new teachers struggling during their first years of service at the school. A school-based leadership project team aspired to ameliorate program shortcomings and guarantee new teacher quality and ultimately quality of the learning experience for children. Despite modest gains in faculty racial/ethnic composition, new teachers at The Eastern School tended to receive mentoring from older, experienced White teachers. For White new teachers, this meant mentoring by a teacher of the same racial characteristics; for a new teacher of color, this meant working in a cross-race mentor-protégé relationship.
New Teachers’ Experience with the Induction Program

The researcher-participant sought to determine how various elements of the new induction program affected new teachers’ connection to the school community, professional satisfaction, and sense of efficacy. The researcher-participant postulated these three feelings or self-perceptions combined to influence how new teachers would feel about their first year upon completion. This section presents data related to answering this question, collected through an end-of-year questionnaire, participant interviews, participant observations, and participant journals.

The researcher-participant designed and administered a questionnaire to new teacher participants at the end of the school year under study. The questionnaire is included as Appendix G. The researcher-participant asked new teachers to rate their overall feelings about their connection to the school community, professional satisfaction, and sense of efficacy as “none” (0), “low” (1), “moderate” (3), or “high” (4). Table 5 displays results in aggregate, and then disaggregated by racial identity.

Table 5 indicates that new teachers’ feelings about their first year of service tended to be positive. Professional satisfaction received the strongest expression of affirmation among new teachers regardless of racial identity. New teachers positively affirmed second, regardless of racial identity, a sense of efficacy at the conclusion of the first year. In the questionnaire, the researcher-participant defined efficacy as the self-perceived “ability to function effectively as a teacher” (new teacher questionnaire). Only the prompt, “connection to community,” revealed a slight difference on the basis of racial
identity, although, overall, the cohort’s perceptions remained positive. Subsequent sections will examine each of these self-perceptions in greater depth.

Table 5

*New Teacher Feelings upon Completion of First Year of Service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entire cohort</th>
<th>Faculty of Color</th>
<th>White Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection to the school community</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional satisfaction</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of efficacy</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professional Satisfaction*

When prompted a second time in the questionnaire to indicate whether they felt professionally “not satisfied at all,” “somewhat satisfied,” “satisfied,” or “very satisfied” upon completion of their first year, 83.3% (7) of the entire cohort indicated “very satisfied” and 16.7% (1) indicated “satisfied.” The researcher-participant noted that professional satisfaction derived primarily from feeling affirmed by others within the school community. In her journal, for example, Michelle commented: “Professional satisfaction comes from my students. Nothing beats having my kids feel good about who
they are as individuals, friends, and peers” (Michelle’s journal). Michelle, in her interview, also spoke of satisfaction stemming from her work with children:

When you come in as a teacher, because kids are so loving, you’ve already got twenty supporters, and that can really get you through the day, because that’s who you’re there for. I’m not here for [head of school], I’m not here for [division administrator], I’m not here for you [researcher]. I’m here for the kids. And, that’s my primary focus. If I’m OK for them, then I’m OK for me. (new teacher interview)

Lourdes described her sources of satisfaction:

I appreciated feedback from parents at the end of the year. While they are not in the classroom everyday, their children provided feedback to them about their experiences in my class. I also had a couple of students who started the year off a little bumpy. Some had trouble with the increased academics, while others struggled socially. By the end of the year, I felt that I had touched these students in a way that made their year with me a successful one. (Lourdes’s journal)

Lourdes continued to write about an experience of meeting with a parent to discuss an anxious child. Lourdes described how she listened and worked with the parent to develop an action plan. Recounting the conclusion of the conference, Lourdes wrote,
“When [the parent] said, ‘I trust your opinion, and I know that you really care for my daughter,’ I couldn’t stop smiling. While I made a parent happy, I am even more proud of helping a child” (Lourdes’s journal).

John expressed a similar sentiment in his journal:

I felt successful with my ninth grade class. I had put so much work into planning and creating the course, and the class just seemed to be an instant hit…. I think that all the kids were on board… first term, and it made me feel more comfortable and confident in my abilities as a first-year teacher in a new school. (John’s journal)

Rachel, as an assistant described her year as an “excellent learning experience” (new teacher interview) based on her work with her students. Bonnie said, “I love helping kids develop a prospectus on the world, to empower them to leave this place as better young people” (new teacher interview). She continued, “I love the intellectual engagement, catering to different learning styles, helping kids to figure out, ‘How can I get the best out of myself?’” (new teacher interview). Bonnie also described her work with her instructional leader as “empowering,” and a source or professional satisfaction (new teacher interview).

Fred indicated in his journal his professional satisfaction derived from “working in a classroom every day, feeling like I was an important element of the [elementary
division] faculty, and being relied on by my lead teacher” (Fred’s journal). Fred shared in his interview he felt “a high level of satisfaction…. From day one I’ve felt like people have treated me like I’m going to be here until I retire… and it has made me feel better about being a teacher and it’s made me feel so great about this community” (new teacher interview).

Jennifer wrote about similar feelings: “The positive support from my mentor, department heads, and the division [administrator] greatly impacted my feeling of professionalism” (Jennifer’s journal). In her interview, Jennifer asserted: “I feel very satisfied personally. I think I’m finally getting to use much of what I learned in education… I am happy with myself, and I think I can go even further” (new teacher interview). Echoing Michelle, Lourdes, John and Rachel, Jennifer continued, “I feel I have a good relationship with my students, which makes me more of an effective teacher” (new teacher interview).

Christine, in her interview, explained that for her, professional satisfaction “is multifold” (new teacher interview):

One is that I feel like I’ve made good personal connections with other faculty. Like that we get along, that I like the people I’m working with. That’s hugely important to me… I love the people I work with. I like the kids, I feel like the interactions, my interactions are largely positive, whenever. If there is something that comes up, whether some tension, discipline, or whatever, you know, I feel like I handle it well…. It’s handled the way it’s supposed to be handled…. You
know, part of that’s because of who Patricia is as the department head and you’ve [division administrator] always encouraged me. (new teacher interview)

A pattern emerged from new teachers’ comments: professional satisfaction stemmed from (a) successes and approbation of new teachers’ students and their parents or (b) from positive support and feedback of administrators, supervising teachers, or peers. Jennifer’s comments indicated she encountered satisfaction from both sources. The tendency, though, appeared that the new teachers of color – Michelle, Lourdes, John, and Rachel – received satisfaction from their work with students while the White new teachers – Christine and Fred – received satisfaction from their work with colleagues. Jennifer and Bonnie found satisfaction in both sources. New White teachers found satisfaction in both sources, whereas new teachers of color tended to define satisfaction in terms of success with their students.

John’s journal entry also demonstrated how his professional satisfaction – “I had put so much work into planning and creating the course” – was closely tied with his emerging sense of self-efficacy – “it made me feel more comfortable and confident in my abilities as a first-year teacher in a new school” (John’s journal). The next section will explore new teachers’ feelings of efficacy.

Sense of Efficacy

Sense of efficacy received the next highest rating in terms of overall perceptions held by new teachers. In the questionnaire, the researcher-participant asked new teacher participants to rate each major induction program activity as having “no contribution”
(1), “little contribution” (2), “some contribution” (3), or “significant contribution” (4) to their perceptions of efficacy at the end of their first year. This portion of one questionnaire was incomplete, thus the researcher-participant did not include those ratings in results presented here and only factored seven responses into averages. Figure 1 shows teacher responses disaggregated by racial identity and ranks responses by the differential between disaggregated respondent groups. For example, White new teachers and new teachers of color differed most in their response to how their work with their professional mentors influenced their sense of efficacy.

Figure 1 reveals that, regardless of racial identity, new teachers as a cohort perceived other peer support as having the most significant impact to their sense of efficacy. Other peer support also displayed the smallest differential between responses of White new teachers and those of their peers of color. “Other peers” consisted of colleagues not serving in official mentoring capacities as designated by school administrators. The leadership project team who designed the new induction and mentoring program established as one of its goals the idea that “everyone should feel invested in new teachers’ success” (leadership project team meeting observation). At a presentation to instructional leadership and in mentor training, as two examples observed by the researcher-participant, division administrators stated “research demonstrates a team approach is best – we are all in this together… everyone should feel responsible for the success of our new teachers” (presentation to instructional leadership observation; mentor training observation).
Figure 1

Influence of Induction Activity on New Teachers’ Self-Perception of Efficacy
Professional mentor support, meetings with division administrator, observations and feedback from administrators, observations and feedback from colleagues (instructional leaders and other peers), and the annual review with the division administrator all displayed comparatively larger differentials, with White new teachers deriving a greater sense of efficacy from these experiences than new teachers of color. These represent more formal, planned, or evaluative (albeit formative) aspects of the induction program. White new teachers as a group appeared to respond better to these experiences than did their colleagues of color. On the other hand, new teachers of color expressed that pre-service contact, social mentor support, instructional leader support, other peer support, and the fall follow-up with the head of school had greater influence than did their White colleagues. These were induction activities intended to form interpersonal connections and offer support.

Pre-service contact, most notably, received the lowest overall rating of influence, but revealed the second greatest differential between new teachers of color and their White counterparts. Pre-service contact included division administrators communicating frequently with new teachers prior to orientation and contact by professional mentors and other colleagues over late spring and summer, after hire but preceding start of service. Pre-service contact by colleagues included phone calls to welcome new teachers early in summer and meetings to plan prior to start of school. New teachers of color responded much better to school personnel reaching out to them prior to service and expressed this interaction influenced their overall sense of efficacy; even nine to ten months after the fact, while their White counterparts expressed this interaction had very little impact.
Interestingly, diversity training, a significant resource allocation for the school community and in support of the major board-level diversity initiative, had the second to last significance with respect to influencing new teachers’ sense of efficacy.

Professional mentor-new teacher interactions were significant in cultivating new teachers’ sense of efficacy. Interviews clarified the specific aspects of these interactions that promoted new teachers’ efficacy development. Bonnie said that although the quality of her teaching and sense of efficacy increased simply “by doing it,” the work with her professional mentor and her instructional leader helped her reflect on her practice and grow professionally (new teacher interview). Bonnie said: “There was never any time I fell flat on my face because Sandra was always there to pick me up and, you know, help me figure out how to do it better next time… I didn’t fall flat on my face, and I was able to get experience just by doing it” (new teacher interview). In her interview, Lourdes indicated observations and feedback by her professional mentor, Amy, were influential “especially in the fall when she was doing my observations and coming in all the time” (new teacher interview). Lourdes continued:

We met right after the observation. And, the great feedback that she’d given me on the lesson that I’d performed was great. She obviously said, ‘Oh, you did great, it was great with this. Maybe one of the few things I would have done was…. You probably want to be sure you have something on the board somewhere for those kids. They don’t take it in verbally’…. That stuck with me and for everything now there’s something written on the board…. So, I think
having that feedback, not even just for that observation but for others as well…. I mean it only makes me a better teacher. (new teacher interview)

Rachel, in her interview, concurred with the opinion that mentor feedback contributed to her emerging feeling of self-efficacy:

In class Jennifer was great about just running through [pause], having observed her a few times, definitely made it easier. But, then her running through exactly how to make it visual, to make it auditory, to make each lesson learnable to every student in the classroom. I found those first interactions on how to teach a math lesson, how to teach a spelling lesson very helpful. Because this is my first real teaching position. (new teacher interview)

In an observation of a feedback meeting with Fred and his professional mentor, Lourdes, Fred began by stating: “Anything that you can say to me is going to be really helpful, whether it’s, you know, criticism or something I’m doing, whatever it is” (mentor-new teacher meeting observation). Lourdes complimented Fred’s management of his students and provided specific examples of effective teacher-student interactions she had noticed. Fred commented at the end of the meeting that Lourdes’s positive approach “was really good for” him (mentor-new teacher meeting observation).

In their interviews, new teachers indicated regular, scheduled time with their division administrator also impacted their sense of efficacy. Lourdes explained her
division administrator played a large role in her self-perception of effectiveness “because I have my meetings with her pretty regularly” (new teacher interview). Michelle agreed:

More importantly, I think her role is making sure that you meet with her. And, so that’s what’s different with all these other people is that I think, like with the mentors. They set up this great system of mentoring, but then you don’t have these set meetings to meet with them. It’s just kind of on your own, and if you leave it to that, it’s not going to get done. You know, that’s just how it is, everyone is so busy. So, what I think makes effective sorts of relationships is not only is the person going to seek you out, but also you have these standard meeting times with them. (new teacher interview)

John said, “I think the meetings that we have are great, because it’s routine. So that I know, if there’s something that I want to bring up or that you want to bring up, we know we have a space to do that…. We have 45 minutes to sit down and talk, and that’s been really good” (new teacher interview). Jennifer also said this impacted her self-efficacy: “[Division administrator], especially at the beginning of the year; very attentive to ‘What do you need?’” (new teacher interview). Bonnie echoed Jennifer’s assertion: “With you [division administrator], I’ve been so psyched to have that as a resource because just our check-in meetings… you have so much experience as a teacher so I love to be able to pick your brain about this, that, and the other thing” (new teacher interview).
The mutual sharing of expertise, or the perception that the mentor and new teacher mutually benefitted from their relationship, influenced new teachers’ sense of efficacy as well, in the researcher-participant’s opinion, by contributing to new teachers’ perceptions of their professional value to the school. Bonnie reported what she valued most about The Eastern School was her perception of how faculty approached their work together:

There isn’t really any lateral competition, and maybe completion isn’t right. But, it really is about, ‘How can I get, how can I support you so that we are bringing out each other’s strengths?’ We all have different strengths and different weaknesses. Sandra might be super organized, I might be organized, but [peer] may not be as organized. How can I use some the strategies that she’s given me to help him? Just, just to function on capitalizing on each other’s strengths empowers the entire community. (new teacher interview)

Bonnie continued to describe her work with her department instructional leader, an experienced veteran faculty member: “To see someone with that kind of experience, but is really looking for that energy and creativity. I walk out of those meetings feeling like, ‘Wow, my voice is being heard.’ It easily could be, you know, squelched” (new teacher interview). Bonnie continued to assert her efficacy was fostered her feeling that she “could put so much of [her]self into [her] work;” she did not need to conform to “an existing infrastructure” (new teacher interview).
Lourdes commented it was very meaningful that her professional mentor, Amy, told her: “Oh, you had a couple things that I want to use in my classroom” (new teacher interview). Lourdes reacted positively: “You know just the exchange of information, I guess, is what I really liked about the experience” (new teacher interview). Christine echoed, “I like the collaboration” (new teacher interview). Jennifer said, “That has helped us to play off each other, me for support, but also her feeling comfortable asking me for ideas” (new teacher interview). Later, when describing a positive mentoring experience Jennifer explained:

[Peer]’s become a good friend of mine, but again she switched grade levels and so was starting something new at the same time, so we were able to relate to each other about that. But also, having been a first year teacher from an assistant role, only a couple years ago, she was able to give me some guidance for that. (new teacher interview)

Jennifer continued to describe a math lesson for which she sought feedback from her teaching partner:

I don’t think anyone caught on to regrouping… so I think asking people for feedback and also gauging from the kids how they’re, if they’re not getting something I need to look at instructing in a different way. I think I am able to
switch a lot quicker to that now during a lesson, instead of having to reflect more after like I was at the beginning of the year. (new teacher interview)

Mutuality is important, not only in its impact on new teachers’ emerging sense of efficacy, but also in its influence on new teachers’ feelings of connectedness to the community. The next section will explore new teachers’ perception of connection.

*Sense of Connection to Community*

While still in the positive range, the entire cohort rated their sense of connection to the community as lower relative to their other responses; faculty of color responded to this prompt with their lowest rating as a group. In the questionnaire, the researcher-participant asked new teachers to rate the influence that specific interactions had on their sense of connection to the community as having “no influence” (1), “a little influence” (2), “some influence” (3), or “significant influence” (4). Figure 2 displays responses to this prompt disaggregated by racial identity. For this prompt, two respondents did not answer – one White and one participant of color – so the sample included six.

Figure 2 shows that, regardless of racial identity, new teachers found interacting with colleagues and their own students equally influential in fostering a sense of connection to the school community. Interactions with parents also contributed positively to feelings of connectedness. Interactions with administrators were only slightly less influential on connectedness. New teachers of color found interactions with administrators more influential in their perception of connection to the community than did their White counterparts. All interactions occurred inside (during the school day) or
outside school (after school hours and on weekends); both had positive impact, although interactions at school were perceived as having slightly greater influence. This was understandable, as the majority of interactions between new teachers and various members of the school community occurred at school and during school hours.

Of note was the finding that the two official mentor roles – professional and social mentors – had two of the lowest relative ratings. The social mentor role in particular, intended to facilitate social connection within the school community, was not fulfilling this objective as well as did other forms of interaction for all new teachers. New teachers of color found their social mentor interactions only slightly more influential than their White counterparts. Interactions with professional mentors revealed the most significant differential among new teachers with respect to racial identity. As with efficacy development, White new teachers attributed a much greater significance to this relationship than new teachers of color in terms of nurturing a sense of connection to the community. Pre-service contact and orientation activities played comparatively smaller roles in helping new teachers feel connected to the community, although, again, new teachers of color found the pre-service contact more influential than their White counterparts.

Lourdes commented specifically in her journal on her feelings of connection to the school community:

I think it’s important to keep in mind that the type of personality one has plays a role in how one connects with his/her community. I’m the kind of person that
Figure 2

Influence of Specific Interactions on New Teachers’ Sense of Connection to the Community
jumps right in and tries to make the best of every situation. So, I think that has played a large role in my feelings about The Eastern School community.

(Lourdes’s journal)

Michelle’s comment – “It’s just kind of on your own, and if you leave it to that, it’s not going to get done” (new teacher interview) – mirrored Lourdes’s. These two teachers of color found proactiveness on their parts to be effective in guaranteeing community connections; they did not passively wait for others, such as their professional and social mentors, to establish that connection for them.

Fred said, “It is sort of having this openness and welcoming everyone into the community. Almost from moment one, I’ve felt very connected to everyone here and it’s grown, you know, daily since then” (new teacher interview). Christine indicated connection stemmed from “personal affinity” and described a close relationship with a colleague who “shared an interest in music” (new teacher interview). White new teachers’ comments reflected they did not feel as great a sense of urgency toward actively seeking connection.

Overall, new teachers participating in the new induction and mentoring program at The Eastern School felt positively about their first year across three parameters: professional satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and connection to the school community, ranked highest to lowest in the order. Connection to the school community represented the only perception for which new teachers differed in their feelings by racial identity, and this difference was slight.
The researcher-participant found evidence that professional satisfaction derived from two sources: (a) students and parents and (b) colleagues and supervisors. Positive affirmation of new teachers’ work from either source contributed to professional satisfaction. New teacher data indicated that new teachers of color more frequently expressed their source of satisfaction to stem from students and parents, while White new teachers indicated their satisfaction derived from both that source and from colleagues and supervisors.

This finding both reflected and contrasted new teachers’ perceptions of their sources of efficacy and connection to the community. White new teachers tended to respond better to professional mentors and formal mentor networks in general. All new teachers found their students and their colleagues to be sources of connection to the community across racial and ethnic classifications. While less a factor in their professional satisfaction and efficacy, new teachers of color did find administrators as important to their emerging sense of connection to the community.

New teachers, regardless of racial identity, reacted positively to self-selected networks of informal mentors. The school-based leadership project team was deliberate in their efforts to create a broad feeling of responsibility for new teachers’ success. These efforts were clearly successful, as evidenced by new teachers’ perceptions that anyone in the school community could and would serve in a mentoring capacity.

Diversity training and pre-service contact, two significant resource allocations for the school, did not influence new teachers’ efficacy and connection to the community significantly relative to other induction and mentoring activities. Pre-service contact did
have a larger impact for new teachers of color, and therefore, was a worthwhile endeavor for the school.

Professional mentor and administrative mentor support hinged on three factors, regardless of racial identity. Observations and timely, specific feedback, both affirming and critical, were very influential for new teachers. Having regular, scheduled appointments with mentors and administrators was equally important. Mutuality between the new teacher and the mentor or other colleagues contributed to new teachers’ feelings of success as well. New teachers responded well when the mentoring relationship was based on mutual learning and growth as opposed to unidirectional from the mentor to the mentee.

With respect to all aspects of the induction program, new teachers of color indicated they could not wait passively for support to happen for them. Their success was based on their willingness to seek support and to meet their own needs actively. White new teachers were much less expressive about the need for assertiveness.

**Mentor Characteristics**

The researcher-participant endeavored to identify characteristics and behaviors exhibited by mentors that new teachers viewed as helpful. In this line of inquiry, given that a goal of the new program was to cultivate a mentoring network, the researcher-participant also attempted to distinguish the relative importance of individual mentoring sources as perceived by new teachers. The researcher-participant collected data related to this question via participant interviews, during which the researcher-participant administered the mentor network instrument, participant journals, and the questionnaire.
The researcher-participant devised and administered the mentor network instrument; the protocol is included as Appendix C2. During new teacher interviews, each participant received a graphic displaying her formal mentors (see sample graphic in Chapter Three), and the researcher-participant instructed her to adjust the circle around each mentor’s name according to the relative amount of influence that mentor exerted during the new teacher’s first year of service. As new teachers either left circles “unchanged,” “decreased” their size, or “increased” their size, the researcher-participant asked them to articulate verbally their relationships with mentors. Table 4a displays new teachers’ frequency of responses to this prompt, disaggregated by racial identity. Next, the researcher-participant inquired whether new teachers would like to add to the graphic anyone who served as an informal mentor in any capacity. Table 4b details teachers’ responses to the second part of the protocol, also disaggregated by racial identity.

Table 6a reveals that for White new teachers, the professional mentor role played a significant role relative to other formally assigned mentors. This affirms the finding from Figure 1 discussed earlier in this chapter. Every White new teacher increased their professional mentor’s significance while three teachers of color either left the degree of influence unchanged or decreased its significance. The other clear result from this exercise was the minimal role the head of school played in mentoring and induction of new teachers. Seven participants decreased the relative influence of the head of school. It was division administrators’ responsibility to ensure induction and mentoring of new teachers at The Eastern School. While the head of school did have some interactions with new teachers, these were minimal compared to other formally assigned mentors, so
Table 6a

Frequency of New Teacher Response to Prompt to Corroborate Relative Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Influence unchanged</th>
<th>Influence increased</th>
<th>Influence decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional mentor</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social mentor</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division administrator</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching partner&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of school</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. <sup>a</sup>If applicable. Only elementary division teachers worked closely with a same-grade teaching partner. Some department chairs served as professional mentors and were only counted once in their professional mentor role. Elementary division lead teachers had more than one department chair.

this finding was unsurprising to the researcher. Division administrators did play a relatively influential role for new teachers, with five of eight increasing the significance and two leaving it unchanged. The researcher-participant recognizes, however,
Table 6b

Other Mentor Influences Mentioned by New Teachers in Rank Order by Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White new teachers</th>
<th>New teachers of Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern School colleagues</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teaching colleagues&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern staff members&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.  
<sup>a</sup>Other teaching colleagues included formal mentors and co-teachers at previous schools who continued to serve in a mentoring capacity as well as colleagues in graduate programs.  
<sup>b</sup>Staff members were non-teaching employees, and participants named members of the technology department and division secretaries.

it may have been difficult for participants in his division to decrease the significance of his influence as a supervisor while participating in the exercise in his presence.

Elementary division new teachers worked closely with same-grade teaching partners. With fewer responses due to the specificity of this prompt, generalization was less reliable; however, it appeared that for these participants, new teachers of color did not find their teaching partners to exert as much influence as other mentors. Likewise, department chairs appeared to play a greater role for White new teachers than for their counterparts of color, who in three cases decreased level of influence. Social mentors’ relative degree of influence displays the least clarity of opinion.
When responses were tallied, the researcher-participant observed a surprising outcome. In general, new teachers of color were more likely to decrease the relative influence of formal mentors than their White counterparts (13:8). White new teachers were more likely to increase or to leave unchanged significance of influence (11:7, 5:3). This finding was illuminated by Table 4b, which displays frequency of other mentor influences mentioned by new teachers during the second part of the mentor network protocol. Mentors mentioned in this part of the exercise represented new teachers’ informal mentor network. New teachers of color identified 25 informal influences, while White new teachers mentioned only 17. The majority of informal influences for all new teachers were other Eastern School colleagues not serving in a formal mentor role. Other teaching colleagues, outside of The Eastern School, played equal roles for new teachers across racial/ethnic classifications, as did family and friends. New teachers of color, however, found influential mentoring in staff members (technology department and division secretaries) and in one case, students.

The influence of teaching partners (grade-alike or subject-alike) was underscored by new teachers regardless of racial identity during their interviews, in some ways contradicting how new teachers of color responded to the mentor network instrument. Lourdes said, “In terms of the first few months here, [teaching partner]’s definitely been the person [pause], I mean she’s right next door [laughs]. It’s been easiest, and she knows what’s going on in [grade level] also” (new teacher interview). Jennifer reported:
I think having Amy as a grade level partner, she’s been the instant go-to person… we know each other’s style really well. I think that has helped us play off each other, me for support, but also her feeling comfortable asking me for ideas, things like that. (new teacher interview)

Fred agreed: “I would add [teaching partner]…. Just her experience has benefitted Lourdes and I a lot…. Just from the experiential side, this is what --- grade is all about, curriculum-wise, things like that” (new teacher interview). Bonnie said, “I think [instructional leader], as far as being subject-specific, has been fabulous” (new teacher interview). Providing a negative example and offering an explanation for the observed contradiction, Michelle complained of a poor relationship with her teaching partner, and speculated that the absence of positive interactions had an impact on her efficacy (preliminary meeting; new teacher interview).

In new teacher interviews, the researcher-participant asked new teachers to identify characteristics of an ideal mentor. New teacher responses were tallied and grouped according to preferred mentor behaviors or attributes. Table 7 ranks new teachers’ responses to this prompt as a cohort. The researcher-participant utilized these responses to design the questionnaire prompt related to behaviors and characteristics perceived as helpful by new teachers. The researcher-participant asked respondents to appraise both professional and social mentors. Two teachers, one White and one of color, did not respond to this prompt, so the sample size was limited to six responses.
Table 7

*Frequency of Responses to Prompt: “What Are the Characteristic of an Ideal Mentor?”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor Behavior or Attribute</th>
<th>$f$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responds well to “questions”; is “thoughtful”</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides “feedback”; is “constructive”</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is “approachable”; is a “go-to” person</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is “supportive”</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches same grade/subject</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Shares”; has a collaborative approach</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is “experienced”</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is “open”</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps solve “problems”/“issues”</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a “friend”; is “friendly”</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an “informal” approach</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes time to meet</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a “positive” approach</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Listens”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is willing to give “advice”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is “proactive” or attentive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a “professional” approach</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3a displays new teacher responses with respect to their professional mentors in rank order and disaggregated by racial identity. All new teacher respondents, regardless of racial identity, responded well to mentors assuming an active and positive role in their professional development: helping to problem solve; willingly offering advice and critical feedback; and being available – attentive to new teachers’ needs, approachable, and friendly.

Experience and common grade level assignment were valued by all new teachers as mentor attributes; new teachers of color also found their mentors teaching in similar subject area and being perceived by peers as efficacious also to be of value. While experience, effectiveness, grade-alike assignment, and subject-alike assignment were all considered to be important, similarity in teaching style was less important. Sensitivity and the ability to develop a personal relationship were important to new teachers of color to greater extent than their White counterparts. Mentor age or racial identity had little importance to new teachers, although one White respondent indicated the experience of working with a mentor who was of different racial identity was of value. Mentors having participated in diversity training had very little significance to new teachers.

New teacher journal responses and interviews reinforced findings generated by the questionnaire with respect to helpful professional mentor characteristics and behaviors. Willingness to give specific advice, “practical things,” was important in Bonnie’s estimation particularly for teachers new to the profession (new teacher interview). In her journal, Bonnie commented: “Sandra helps me feel successful, yet also balances that with providing suggestions on how to improve and strengthen what I am
Figure 3a

Professional Mentor Behaviors and Characteristics Identified by New Teachers as Helpful
doing” (Bonnie’s journal). In her interview, Bonnie said as an example Sandra had “been fabulous in, just before conferences, saying you might want to be jotting down notes after every unit. Things like that, where, that could have easily been a mistake a new teacher makes… her foresight and experience was great” (new teacher interview). Bonnie continued in her interview to describe how her instructional leader “empowered” her by helping her problem-solve: “‘Well, here’s where you might meet some resistance,’ or ‘here are your potential hurdles or obstacles down the road.’ Just having someone with that foresight in a subject-specific manner was great” (new teacher interview). Christine expressed:

I am happy at Eastern…. My mentors have helped with this by being caring, outgoing people…. My sense of effectiveness is stretched by additional duties that I am asked to handle that are not directly related to my classroom teaching.

(Christine’s journal)

Fred echoed Christine’s and Bonnie’s sentiments (Fred’s journal): “We [Fred and Lourdes] quickly developed a very comfortable working relationship and a very helpful mentor/mentee relationship. When I ask for it, I receive constructive and substantive feedback on my teaching.”

Michelle indicated: “The mentor system works well for me because I really seek them out. Therefore, I feel like my work is being validated and I use Deirdre and
Jackie’s support to produce the desired results” (Michelle’s journal). Michelle reiterated this sentiment as she worked through the mentor network instrument: “I think my circles would look a lot different, and I put this I think in my journal, if I hadn’t sought out help” (new teacher interview). Michelle affirmed that availability and attentiveness were critical mentor attributes:

I’m here a lot at night and [division administrator]’s here, so she says, ‘Hey, I’m here until 6:30 p.m., so come and see me.’ It’s good about giving me the time when I need to talk about things. And, really listens. I would say she’s a very good listener. (new teacher interview)

Jennifer confirmed that availability was a vital attribute: “Jay kind of taking the initiative to sit down and to chat about it. It was an after school thing, too, I remember. It wasn’t a set, ‘My kids are at PE for 25 minutes, you have that long to talk about this’” (new teacher interview). Bonnie said of her department instructional leader:

What I love is that she’s available to not only have the philosophy curriculum discussions, but how is that going to translate into what you’re doing in the classroom: I can walk in and say, ‘I feel like I’m calling on more boys than girls,’ or ‘I have a couple kids who won’t talk,’ or ‘the range of ability in my class is huge.’ It becomes a discussion about: ‘Here’s a couple ways I’ve dealt with it. Have you tried this? Try that. Have you tried cards?’ You know, and also
bouncing forward and saying, ‘Here’s a way, I think you’re going to have success doing it.’ (new teacher interview)

Fred agreed about availability being critical, stating, “I love, love, love that I can just go, you know, I feel like whatever [division administrator]’s doing, she can always spare a couple minutes to answer a question” (new teacher interview). Fred was particularly struck by this availability in light of his role as an assistant: “She really stresses, especially with the assistants, if there’s anything, you know, any issue or question or anything that I can help you guys out with, please don’t hesitate to come by” (new teacher interview). Fred continued to speak about his mentor network: “Well, I think the biggest thing I have found with these people… has been they are really good about following up or checking in” (new teacher interview), reinforcing again the value of mentor attentiveness to new teachers.

Fred spoke about willingness to provide constructive criticism and the ability to offer this feedback well:

Lourdes could tell me, you know, that my clothes are out of style, and she could do it in a way that would still make me feel like we had met half way or that we see eye to eye somehow…. She’s just very constructive…. Anything that’s critical that she has to say is preceded by, you know, ‘Something that you’re doing that I think is really great. But, try this next time,’ you know. It’s the balance that I think she’s able to strike. (new teacher interview)
Social Mentor Influence

Figure 3b displays the new teachers’ perceptions of helpful behaviors and attributes exhibited by their social mentors. As Figure 3b reveals, in general, the social mentor prompt generated fewer positive responses from new teachers. Surprising to the researcher-participant was how varied were perceptions of social mentors held by new teachers. The leadership project team included social mentors in the mentor training and in the overall induction program design. Yet, the social mentor role received low ratings with respect to influence on new teachers’ sense of efficacy and connection to the community (figures 1 and 2).

Interviews and journals indicated individual relationships new teachers and their social mentors were either very strong or essentially non-existent. For example, one White respondent commented (new teacher questionnaire open-ended response): “I had limited to no interactions with my social mentor.” Lourdes, in her interview, said, “I mean she’s the social, it’s kind of like, ‘Hey, hi!’” (new teacher interview). Bonnie, when completing the mentor network exercise, said: “This one [social mentor] would be a flat line. I mean I think I’ve seen her twice this whole year” (new teacher interview). In contrast, another new teacher of color reported (new teacher questionnaire open-ended response): “My social mentor was fantastic. She led by example and always made sure to let me know that she was around if I needed anything. She always came through for me.”
Figure 3b
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New teachers provided insight to the causes of success or failure of relationships. Christine explained factors that contributed to a positive experience with her social mentor, Oscar:

I kind of use Oscar as my, my reality check, if you will. Because he’s very much in the same position. You know, we both live in the same town, we both have two kids, he’s a faculty here, he’s also a parent here… we have all these commonalities. (new teacher interview)

In comparing Figures 3a and 3b, some notable differences emerge. Similar age played a larger role for the successful social mentor relationship than it did for the professional mentor relationship, particularly for White faculty. Professional characteristics such as experience, grade-alike and subject-alike assignment, teaching style, and perceived effectiveness all reduced in significance for the social mentor role, somewhat in conflict with what Christine and John said in their interviews. Interestingly, similarity of racial identity emerged as important to one White respondent, while interacting with someone of different racial identity remained of value to the same White participant who responded with this answer on the previous prompt.

New teachers appeared to value personal similarity to a greater extent in developing a relationship with their social mentor than with their professional mentor. The researcher-participant also observed that the accountability that was felt by
professional mentors, to which they responded positively, did not have the same impact on all social mentors. Fred explained, “Mel, as a social mentor, I don’t really see him that much…. Other people have definitely picked up his role in other respects” (New teacher interview). Bonnie likewise attributed her lack of a relationship with Sally to differences in age and life experience, as well as simple physical distance from each other at the school: “We just don’t run into each other, you know physically, much” (new teacher interview). Bonnie and Sally, Lourdes and Sally, Fred and Mel were all in different buildings on the campus. Physical proximity did not affect the relationship between Michelle and Jackie, although Michelle was clear that her formal mentor assignments worked because she was proactive in seeking them out.

As Fred indicated in his interview, new teachers’ professional mentors often assumed social mentor functions when new teachers did not experience successful relationships with their assigned social mentors. Lourdes wrote in her journal, “Working with Amy is helping me to get to know the community, as well as connect with another person that I can use as a resource” (Lourdes’s journal). Rachel expressed:

Jennifer has helped me both socially and professionally to become part of the Eastern community. Socially, she introduces me to so many people at the school as well as many of the ways that events happen at Eastern that may be different from other schools. Professionally, watching her teach and hearing her feedback on my teaching has been immeasurably helpful. (new teacher interview)
Even when the social mentor role worked well in a new teacher’s estimation, distinctions between the professional and social roles were blurred. John wrote, “Alan and Lori help me understand all that goes on… at Eastern” (John’s journal).

John later elaborated on attributes that influenced a successful social mentor relationship:

Being close – close in age, same grade, same subject, living close to each other, similar interests, etc. I don’t think you can make this systematic. Finding processes and protocols for everything confines and limits room to grow and do new, spontaneous, organic things. (John’s journal)

Informal Mentor Network

I feel that I can ask ANYONE [emphasis in original] a question about anything. My [division administrator]’s door is always open and that makes me feel comfortable. I also appreciate that fellow faculty members invite me to functions outside of school. (Lourdes’s journal)

Lourdes’s emphatic declaration, common to the cohort, was a surprise finding for the researcher. Bonnie, after naming several colleagues who had emerged as informal mentors after offering to help at the start of school, said: “You know, they didn’t need to give me the time of day, but as a new faculty member they check in and say, ‘How are
things going? What can I do?’ and that’s been a wonderful feeling” (new teacher interview). The school clearly and deliberately emphasized all personnel sharing responsibility for new teachers’ success. Yet, the degree to which informal mentor networks influenced the experience of new teachers at The Eastern School was unexpected. Eight new teachers in the sample worked with eight professional mentors and seven social mentors for a total of fifteen formally-assigned mentors, referred to as formal mentor network. Table 6b illustrates that all new teachers, regardless of racial identity extended their networks through self-selected informal contacts numbering 42 informal mentors, nearly a 3:1 ration of informal to formal mentors. Christine, in fact, when prompted to consider who comprised her informal mentor network, named nearly every teacher in her division and was able to identify a mentoring experience she had with those colleagues.

New teachers referred to their informal mentors as their “go-to people” (new teacher interviews). This phrase revealed the nature of the informal mentor network – a reliable, need-specific source of information and guidance – someone to “go-to”. The purpose of some informal mentors was obvious – technology staff members mentored new teachers on how to use technology resources, division secretaries clarified the complexities of a busy school, supportive colleagues expressed their availability to help, or fellow coaches showed new coaches how to work with their teams. However, some informal mentors were unexpected.

Michelle, while working on the mentor network instrument, said:
Oh yeah. Yeah! My parents. Huge!.... I had a great meeting with [head of school]…. I wanted to be able to sit down with Bonnie and run through this meeting because she’s my best friend here, and she’s also a colleague. And, we’re kind of going through a lot of similar stuff…. But, I kind of have to make the discretion that, you know, no, I’m not going to tell her about that, so I’d say definitely my parents are the biggest. And [pause] I’d say, in general, my friends outside of school… they’ve had a pretty big impact. (new teacher interview)

Michelle continued:

[Specialist], it’s not her job to come see me, but she’s been great about… staying either after school for a few hours or saying, ‘Hey, come over to my house.’ So, gone over there to shoot curriculum and do lunch or whatever it is. So, she’s been huge…. I take good care to surround myself with people that I feel like are going to challenge me and push me to grow…. That personal growth makes me into a better person, which thus makes me into a better teacher.

John reported in his interview:

I think Lori’s been big, she’s probably the [pause], I think her, [tech staff member], [fellow coach], [peer] are people that I just enjoy talking to a lot, just about anything. And so with her there’s a sort of calmness that I find in her and
[peer] that is good for me because I can be the opposite sometimes…. [Division secretary]’s routinely staying on top of me for forgetting things, which I really like and appreciate, and so she’s been a really big help this year. (new teacher interview)

John continued to name his fiancé, who was also an independent school teacher at another school but with more years in the classroom:

I guess I’d put [fiancé] on there, too. It’s hard to draw her circle, because, you know, with all these things, almost with everyone here, except for her, there’s a concrete divide between personal and professional, and like, you know, when I have a conversation with Lori, I know it’s either a personal or a professional one…. But, with [fiancé] it’s just like it’s one conversation. (new teacher interview)

Jennifer identified friends at graduate school:

These are friends of mine who I met in grad school that I actually wrote a thesis with last summer…. They both had that lead teacher experience for a couple of years so it was nice to pose some ideas of them as well…. Other people at Eastern, too. (new teacher interview)
Lourdes named a former mentor and a former colleague at a previous school. Not only did new teachers seek informal support and guidance when specific needs arose in the school setting, but when circumstances dictated school-based interactions were ill advised or unpractical, new teachers turned to trusted mentors unassociated with the school.

Bonnie was a young alumna of The Eastern School, and she represented a mentor for other young new teachers with respect to school culture. This phenomenon is perhaps unique to independent schools, in the researcher-participant’s estimation. Fred identified Bonnie as an informal mentor:

Also, I think in terms of nuts and bolts, what this community is like, I would also add Bonnie…. We’ve become good friends outside of the school setting… and knowing each other in that informal setting, you know, I feel like I can ask her whatever I want, and you know, and not feel embarrassed about it or out of line. (new teacher interview).

Michelle also named Bonnie as an informal mentor:

Bonnie. We do a lot of curriculum talk together…. She’s my best friend here, and she’s also a colleague…. She’s really my main person here because I can shoot curriculum with her, I can shoot sports with her, and I can shoot personal stuff with her… to shoot those kind of questions and to really be able to, to really look
at things in a deeper manner, has been I think, if I didn’t have that, I know I would be OK, but it has made this year so much better because of that. (new teacher interview)

New teacher participants cultivated extensive mentor networks consisting of formal and informal mentors. The degree to which new teachers relied on informal self-selected, need specific mentors was a major unexpected outcome of the research study. New teachers of color identified a higher number of informal mentors than did their White counterparts and new teachers of color informal networks included greater variety: students, staff, family, and friends. The informal mentor network appeared to have played a more influential role for new teachers of color, too, as they were more likely than their White peers to reduce the significance of formal mentor interactions.

Grade-alike or subject-alike teaching partners were important mentors to new teachers in the research study. White new teachers attributed greater influence to their teaching partners, although all teacher participants, regardless of racial identity, found their teaching partners to be influential, although in at least one case the influence was detrimental. When a teaching partner did not serve in a formal capacity, the new teacher sought that individual out as an informal mentor. In one case, when the relationship with the teaching partner was poor, the new teacher perceived her experience – satisfaction, efficacy, and connection – to be substantially impacted by its lack.

The professional mentor role in general was more successful than the social mentor role and less dependent on non-professional factors. New teachers, regardless of
racial identity, agreed completely on the effectiveness of four professional mentor attributes – experience, approachability, friendliness, and same grade level assignment – and several behaviors – help with problem-solving, willingness to offer advice, availability, attentiveness, and willingness to provide critical feedback. Sensitivity, ability to develop a personal relationship, and perception by colleagues of effectiveness were all more important to new faculty of color than they were to their White peers.

New teachers responded better to social mentors who shared similarities with them – age, interests, hometown, or children as examples. When these similarities were absent, the relationship floundered or was non-existent. In two cases where social mentors worked in different divisions than their protégés, there were almost no opportunities for interaction and the relationships were considered by the new teachers to be ineffective.

Cross-Race Comparison of Findings

The researcher-participant sought to understand how induction and the mentoring relationship differed for new teachers of color in contract to their White counterparts in the research study. In addition to the analysis that the researcher-participant has presented throughout Chapter Four, he asked new teachers of color to reflect on cross-race mentoring, support for faculty of color, and unique challenges in their interviews and in their journals. Data presented in this section were from those sources.

Lourdes stated that people of color in suburban independent schools “know they are probably going to be one of the few there” and they had to be “comfortable with it” (new teacher interview). Lourdes explained that alongside the immediate thought of all
teachers “in a new situation” – “am I going to get along with any of these people?” – new teachers of color had the additional thought of “wow, no one else looks like I do” (new teacher interview). Administrators at The Eastern School realized that to have had four new teachers of color enter the school in the same year was an unusual circumstance.

Being only one or one of a few engenders unique feelings for faculty of color, and the burden of representation was a fear repeatedly expressed by several research study participants. They wondered if others in the community believed they were hired based on their race rather than their merit, and they feared if they made a serious error, race would become a factor in the judgment of their performance. In her interview, Lourdes commented:

I feel like I’m a reflection on mixed people, or I’m a reflection of Latin people, or you know, African-American people. And, even though the other person may not perceive it that way, I kind of feel that way because there’s no one else here like me. (new teacher interview)

Rachel reflected: “I think as soon as you check that box that says you’re a minority, one of the first things that comes into your head is, ‘Is that why I’m here? Was I hired because I am considered person of color?’” (new teacher interview). John echoed her sentiment:
It sometimes strikes me to think, ‘Do other faculty members or staff members think I got this job because I’m a faculty of color? Or, because I’m a male faculty of color?’ And, and you know, for someone like me that does well with positive reinforcement, I think I struggle with that because I think, ‘Well, I have to prove to them that I earned this on my merit.’ (new teacher interview)

Michelle said: “I think it’s after you start rocking the boat, they get angry and they want to be able to pinpoint something. They, they’re, that’s when race might come into it” (new teacher interview). John mirrored this fear:

The question is like, ‘If I slip up, how do things change after?’ If a parent or someone in the school doesn’t agree with something I did or said, you know, why are they saying it? Is it because I’m faculty of color? Is it because I’m not wealthy, or because I’m young? Or, is it as a teacher, I goofed? I don’t know how you support that aside from conversation. (new teacher interview)

John pointed to the need for “conversation,” initiated by school personnel to aid in mitigating these feelings for new teachers of color.

In new teacher interviews, the researcher-participant inquired about specific mentor attributes that were effective in cross-race contexts. Rachel said: “Jennifer’s very informal and non-judgmental. So, I felt like I could teach the lesson without having to worry like I was making a mistake or doing something wrong and being judged based on
that” (new teacher interview). Later, when she expanded on this idea, Rachel continued, “Not judgmental is the first thing that comes to my mind. Somebody who you always feel comfortable talking to and approaching about new things or things you’re unsure of” (new teacher interview). The researcher-participant observed a follow-up meeting to an observation of Rachel by Jennifer. Rachel commented, “I would say I am much more comfortable getting feedback from Jennifer. Partially because we spend so much time together, I feel like we are very comfortable around each other… as opposed to an administrator giving feedback” (Observation of mentor-protégé interaction).

Lourdes agreed and added openness as an important attribute:

If they [mentor] are not of color I guess it’s open to, maybe, feelings that I might have as a person of color. And, if I’m discussing it with them, you know, that they don’t really, if I had issues, I don’t know, but if something came up, then it wouldn’t be dismissed as ‘Oh no, no, no you’re just being overly sensitive’ or anything like that. That they would take it to heart basically and be open to any comments I would have to say. (new teacher interview

Michelle added: “Someone who I immediately connect with who has a lot of the same interests, kind of whose philosophy matches with mine. Their passion and hunger, for whatever it is, matches with mine. Who intellectually, you know… looks at things in a deeper manner” (new teacher interview.
When asked specifically if an affinity group would aid new teachers of color in feeling connected to other teachers of color or feeling supported within the school community, Lourdes responded, “I don’t want to feel like I’m separating myself from the rest of the faculty, whom I want to get to know as well” (new teacher interview). Other faculty expressed this would not be of assistance. John said:

The supporting of faculty should be the same in the sense of is you’re trying to make them do the best they can without doing it for them. But, the, I think the twist in it with faculty of color, especially independent schools, especially in an independent school in an area where the demographics are just White, I mean it’s just White. I think the twist on that setting is that the person feels comfortable. (new teacher interview)

Within the cohort, Fred was in a unique position being mentored by a teacher of color; he was in a cross-race mentor relationship, but with the new teacher being mentored by a more veteran faculty member of color rather than the reverse. Being male in an elementary setting, Fred admitted, “I had a pretty good idea that I was probably going to be working with a female teacher” (new teacher interview). He continued to indicate his surprise when he learned he would be working with a lead teacher and professional mentor of color:
I mean I was very definitely pleasantly surprised to be working with someone like Lourdes. Because, I mean, stereotypes aside, someone like her brings something to the table that a White teacher from wherever isn’t bringing to the table. It’s a whole set of experiences, it’s a world view, it’s, you know, whatever. And, to be a part of her teaching that to the students and sort of giving them what is inside of her has been really beneficial I think for me also. (new teacher interview)

Summary

New teachers of color in this research study understood they worked in an organization where they were one of few people of color. However, they wanted to be considered a professional with no race-based distinction placed on them or their performance. The fear of race being a factor in how colleagues viewed their hire, in how supervisors or parents judged their mistakes, or in how their performance was evaluated was very real.

New teachers of color asserted that the school could mitigate these fears by openly acknowledging race-based stereotypes and talking about them. It was important to them to know they were hired because they were excellent teachers and to observe firsthand that it was safe to make mistakes. Mentors who were (a) open-minded, (b) accepting of differences, (c) able to make new teachers of color feel comfortable, (d) valued new teachers of color as colleagues and people, and (e) could provide feedback without passing judgment were considered effective. For some new teachers of color, it was easier to receive feedback from a mentor in a non-evaluative role than it was to
receive feedback from a supervisor or administrator. Affinity groups, often advocated as a means of supporting people of color in organizations, were not perceived as being useful by participants. In fact, new teachers of color asserted that such a practice had the potential risk of creating divisions between faculty of color and their White peers.

For the two teachers involved in the reverse cross-race relationship, the new teacher valued the experience he gained from working with a mentor of color. The mentor agreed:

I think with some of the lessons that I teach, he is exposed to some things he didn’t know before… it’s about exposure, a different point of view…. I hope that he would recognize that I’m coming from a different background and I would do the same for him. (new teacher interview)

In Chapter Five, the researcher-participant (a) summarizes findings, (b) discusses findings through the lens of research questions and frameworks generated by the literature review, (c) considers implications for policy, practice, and future research, and (d) reflects on his leadership learning during the course of the research study.
CHAPTER FIVE
Summary, Discussion, Findings

Introduction

This qualitative research study examined the experiences of teachers new to a school with an induction and mentoring program. A particular investigative focus was the respective experiences and perceptions of new teachers of color in contrast to those of White new teachers. Chapter Four presented data collected in the research study and introduced findings drawn from data. The purposes of Chapter Five are to (a) summarize these findings, (b) discuss findings in the context of the theoretical framework presented in Chapter Two, (c) clarify limitations of the research study, (d) present implications for practice, policy, further research, and leadership, and (e) conclude the research study. Chapter Five is organized according to these purposes.

Summary of Findings

This research study endeavored to answer three research questions:

1. How did the induction program affect new teachers’ (a) connection to the school community, (b) professional satisfaction, and (c) sense of efficacy?

2. Which mentor characteristics did new teachers perceive as being helpful and supportive?

3. Did new teachers’ perceptions vary for cross-race mentoring relationships as compared to same-race mentoring relationships?

This section summarizes findings for each research question.
The researcher-participant observed an independent school community with two reform efforts underway concurrently. First, under direction of its board of trustees, the school was actively engaged in becoming a more diverse community with respect to racial composition of students, faculty, and trustees. The initiative to diversify the community’s racial composition also featured substantial and board-mandated professional development designed to enhance community members’ recognition of privilege, appreciation of difference, and cross-race communication. In the second reform initiative, school administration and instructional leadership recognized a need to improve induction and mentoring of new teachers. A school-based leadership project team designed and implemented a new induction and mentoring program characterized by high accountability, structure, attention, and participation. Overlap between the two initiatives was significant and relevant during the 2006-2007 school year, the research study period, when four of eight new teachers were people of color and participated in the newly implemented induction and mentoring program.

All four new teachers of color were mentored by White teachers. In several cases, the White mentors were also older and veteran within the faculty. Thus, the relationships between the new teachers of color and their mentors were cross-race and cross-experience and, in some instances, cross-generational. This type of mentor-new teacher relationship is the norm for most schools engaged in similar diversity work (Brosnan, personal communication, 2006). While schools are building a critical mass of teachers of color within their faculties, most new teachers will be mentored by older, White teachers. A fifth cross-race pair existed in the study, however, in the case of Fred and Lourdes. In
this case, Lourdes, a female teacher of color, mentored Fred, a White, male assistant. This case was useful to the research study in that it represented the promise of change and hope of teaching as a profession in an increasing multicultural society. If The Eastern School and other schools persevere in their efforts to recruit, hire, and retain teachers of color, cross-race mentoring relationships will become commonplace, with mentors of different races regularly working with new teachers of different races.

To sustain a diverse school community, retention of faculty of color especially must be high, and this retention must be driven by effective induction and mentoring when teachers of color are new to the school. Induction and mentoring that is efficacious for new teachers of color, in the researcher-participant’s opinion, cultivates their connection to the school community, their professional satisfaction, and their sense of efficacy. Mentors working in cross-race relationships have certain attributes and engage in particular behaviors that support new teachers of color developing these feelings or perceptions, as does the structure of the induction program itself.

*Induction Program Influence*

*Connection to the school community.* New teachers’ feelings of connection to the school community influenced their feelings of satisfaction and efficacy at the end of their first year of service. Aspects of the induction program nurtured these connections. Overall, new teachers expressed their connection to the community was strong, although slightly less than their feelings of satisfaction and sense of efficacy. Teachers stated simply that one year was not enough time to develop deep connections to a large,
complex community such as The Eastern School. Connections were just beginning and were expected to continue.

White new teachers felt more connected to the school community than did new teachers of color, although the difference was slight. The greatest sources of connection to the community for all teachers were their students and their colleagues, obviously the two groups with whom they spent most of their time. New teachers were outspoken about the influence of their students. Success with inspiring and connecting to students translated into feelings of connection to the community. Parents were only slightly less influential, with new teachers’ feelings of connection naturally stemming from their success with parents’ children in the classroom.

Connection to the community was assumed for White teachers; they could passively let bonds and relationships form based on affinity of interest or life station. Teachers of color, on the other hand, believed they needed to seek help proactively and to cultivate relationships assertively. They found the organized formal induction activities to be more useful in developing connections to the community than did their White peers. With the perspective that relationships developed through their own agency, new teachers of color responded well to school-sponsored opportunities to facilitate such connections. The one exception was working with the professional mentor. White new teachers responded more positively to that relationship than did new teachers of color.

The findings related to this research sub-question revealed two unexpected outcomes. Surprisingly, the social mentor role – unique to this site context – did not have as significant an influence on connection to the community despite being designed to
facilitate such a connection. Although slightly more influential for teachers of color, the social mentor role had comparatively minimal influence for any new teachers in contrast to other elements of the induction program. A second noteworthy surprise was a significant difference in the influence of pre-service contact for new teachers of color as compared to their White counterparts. New teachers of color identified pre-service contact by members of the school community as an important factor in their development of feelings of connection to the community, even long after the contact occurred.

The burden of representation was real for teachers of color, despite the school’s efforts to cultivate an open and inclusive community. With the presence of a diversity initiative, new teachers of color wondered if their new colleagues believed they were hired because of their race. They worried that a mistake or misstep on their parts would cause their race to be a factor in evaluating their performance or reflect poorly on other faculty members of color. Despite these fears the school’s significant investment in diversity training for all employees was not viewed as having a significant influence on new teachers’ feelings of connection to the community.

*Professional satisfaction.* Feeling satisfied professionally at the end of their first year of service contributed to new teachers’ sense of efficacy and connection to the school community and ultimately led to retention. New teachers, regardless of racial identity, expressed a strong sense of professional satisfaction upon completion of their first year of service.

Two main factors contributed to new teachers’ satisfaction. The researcher-participant observed a pattern of professional satisfaction stemming from: (a) affirmation
from students and their parents and (b) affirmation from colleagues and administrators. Again, new teachers derived professional satisfaction from success with working with their students. Affirmation of their work from children and their parents, colleagues and administrators had positive influences on new teachers’ professional satisfaction. New teachers, regardless of racial identity, received affirmation from both sources. However, new teachers of color identified student and parent affirmation as having the greater influence on their sense of professional satisfaction. White new teachers defined their professional satisfaction in terms of both sources. Age and experience were not differentiating factors.

Sense of efficacy. The researcher-participant defined efficacy as new teachers’ self-perceptions of their ability to function effectively as a teacher. New teachers’ sense of efficacy at the end of their first year of service affected professional satisfaction and connection to the community. Perceiving oneself as efficacious led to feeling like a contributing and valued member of a community of professionals. Aspects of the induction program contributed to new teachers’ sense of efficacy, although this line of inquiry resulted in an unexpected finding.

It was a surprise to discover that new teachers expressed their sense of efficacy was influenced most by their peers through informal interactions, observations, and feedback. This represented the least planned aspect of the induction program and the aspect over which the leadership project team or division administrators exercised the least control. The leadership project team and division administrators stressed that everyone in the community was responsible for new teachers’ success and should be
active and responsive in offering support. This finding affirmed the community acted upon the emphasis the leadership project team placed on fostering a school culture in which support for new teachers was broad and extended far beyond the formally-assigned roles and responsibilities.

Other aspects of the induction program fell into two categories with respect to influence on new teachers’ sense of efficacy. White new teachers derived greater benefit from formal, planned, and evaluative activities such as observations and feedback meetings conducted with administrators and professional mentors. New teachers of color expressed that informal, supportive, interpersonal activities contributed more to their sense of efficacy such as interactions with their instructional leaders, social mentors, and peers. Again, informal interactions and activities depended on the agency of new teachers of color; they exercised control over under what conditions these interactions occurred – they were done *with* the new teachers of color by their choice. Formal interactions and activities were scheduled and planned; White new teachers did not need to act for them to occur. In a fashion, they were being done *to* the new teachers.

Contact before service began by members of the school community was again positively regarded by new teachers of color, whereas it had little effect on White new teachers. Diversity training had little influence, although it was a significant resource investment for The Eastern School.

Sincerity and candor were important influences in how mentors and administrators fostered new teachers’ sense of efficacy. However, trust was a prerequisite to these relationships being successful. New teachers’ openness to hearing
constructive criticism was nurtured when mentors and administrators met with them regularly and feedback was timely and specific. Mutuality, or the sharing of ideas, was also important to building trust between new teachers and mentors or teaching partners. When new teachers perceived they were a partner in their development, they derived greater benefit from induction activities.

Again, for all aspects of the induction program, White new teachers enjoyed the privilege of passively waiting for support to occur. New teachers of color, on the other hand, realized they could not wait passively for support to happen for them or to them. Their success hinged on their willingness to seek support actively and to meet their own needs assertively.

*Mentor Characteristics*

New teachers expressed that certain mentor characteristics were helpful and viewed specific sources of mentoring as more helpful than others. This section summarizes findings related to mentor characteristics and sources of mentoring.

Mentor characteristics included behaviors and attributes. New teachers as a cohort identified behaviors they perceived as helpful: (a) responded in thoughtful manner, (b) provided constructive feedback, and (c) helped to problem-solve. Helpful attributes were (a) approachable, (b) attentive, (c) supportive, (d) collaborative, (e) similar assignment, and (f) experienced. Behaviors such as letting new teachers figure it out on their own were not considered helpful; attributes related to age or racial identity were not influential. Again, while new teachers of color recognized particular mentor
characteristics as specifically helpful in cross-race relationships, they did not perceive school-sponsored diversity training as influential in the mentor-new teacher relationship.

White new teachers were more likely to express that their formally-assigned mentors were influential; teachers of color were less likely. Teaching partners, working in the same grade or same subject area, were perceived as important sources of mentoring, whether assigned or not. The school publically and openly discussed the importance of mentoring, provided training, and held mentors and new teachers accountable for their work: it raised the attention paid to formal mentor roles. When a new teacher did not form a connection with a formally assigned mentor and especially a teaching partner, this lack of relationship was viewed as negative – a missed opportunity.

The social mentor role again provided evidence of lack of influence and lack of clear definition. It was more likely that the social mentor role did not work for a new teacher than it was for the professional mentor role. Affinity of interest or life station was beneficial for the social mentor relationship to develop, although not always correlated with success. The professional mentor role, well defined and assigned specific responsibilities, established a formal framework for mentoring to occur and relationship to develop. The social mentor role with less definition and responsibility did not offer a similar framework, and new teachers instead self-selected informal mentors, in many cases with whom they had a pre-existing relationship, to answer technical needs and offer emotional encouragement and support.

An unexpected outcome of this line of inquiry was the significance of informal mentors self-selected by the new teachers based on specific, individualized needs for
technical guidance or emotional support. Every teacher identified informal mentors; informal mentors identified by new teachers of color were more varied. Informal mentors included the obvious – Eastern School teacher colleagues and staff members – and extended to the surprising – students, family, friends, colleagues from graduate school, a colleague who was an alumni, a pastor. In the case of the latter group, an important distinguishing characteristic was a pre-existing relationship, with the exception of current students. A pre-existing relationship meant trust, openness, and confidentiality already were present. The new teacher did not need to fear being vulnerable with someone who was unknown and based on a relationship with a person assigned by the school.

Another unexpected outcome was the breadth and variety of new teachers’ mentor networks. It was clear new teachers sought and received mentoring from an extended network of formal and informal mentors. Some were assigned and some selected. Some fulfilled technical needs, others offered emotional support. In an era of social networking, new teachers approached their professional lives with similar complexity of relationships. Informal mentors were new teachers “go-to people”: reliable, need-specific sources of information, guidance, and support. Another distinguishing feature of the informal mentor network was it consisted primarily of people who did not evaluate or judge new teachers’ performance. New teachers could be more open and vulnerable with people who were not direct supervisors.
Again, new teachers of color expressed mentor relationships worked effectively as a result of their assertiveness. Passivity was not seen as an option; they were the controlling agent in the success of their mentor relationships.

**Cross-Race Relationships**

People of color working in predominantly White organizations have specific needs, feelings, and concerns that are different than their White colleagues. These needs, feelings, and concerns are likely to be unexpressed yet be a significant factor in the work of teachers of color. In The Eastern School for the school year under consideration, students of color were not evenly distributed throughout the school. One classroom might have included several students of color; another might not have included any. A teacher of color, then, could have gone about her professional day without once encountering a student, colleague, or parent of color. This creates the feeling of being the only one, a feeling that is unique to people of color. White teachers, students, and parents do not experience this feeling, and it is part of the unearned privilege of being White in certain parts of America such as the suburban setting of The Eastern School.

For the new teachers of color participating in this research study, the feeling of being the only one led to fears of representing all people of color or all faculty members of a specific racial identity. They wondered if their White colleagues believed they had been hired because of their race to fulfill an organizational goal. A mistake or a misstep on their part did not reflect poorly on their performance alone, in their opinions, rather it reflected poorly on the performance of all teachers of color.
Under these circumstances, trust was critical to the mentor-new teacher relationship. For new teachers of color to accept advice, suggestions, guidance, and especially constructive criticism from White mentors and veteran teachers, trust had to precede mentoring within the relationship. Trust built over time through the mentor (a) affirming the new teacher of color’s role and value as a faculty member, (b) displaying openness to listening, and (c) legitimizing their concerns. Vital was affirmation that new teachers of color were valuable and contributing members of a professional community and not hired to meet a professional goal outlined by a diversity initiative. This affirmation came from students, colleagues, parents, and administrators. The fact that all the sources need to be in concert with affirmation for new teachers of color is a challenge for schools seeking to diversify their teacher force. It would appear from the results of this research study that no school should ever seek to diversify without broadly shared purpose and clear intent.

The new teachers of color in this research study expressed that affinity groups, often proposed as organizational vehicles of support for people of color, were not useful. They wanted to feel membership, belonging, and connection within the larger community and did not want to engage in activities that might separate or distance them.

Fred’s case represented the future of teaching and mentorship – he was a young, inexperienced, male, White assistant working with and being mentored in his first job by an older, more experienced, female, teacher of color. Both Fred and Lourdes recognized the benefit to Fred. He gained something more than he would have in a same-race relationship: a different perspective, different ways of doing things, different ways of
related to a colleague. Describing being new in a previous school, Lourdes spoke about being assigned the only other teacher of color as a mentor and deciding race was the deciding factor in that assignment. She expressed appreciation that The Eastern School had not taken the same approach. Fred and Lourdes’s mutual receptivity to the relationship and understanding that they stood to gain from the experience opened a valuable learning opportunity for them.

Discussion of Findings

The research study is situated within three theoretical frames: (a) new teacher induction, (b) mentoring as a primary vehicle for new teacher induction, and (c) mentoring in cross-race contexts. Adult learning as it pertained to induction and mentoring of new teachers was a theoretical framework that encompassed the three primary frames. The research base related to cross-race mentoring in educational settings is very limited; it was the researcher-participant’s intent to contribute most to this framework. This section discusses the research study findings in relation to these theoretical frameworks.

In Chapter Two, the researcher-participant also framed the research study in relation to public policy related to teacher quality and diversity in the teacher force. These subjects are addressed in the implications section of this chapter.

Adult Learning

New teacher induction and mentoring is predicated upon adult learning, for both new teachers and mentors. Smith and Ingersoll (2004) envisioned new teacher induction “as a bridge, enabling the ‘student of teaching’ to become a ‘teacher of students’” (p.

Little (1990) asserted this learning meant role reconceptualization for the mentor, too, as the mentor shifted from being a teacher of children to being a teacher of teachers. This research study examined how mentoring and induction impacted new teachers’ feelings of professional satisfaction and sense of efficacy, and the researcher-participant contended that these feelings evolved through learning over the course of the first year of service. Lazovsky and Reichenberg (2006) concluded that, given the substantive influence of the mentor, induction programs should “include mandatory training for all mentor teachers… and standardization of mentoring procedures” (p. 67). Training and development of mentor expertise directly increases new teacher effectiveness (Evertson & Smithey, 2000; Grove, Strudler, & Odell, 2004). Wang, Odell, and Strong (2006) argued that without such guidance mentoring does not produce desired growth or a “focus on standards-based teaching” (p. 126).

The leadership project team at The Eastern School defined the professional mentor role and provided training that mentor participants expressed was beneficial to their development as mentors. The social mentor role lacked training and standardization, and these deficiencies were evident in the research study findings.

Cognitive learning theory (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983; Thies-Sprinthall, 1986; Thies-Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987) as it applies to adults was useful to
understanding the learning that occurred in the research study. Harrison, Dymoke, and Pell (2006) presented a teacher (adult) learning cycle of (a) experience, (b) reflection, (c) learning, and (d) further experimentation. For new teachers, mentors play key roles at each stage of the cycle and especially offering challenge and support for risk-taking in a safe environment. Turley, Powers, and Nakai (2006) likewise found “opportunities for reflection” (p. 27) were an important feature of effective induction and mentoring programs. Gibson’s study (1995) found (a) clarity of the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in new teacher induction and (b) “regular, supportive, structured feedback” (p. 255) to be vital induction program elements. Napper-Owen and Phillips (1995) also discovered regular constructive feedback was critical to the development of new teachers.

The researcher-participant found evidence of mentor attributes and behaviors that facilitated new teachers’ learning processes. New teacher participants explained they valued mentors observing them teach, and then guiding their learning and reflection through timely constructive feedback. Candor and specificity were critical to this process; otherwise new teachers did not feel they were growing. New teachers also expressed the importance of feeling safe to experiment and take risks. Comfort with and trust in the mentor and security in the perception that the mentor served a non-evaluative function afforded new teachers the freedom to take risks and learn from mistakes. In support of The Eastern School model, Andrews, Gilbert, and Martin (2007) found “opportunities to collaborate” (p. 9) to be of value to new teachers, as well as working with a mentor and receiving frequent, non-evaluative feedback.
Recent studies have examined whether summative judgment about teacher quality and mentoring might be blended (Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008). Participants in this research study expressed such a model would have diminished their trust in their mentors and the security they felt to experiment, reducing their capacity for learning during the induction year. In fact, in The Eastern School induction and mentoring program, the first summative evaluation was not conducted until the second year of service (division administrator interview). In agreement with Yusko and Feimain-Nemser (2008), The Eastern School did train mentors to employ the same standards used in the evaluation system in providing formative feedback to new teachers.

In this research study, the researcher-participant did not investigate whether mentors benefit when their own learning is supported by other mentors or administrators. The leadership project team at The Eastern School, however, did design the induction program with this mentor support as a feature. This represents a possible area for further research.

New Teacher Induction

A leadership project team at The Eastern School designed and implemented an induction mentoring program characterized by high structure and accountability, broad participation and attention. This was in stark contrast to the previous program that was characterized by low structure and accountability, minimal participation and attention. The researcher-participant examined whether the induction program influenced new teachers’ attitudes, specifically (a) connection to the school community, (b) professional satisfaction, and (c) sense of efficacy, and what aspects of the program influenced these
attitudes. The underlying induction program goals and structure had significant impact on new teachers’ experience during the research study period.

**Program structure and goals.** Induction program goals were carefully crafted by the leadership project team. Feiman-Nemser (2001a) devised a continuum of central tasks of learning to teach, asserting effective induction programs should involve professional development across the full scope of tasks. The leadership project team identified central tasks for new teachers at The Eastern School and designed the induction program to build their capacities in each area. New teacher participants in this research study identified elements of the induction program that influenced their self-perceptions of satisfaction, efficacy, and connection rather than the teaching tasks devised by the leadership project team. New teachers’ perceptions examined in this research study reflect Feiman-Nemser’s fifth central task (2001a): developing a professional identity. The degree to which new teachers at The Eastern School perceived themselves as professionally satisfied, efficacious, and connected to the school community at the end of their first year defined how they perceived themselves as teachers at the school. The success of the induction program in developing new teachers according to the central tasks represents an area for future research.

The leadership project team also developed a structure for the re-designed induction program. Ingersoll and Smith (2004) determined that induction and mentoring programs characterized by high structure and offering a combination of supportive strategies and activities were more effective at retaining new teachers. Collaborative activity with colleagues and a grade-alike or subject-alike mentor were among the most
influential combinations in Ingersoll and Smith’s study. The researcher-participant in this study did not specifically investigate retention but he did follow-up two years after the research study period and determined that all the new teacher participants were still working at The Eastern School.

Nielsen, Barry, and Addison (2007) asserted that to promote teacher effectiveness, induction programs must have the following features: (a) high structure, (b) mentoring, (c) a focus on adult learning, and (d) an emphasis on collaboration. Again, these were key elements of The Eastern School’s re-designed and newly implemented induction and mentoring program during the research study period.

Data collected during the research study period indicated participants valued the structure, accountability, attention, and support that characterized the new Eastern School induction and mentoring program. Likewise, participants expressed they valued working with colleagues in a collaborative manner and being paired with a grade/subject-alike mentor. Similarity of assignment was more influential than similarity of style or other mentor attributes. Feelings of mutuality – sharing and collaborating with colleagues – contributed to self-perceptions of value, contribution, and connection to the community. These findings suggest agreement with Ingersoll and Smith’s and Neilsen, Barry, and Addison’s work.

Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, and Cowan-Hathcock (2007) asserted that high quality induction correlated with better quality instruction in new teachers’ classrooms and thus a better experience for their students. Certainly, the quality of the teacher relates to student performance (Gladwell, 2008), so it is reasonable to assume the quality of a new teacher...
will impact the quality of students’ experience. This study did not investigate the Eastern
School induction and mentoring program from this perspective, and this represents a
worthwhile line of future inquiry, particularly within an independent school context.

There is broad agreement in the literature that the principal plays a key role in
induction of new teachers (Wood, 2005; Brock & Grady, 1998; Quinn & Andrews, 2004;
asserted the principal has important roles in (a) recruiting, advocating for, and retaining
new teachers, (b) supervising mentor teachers, (c) serving as school instructional leader,
and (d) cultivating a school culture that supports new teachers. Division administrators
were central to the induction program at The Eastern School. New teacher participants
indicated that regular, scheduled meetings and timely, focused feedback from division
administrators were important influences in their perceptions.

*Developing efficacy.* This research study considered factors that influenced new
teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy as it related to teaching at the conclusion of their
first year of service. Researchers (Stallion & Zimpher, 1991; Lee, Brown, Luft, &
Roehrig, 2007; McCormack, Gore, and Thomas, 2006; and San, 1999) have suggested
attention to developing new teachers’ pedagogical expertise contributes to their sense of
efficacy. According to the adult learning model discussed previously, experience,
reflection, and learning from experience all contribute to cultivating expertise and
development of a feeling of efficacy. Research study findings underscore the importance
of professional development and reflection within induction programs (Lee, Brown, Luft,
...and especially the mentor in working with the new teacher to generate meaning from experience (McCormack, Gore, & Thomas, 2006).

This research study found that informal, unplanned conversations with colleagues and other supportive individuals external to the school had the greatest influence on new teachers’ sense of efficacy. This finding concurred with McCormack, Gore, and Thomas’s (2006) conclusion that “informal unplanned conversations and sharing of ideas and concerns” with peers were significant in fostering new teachers’ professional identity (p. 110). The researchers also stated “feedback and confirmation as to their value within the school” were critical to new teachers’ willingness to engage in ongoing professional learning (p. 110). Affirmation played a major role for new teachers in this research study, too, particularly when it was in the form of mutual sharing and authentic collaborative work with a colleague or parent. Being affirmed as expert, knowledgeable, efficacious by another member of the school community had great influence on new teachers’ sense of efficacy.

**Connection to school community.** Few research studies have dealt with new teachers’ feelings of connection to the school community. This researcher-participant postulated that strong connection and self-identification as a member of the school community would positively influence new teachers perceptions of success at the conclusion of their first year, particularly where the research study context was an independent school. Independent schools, in general, have a strong focus on community and culture (NAIS, 2006).
Oplatka and Eizenberg (2007) identified a number of factors that influenced new teachers’ sense of belonging including their students’ parents. Yandell and Turvey (2007) found new teachers derived significant meaning from their students and their students’ academic and personal growth. In this research study, several participants identified successful experiences and interactions with students and parents as helping to form connections with the school community.

In the relative absence of studies specifically attending to new teachers’ connection to the school community, the researcher-participant found it helpful to examine studies dealing with school culture and new teachers. The researcher-participant postulated that school culture played a role in new teachers’ feelings of connection. Williams, Prestage, and Bedward (2001) found that school cultures centered on mutual collaboration and learning as opposed to isolation and individualism fostered new teachers’ success. Kardos, Johnson, Peske, Kauffman, and Liu (2001) argued an integrated culture that balanced the needs of veteran and novice teachers developed a stronger sense of community.

An important finding in this research study was the perception that new teachers of color need to assert themselves to address their professional needs and connect with the community. White teachers, on the other hand, were able to take a more passive approach. This represents an area of further research in educational settings to determine the extent to which this is a factor in the workplace culture of diverse schools.
**Mentor Characteristics**

The school under consideration in this research study developed an induction program wherein the primary vehicle for induction was the mentoring relationship between a new teacher and a professional mentor. The researcher-participant identified mentor characteristics that new teachers perceived as helpful and sources of mentoring. This line of inquiry resulted in a number of unexpected outcomes.

*Mentor behaviors and attributes.* Current research on mentoring focuses on mentoring as a collaborative, participatory practice in which (a) benefits to the mentor are equal to those for the new teacher and (b) the new teacher plays an important role in school reform (Odell, 2006; Achinstein and Athanases, 2006; Fletcher & Barrett, 2004; and Wang, 2001). The Eastern School premised their re-designed induction and mentoring program on the idea that induction of new teachers had professional benefits for the mentor as well as for the new teacher and that mentoring was a collaborative practice.

Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, and Cowan-Hathcock (2007) found mentors were valued who (a) treated new teachers as “respected colleagues;” (b) were available, open, and proactive; and (c) provided “constructive” feedback on teaching (p. 141). Mentors having the same teaching style and have a grade/subject-alike assignment were not considered by new teachers as useful in their study. Ballantyne and Hansford (1995) and Jones (2001) demonstrated that mentors need to be expert enough to adapt to the role needed by their protégés. Johnson and Reiman (2006) agreed: mentors whose conceptual, ego, and moral judgments were more complex were better able to match role
with protégé need, are more likely to collaborate, and are more apt to view protégé as a colleague. Bullough and Draper (2004) found that when mentors provided new teachers with greater honesty and insight into the challenges of teaching and mentoring, benefits to the new teacher increased. Kanan and Baker (2002) found new teachers preferred mentors (a) who taught in the same subject area, (b) were more expert (e.g. held an advanced degree), (c) were more experienced, (d) were older, (e) were giving with their time and attention, (f) displayed a genuine interest in new teacher’s growth, (g) had a sense of humor, and (h) were patient and tactful.

New teacher participants in this research study identified mentor behaviors and attributes they perceived as helpful. Helpful behaviors included mentors (a) responding in thoughtful manner, (b) providing constructive feedback, and (c) helping to problem-solve. Helpful attributes were (a) approachable, (b) attentive, (c) supportive, (d) collaborative, (e) similar assignment, and (f) experienced. Contrary to Kanan and Baker’s finding new teachers in this research study did not find attributes related to age to be influential. Kanan and Baker did find male new teachers expressed a preference for male mentors. Perhaps as a result of being in an elementary setting where there are fewer male teachers, new teachers in this research study did not express a gender preference, nor did similarity of racial identity play a significant role regardless of respondent racial identity.

New teachers benefit when the mentoring relationship is reciprocal or mutual (Certo, 2005b, Johnson & Reiman, 2006) and when the relationship is based on trust (Stanulis & Russell, 2000). When novice teachers are given a leadership role, such as
serving as one of two mentors in their second year (a mentor-triad), self-efficacy is increased (Hayes, 2006). New teachers will go outside of the formal mentor network to obtain help (Ballantyne & Hansford, 1995; Hertzog, 2002; Marso & Pigge, 1990), self-selecting faculty whom they perceive as “friendly” or “caring” (Tellez, 1992, p. 214).

School culture. School culture is an important factor in novice teacher success. Angelle, (2002) found that the overall effectiveness of a school correlated to the effectiveness of the mentoring experiences within that school. Students, parents, colleagues, and school context all impact novice teacher induction and retention (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, & McLaughlin, 1989). Climate must allow for and even encourage risk-taking and a perception that it is safe for novices to make and learn from mistakes (Yendol-Hoppey & Dana, 2006). Novices need to believe the climate is safe to make mistakes and seek help; they can be reluctant to impose on veteran teachers (Osgood, 2001). Kardos, Johnson, Peske, Kauffman and Liu (2001) found that schools with an integrated orientation that balances the professional needs of veterans with those of novices are most conducive to new teacher success.

New teacher participants in this research study expressed the importance of school culture. Feeling affirmed as a valued, contributing member of the school community was the greatest influence on their feelings of satisfaction, efficacy, and connection. The sources of this affirmation were diverse. As Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, and McLaughlin (1989) found, students, parents, colleagues, and administrators all contributed to new teachers’ feelings and perceptions. This underscored the importance of broad participation and investment in new teachers’ success.
**Principal role.** The principal plays the critical role in cultivating such a climate, by providing the context, purpose, and support for mentors and new teachers to meet. Specifically, principals (a) hold mentors accountable for following through on their responsibilities (Lindgren, 2005, Youngs, 2007), (b) appropriately assign mentors and new teachers (Gray & Gray, 1985; Osgood, 2001), (c) establish and communicate clear purpose (Feiman-Nemser, 2001b; Prestine & Nelson, 2005), (d) allocate sufficient time to the program (Arends & Regazio-DiGilio, 2000), and (e) evaluate mentor program outcomes (Kilburg & Hancock, 2006; Trenta, et al., 2002).

In this research study, the principal role was fulfilled by the division administrators. New teachers identified the division administrators as key influences in their development. Availability through a regularly scheduled meeting, willingness to devote time and attention, support, and affirmation were actions valued by new teacher participants.

**Informal mentor networks.** An unexpected outcome of this research study was the degree to which new teachers relied upon a network of self-selected informal mentors, both internal and external to the school. Klug and Salzman (1991) contrasted mentoring programs with formal and informal structures. Results related to teaching skill development and changes in new teacher perceptions indicated greater success from high structure programs.

In this research study, all new teachers identified informal mentor networks, some quite extensive, that they routinely accessed in addition to their formal mentor contacts. Informal mentors were most often selected and accessed to address a specific need
whether technical or supportive. Odell and Ferraro (1992) found emotional support was a key element to development of identity and long-term retention of new teachers. New teachers’ informal mentors who were external to the school were individuals with whom they had pre-existing relationships. Trust, not judging the new teachers’ actions, unconditional emotional support, and an understanding of confidentiality were implicit to external informal mentors.

Algozzine, Gretes, Queen, and Cowan-Hathcock (2007) found that new teachers rated “individual, focused, and specific opportunities… more favorably than … diffuse, collective, and diverse” ones (p. 139). New teachers preferred induction practices that were tailored to fit their particular circumstances and needs. Findings from this research study suggested that new teachers selected informal mentors to fulfill specific areas of need. School-sponsored activities had the potential to fall into the category of diffuse and collective.

Social mentor role. The social mentor role, unique to The Eastern School setting, provided evidence of lack of influence and lack of clear definition. The professional mentor role, well defined and assigned specific responsibilities, established a formal framework for mentoring to occur and relationship to develop. The social mentor role with less definition and responsibility did not offer a similar framework, and new teachers instead self-selected informal mentors, in many cases with whom they had a pre-existing relationship, to answer technical needs and offer emotional encouragement and support.
Sundli (2007) found that when mentor roles were not well framed and mentors were not well trained, mentoring could become a hindrance to new teachers’ professional growth rather than a support. Tillman (2001) identified the same phenomena in cross-race mentoring contexts. Ill-defined and poorly executed, the social mentor role at The Eastern School carried the risk for actually being detrimental to the development of new teachers, particularly for new teachers of color. This will be addressed in more detail in the section, “Implications for Practice.”

Cross-Race Mentoring

This research study contrasted the experiences of new teacher of color with White colleagues involved together in an induction and mentoring program. While many researchers share a general consensus of the importance of teacher diversity mirroring pupil diversity, limited research exists on cross-race mentoring as a means of supporting the diversification of the teacher force in K-12 school contexts. A theoretical framework for cross-race mentoring exists in research on business environments, social work and counseling, and university teaching. The latter is almost exclusively restricted to self-examinations of single mentor-protégé pairs, and thus somewhat limited in its applicability to school-wide or district-wide K-12 settings.

Cross-race mentoring “requires extra sensitivity”, familiarity with diversity work, “reflection on the meaning(s) of white privilege”, and “is built on a relationship”, a sense of responsibility, the ability to take perspective, “help[ing] others achieve their goals”, and being an ally (Stanley & Lincoln, 2005, pp. 40-42). The “ability of entry-level employees is increased by mentoring”, particularly when the workforce is diverse (Athey,
Avery, & Zemsky, 2000, p. 765; Salomon & Schork, 2003; Wanguri, 1996). Protégés express greater satisfaction when they perceive interpersonal similarities with their mentors (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Ensher, Grant-Vallone, and Marelich (2002) found that “perceived attitudinal similarity was a better predictor of protégés’ satisfaction with and support received from their mentors than was demographic similarity” (p. 1407). This was certainly true for this research study in the case of the few successful social mentor dyads – success generally resulted from affinity of interest or life station.

When considering a variety of mentor/supervisor factors, such as diversity training, ethnic self-identity, and personal experiences that lead to identity development, Chrobot-Mason (2004) found that white mentors/supervisors were more effective working with people of color when they had clearer sense of own ethnic identity. In this research study, participants routinely indicated they did not perceive the school-sponsored diversity training to be of any influence in their or their mentors’ success.

Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly (2006) found successful organizations cultivated a broad (organization-wide) sense of responsibility for diversity. M. Brosnan (personal communication, February 15, 2006) agreed this was important in school settings. In this research study, it was evident to the researcher-participant that broad investment was present; however, this was not directly identified other than by inference of the participants. New teachers of color perceived broad affirmation for their efforts and respect for their contribution to the school community.

Trust and acknowledgment of white privilege can be critical to successful cross-race mentoring, according to Johnson-Bailey, Cervero, and Baugh (2004). New teachers
of color in this research study indicated trust, openness to their perspectives, non-judgmental listening, and legitimizing their concerns were essential for mentors working with new teachers of color.

"Ethnic-specific" support and affinity-group network opportunities increase teacher of color recruitment and retention (Case, Shive, Ingebrestson, & Spiegel, 1988, p. 54) as well as in business (Friedman, Kane, & Cornfield, 1998; Thomas, 1990). Interestingly, this idea was presented directly to new teachers of color at The Eastern School and none agreed this would be of benefit.

Researchers have found that Black professionals experience particular difficulty in the mentoring process. Viator (2001) found that Black accountants experienced greater difficulty developing informal mentor relationships than their white counterparts, resulting in increased job dissatisfaction and greater likelihood of leaving the profession. In contrast to Viator’s study, participants of color in this study actually identified a greater number and a greater diversity of informal mentors, although no participants self-identified as Black racial identity alone; one participant self-identified as Mixed Black and Latino.

Again, new teachers of color expressed mentor relationships worked effectively as a result of their assertiveness. Passivity was not seen as an option; they were the controlling agent in the success of their mentor relationships. This, in the opinion of the researcher-participant, is the most important finding from this line of inquiry for two reasons. First, it speaks to an issue of unrecognized White privilege. White new teachers did not feel the same sense of urgency: they could passively await support to happen to
them. It also indicates a fear that without assertiveness, support for new teachers of color might not have happened. Trust was present, but only to a certain point. This unexpected outcome deserves further attention.

The phenomenon of cross-race mentoring in K-12 contexts is an under-studied area. Given the plethora of research related to mentoring, it is fascinating relatively little is related to mentoring across race. The researcher-participant recommends this as an area for further study.

**Limitations**

This research study had a number of limiting factors that have potential effects on its generalizability to other settings and had the possibility of impacting reliability and validity during the research study period. Limitations included (a) attributes of the research study context, (b) elements of the research study design, and (c) the position and biases of the researcher-participant. This section presents (a) limitations of the research study, (b) how these had the potential to affect validity and reliability of the research study, and (c) strategies the research-participant employed to enhance validity and reliability.

The research study occurred in a single independent elementary school, a fact which limits generalizability of findings to other settings, most notably a public school. Teachers at The Eastern School, for example, were not required to hold teaching credentials, but were expected to hold degrees in their content areas. The induction program developed by the leadership project team was designed and implemented by choice rather than in adherence to state or federal mandates. Its design had unique
features, such as distinct professional and social mentor roles, that may not be present in other settings. Merriam (1998) explained external validity as “the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations” (p. 207), and unique attributes of this research study context influenced its external reliability.

Merriam defined internal validity as the degree to which “research findings match reality” and suggested triangulation, member checks, long-term observation, peer examination, and clarifying researcher biases as means to increase validity (pp. 201-204). The researcher-participant designed this research study with these strategies in place. However, the intersection of research design with the reality of a school meant that not all strategies functioned without mishap. Not all participants completed journals as thoroughly as others due to other commitments and time constraints. Two participants did not complete the final questionnaire in its entirety, possibly due to a technical error with the web-based survey provider. Rather than disqualify and discard incomplete responses, the researcher-participant elected to use the incomplete responses where possible. Not every interaction between mentors and new teachers was observed due to time and scheduling constraints; however, the researcher did observe at least one representative interaction for each professional mentor-new teacher pair. The researcher-participant did not observe any interactions between social mentors and new teachers. With the lack of structure and formality to that relationship, it was impossible to schedule an observation of an interaction.

Merriam (1998) framed reliability as “the extent to which research findings can be replicated” (p. 205) and suggested dependability and consistency were better terms to
describe reliability for qualitative research. Again, the researcher-participant used triangulation as a strategy to enhance dependability and consistency. The researcher-participant recognized his role as an administrator in the research study context and a participant in the leadership project to reform induction and mentoring both had the potential to affect dependability. As an administrator in the research study context, the research-participant hired all new teacher participants and supervised all mentor participants. In some cases, this may have influenced participant responses despite measures taken to guarantee confidentiality and anonymity. For example, as mentioned previously, it might have been difficult for a participant to reduce the significance of the research-participant’s influence as a supervisor while the researcher-participant was present in the room administering the mentor network instrument. Where possible, as in the case of the end-of-year questionnaire, the researcher-participant collected responses anonymously to enhance reliability and validity.

The researcher-participant also recognized that simply drawing attention to the importance of induction and mentoring and mentoring in cross-race contexts had the potential to influence the research study outcomes, particularly the broader community’s participation in supporting new teachers. The researcher-participant reflected whether the broader community’s investment in mentoring of new teachers was a result of the work of the leadership project team or the attention that the research study drew to induction and mentoring or a combination of both. Likewise, the researcher-participant recognized that drawing attention to the experiences of new teachers differentiated by racial identity had the potential to influence outcomes. At one point, a new teacher of
color commented, “You know, this isn’t as much about race, you know being of color, as you’re making it out to be” (new teacher interview). This comment indicated to the researcher-participant that drawing attention to the phenomena of cross-race mentoring by studying it potentially influenced the perceptions of the research study participants.

Implications

The findings of this research study suggested a number of implications for practice, policy, further research, and the research-participant’s own leadership. This researcher-participant discusses implications in this section.

Implications for Practice

The research study findings underscored the importance of induction and mentoring in the development and retention of new teachers. All new teacher participants in the research study were still working at The Eastern School two years after the research study period. The research study suggested that an induction program design focused on mentoring as the primary vehicle for induction was effective under particular conditions. The successful elements of the Eastern School induction program featured high structure in terms of (a) clear goals, (b) well defined roles and responsibilities, (c) accountability for fulfilling responsibilities, (d) administrative attention and visibility, (e) training for mentors, (f) focus on professional development, and (g) regular feedback to mentors and new teachers. Broad investment and participation were significant to program outcomes, as revealed by the research study.

Mentoring is a professional practice that is different from teaching and involves adult learning. The research study results suggested that mentor training, holding
mentors accountable, and clearly defining mentor roles and responsibilities were effective strategies. The professional mentor role differed from the social mentor role in all three dimensions. Social mentors were not addressed as fully in training as professional mentors, administrators met regularly with professional mentors to provide feedback but also to guarantee follow-through, and the leadership project team delineated professional mentor roles and responsibilities more clearly. The comparative failure of the social mentor role accentuated the importance of these dimensions of mentoring as professional practice.

Administrators emphasized that everyone in the community was responsible for the success of new teachers. The results of the research study suggested new teachers flourish in a climate of shared responsibility and investment. New teachers developed extensive informal mentor networks largely because no one would say no when asked for help. Faculty and staff dropped what they were doing, listened, talked, and answered questions when and where the new teachers needed assistance. A question about a lesson or the needs of a child generally carries with it a sense of urgency and cannot wait until the next regularly scheduled meeting. The research study outcomes suggested such a climate results from administrators and instructional leadership openly discussing universal investment and participation and modeling this commitment in their own priorities and actions.

With respect to mentoring and induction of new teachers of color, the research study suggested that schools engaged in such work must be clear with their intent and cultivate broad investment in the plan. Affirmation from all constituents – students,
parents, colleagues, and administrators – was influential in the feelings and perceptions held by new teachers of color at the end of their first year. Without clear intent to a diversity program and broad participation by all members of a community, such affirmation is unlikely to occur spontaneously.

Likewise, the teachers of color who participated in the research study expressed fears related to being the only one and bearing a burden of representation. They suggested administrators can help new teachers of color overcome these fears by openly talking with them about them and recognizing the additional pressure that results from being a person of color in a predominantly White organization. While participants did not recognize the diversity training as a major influence in their experience, it does require diversity training for colleagues and administrators to understand and acknowledge White privilege and to reach a point where such conversations might occur. Administrators in schools considering such diversity work might consider their intentions carefully, craft appropriate goals, and cultivate broad investment before ever recruiting the first faculty member of color.

Implications for Policy

NCLB and state reform initiatives have recognized the need for induction and mentoring, as have independent school principles of good practice and accreditation agencies. However, the literature suggested that these programs were often among the first cut in tight budget years (Nevins, Patterson, & Chorney, 2007). School leaders must protect mentoring programs and educate their communities and governing boards about their importance – establish the public policy imperative to support mentoring as a
professional practice. It is only then that time and funding will be adequately allocated for high quality mentoring. Training mentors in adult development and provide opportunities for mentor collaboration and reflection are also critical actions for practitioners. This research study emphasized the importance of such programs in the first-year success and retention of new teachers. Its outcomes suggested that induction and mentoring should be fought for and preserved by administrators seeking to guarantee new teacher quality and the learning experience of children in their classrooms.

Given changes in schools and specifically new teacher induction in recent decades, the NEA and AASA Codes, written in 1975 and 1981 respectively and prior to the school reform movement, are lacking in guidance on the subject of induction, mentoring, and mentoring in cross-race contexts. Attention to these ethics codes, invaluable sources of guidance to educators, is suggested by the importance placed on induction and mentoring in social science research.

With respect to diversification of faculties and mentoring in cross-race contexts, this research study suggests that educational leaders must begin by generating broad support for teacher diversity. It cannot be assumed that simply because a school exists in an urban or a diverse community that this support is present. Providing opportunities for teachers and mentors to examine their own ethnic identity and examine issues of race, justice, and equity are important next steps. It is perhaps more important for educators to work toward a climate that openly examines bias, privilege, and diversity issues than it is for school leaders to endeavor to blindly diversify a faculty. Color blindness is an inherent privilege – to be blind to color and thus ignore the need to critically examine
what it means to be white and privileged is to deny the experience of what it means to be of color. To authentically pursue faculty diversification and mentoring of faculty of color in integrity, a school community must first journey the road of self-examination and vigilance with respect to equity and justice issues.

**Implications for Further Research**

There is an extensive research base examining mentoring and induction. Several areas did emerge, though, as possible lines of additional inquiry. The first area was how schools cultivate a climate in which new teachers develop informal mentor networks. A second area was under what circumstances new teachers seek assistance from self-selected informal mentors as compared to school-assigned formal mentors. Third, the degree to which mutuality influences new teacher learning and retention and the conditions under which mutuality develops best. Fourth, the transition of mentors from teachers of children to teachers of teachers. And lastly, the degree to which The Eastern School induction program contributed to new teachers’ development on its own learning to teach tasks would be worthwhile for additional inquiry.

Mentoring as it occurs in cross-race contexts has received little attention in educational settings. This study suggested several implications for practice and policy, but cross-race mentoring deserves more attention within schools. This is particularly important considering the changing U.S. demographics presented in Chapter One. Likewise, the phenomenon of new teachers of color stating the need to approach mentoring and induction assertively deserves further attention.
Ingersoll & Kralik (2004) and Smith & Ingersoll (2004) assert that, given the complexity of interactions within mentoring and induction programs, most studies are seriously limited by lack of controlling for variables; likewise, studies which do not include a control group are difficult to generalize from. Research should continue to examine how adult learning occurs within mentoring relationships and the factors that contribute to optimal learning conditions. How student achievement is connected to teacher mentoring is an area for additional study. Ballou and Podgursky (1998) state that few comparisons exist between public and private settings on measures aside from student performance, such as teacher mentoring. Indeed, independent schools in general are not well studied, at least relative to public contexts.

Implications for Leadership

The research-study contained valuable lessons in leadership for the research-participant. The long-term nature of the study was a meaningful lesson in sustained focus on an issue. It was also important to recognize what sustained focus on an issue can do within a community. The long-term focus on mentoring and induction did more for promoting effective practices in The Eastern School than any one-day professional development activity or consultant could have done. The program has become instilled as part of what the school does. Likewise, attention to support of faculty of color has, in the researcher-participant’s estimation, contributed to a positive climate for new teachers of color at The Eastern School. The starting point of a leadership project initiative that had broad participation, the researcher-participant believes was the instigation for the
current community-wide investment in new teacher success. Sustained focus and broad participation are two lessons for any major school reform initiative.

The researcher-participant also realized first-hand the damaging effects an ineffective teacher has on a teaching partner and other colleagues, especially when they are new. In the case of Michelle, her teaching partner was struggling and was resistant to working with her. The lack of collaboration and support was keenly felt by Michelle and often made her question whether she was approaching her practice appropriately. The lack of a positive model in the classroom next door, where there were only two sections of the same grade in the division, meant she did not have an effective model of how her grade should function. Teacher quality is often touted as a correlate to students’ experience, but it also impacts new teacher experience as well. The imbedded leadership lesson is for low tolerance for long-term indicators of a struggling teacher.

Personally, the researcher-participant learned firsthand the value of research, inquiry, and learning preceding action. In a world that favors quick fixes and easy answers, adopting a thoughtful and careful approach to a problem of practice was a valuable learning experience.

Conclusion

It bears repeating that the case of Fred and Lourdes represents the promise of schools in an increasingly multi-cultural America. One day, the researcher-participants hopes it will be commonplace to find teachers of different racial and ethnic identities working collaboratively in mentor-new teacher relationships in all kinds of schools. Open communication, mutual trust, and understanding across differences will need to
pervade in these contexts. At the time of writing with the election of President Barak Obama, that aspiration certainly seems closer to reality. Sustainability of American schools in their richness and complexity, both public and private, is contingent on accessibility and relevance to all Americans regardless of racial identity. Until the teacher force reflects a similar richness and complexity in all schools, not just those in urban settings, this dream will stop short of reality.
APPENDIX A

Informed Consent for the Research Study on Beginning Teacher Induction

You are invited to participate in a research study examining the beginning teacher induction program at The Eastern School. This is a qualitative study aligned with my doctoral work at Boston College. It will form the basis of the research for my dissertation and is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Twomey.

The purpose of the study is to determine how a beginning teacher induction program impacts new faculty at an independent school. The research has a specific focus on how orientation activities and mentoring engage new faculty of color. I am gathering data through a variety of means: questionnaire, interviews, observations, reflective journaling, focus group activities, and the examination of documents. It is my hope that the data collected will guide our decisions on how to improve induction practices and best support new faculty of color at The Eastern School.

The exact amount of time required will vary according to the role of each participant. It is my intent to respect your time and to inform you in advance of a specific activity of the time required. There is no financial payment for participation, although it is hoped your contributions to the study will enhance the experience of future new teachers at The Eastern School.

You are free to ask questions at any time, and you can withdraw from the study at any point. Your participation or withdrawal will have no impact on your performance as a school employee. Some activities will be audio-taped for the purpose of accurately collecting data, and I will provide you with a transcription for you to review its content for accuracy. Your confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed; the name of the school and the participants will be camouflaged in the final report. Thank you for your consideration, involvement, and time.

Signature of Participant: _______________________________

Print Name: _________________________________________

Date: _______________________________________________
APPENDIX B

Recent Hire Focus Group Protocol

Qualifying criteria:
1. Hired within last five years.
2. Currently a lead teacher.
3. Consented to participate.

Purposes:
1. To collect pre-intervention data.
2. To find out what being new to The Eastern School was like for new teachers prior to intervention.
3. To determine the extent that the previous model impacted their feelings of professional satisfaction, efficacy, and connection to the community.
4. To determine the degree to which they formed a relationship with their mentors.

Protocol:
1. Explain purpose.
2. Review informed consent protections.
3. Call attention to the fact that activity is being recorded and why.
4. Set time limit.
5. Set ground rules for group discussion.
   a. One speaker at a time
   b. Active listening
   c. Speak from the “I” perspective
   d. Respect others’ experience
   e. Lean into discomfort
   f. If you want to pass, that’s OK
   g. What’s said in room stays in room
6. Questions:
   a. Round robin focus on a feeling – finish phrase – “During my first year I often felt…”
   b. What stands out in your mind most from orientation?
   c. How many times did you see your professional mentor during the first year?
   d. Using a word or a phrase, describe your relationship with your professional mentor.
   e. In what ways could we have better prepared you for your first year?
   f. In what ways did orientation and mentoring help you feel effective as a teacher?
   g. In what ways did orientation and mentoring help you feel connected to the school community?
   h. What else do you feel the school should do in support of new teachers?
APPENDIX C1

New Teacher Interview Protocol

Qualifying criteria:
1. Hired as teacher or assistant at start of research study period.
2. Consented to participate.

Purpose:
1. To gather data related to research questions from beginning teacher participants.

Protocol:
1. Explain purpose.
2. Review informed consent protections.
3. Call attention to the fact that activity is being recorded and why.
4. Set time limit.
5. Questions:
   a. Look at pictograph and identify the most significant mentors to you this year in terms of the amount of time you have spent with them and the effectiveness and value of the relationship to you professionally. Change the size of the circle base on the degree of impact - larger for greater impact, smaller for less.
   b. Who is not on here? That can include mentor support outside of Eastern.
   c. In a few words or phrases, how would you describe your relationship with each person on the pictograph, including those you have added?
   d. Think of the most effective mentoring contact you’ve had so far this year – this can be with anyone on your pictograph. Who was it with?
   e. Describe what happened.
   f. Think of a mentoring experience that hasn’t worked well; where you’ve left feeling deflated or undervalued. Describe what happened.
   g. What are the characteristics or attitudes of the ideal mentor?
   h. Describe how your feeling of being effective as a teacher has changed over the course of the year.
   i. Describe your feeling of professional satisfaction with your job.
   j. To what extent has your relationship with your support network contributed to this?
   k. Describe your feeling of connection to Eastern as a community.
   l. To what extent have the activities to support new teachers contributed to this feeling?
   m. What should I be asking about the experience of new teachers Eastern?
6. Additional questions for new teachers of color:
   a. What is the ideal mentor like for a faculty member of color?
   b. Suppose this is next school year and I am a person of color sitting in orientation. What would be going through my head?
c. What things has Eastern done this year to support faculty of color specifically?
d. If you were planning ways or activities to support faculty of color specifically at Eastern, what else would you add? (If interviewee does not mention affinity groups, ask)
APPENDIX C2

Mentor Network Instrument

Purposes:
1. To determine relative degree and nature of influence among formal mentor sources.
2. To identify informal mentor sources and determine relative degree and nature of influence.

Protocol:
This instrument is used as part of the Beginning Teacher Interview Protocol. Researcher will fill names in during interview, then camouflage for analysis, reporting, and storage.

Prompt:
Look at graphic that shows formal mentor relationships – professional and social mentors, division administrator, instruction leader(s), and head of school. Identify your most significant mentors in terms of the amount of time you spend with them and the effectiveness and value of the relationship to you professionally. Make the size of circle larger for greater influence, smaller for less – relative to each other.

As you adjust the size of each circle, describe the relationship using a few sentences, phrases or adjectives.

Who is not on here? Anyone who has served informally in a mentor role? Describe those relationships as you add informal mentors.
Sample:
APPENDIX D

Interview Protocol with Instructional Leaders and Professional Mentors

Qualifying criteria:
1. Currently serving as an instructional leader or professional mentor working with a new teacher participant in the research study.
2. Consented to participate.

Purpose:
1. To collect data regarding perceptions of beginning teacher induction from primary mentors.

Protocol:
1. Explain purpose.
2. Review informed consent protections.
3. Call attention to the fact that activity is being recorded and why.
4. Set time limit.
5. Questions:
   a. Describe your perceptions about the change in the number and needs of new teachers over the last five years.
   b. How do you feel the level of support for new teachers offered at Shore has changed over the same time period?
   c. What are the ideal characteristics and attitudes of a professional mentor / instructional leader for a new faculty member?
   d. Would you add any attributes for a mentor of a new faculty member of color?
   e. What are the most important actions a mentor can take in support of a new teacher?
   f. In what ways do we build up a new faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher?
   g. In what ways do we promote new teachers’ connection to the community?
   h. How would you describe your relationship with your new teacher?
   i. If you were to recommend improvements to the current induction program, what would they be?
   j. What questions have I not asked that you believe are important to understanding your work with new teachers?
APPENDIX E

Reflection Journal Protocol

Procedure for reflection journal:
Each week during the research study period, record your thoughts and feelings pertaining to your work with the people formally supporting you during your first year of teaching - your mentors, instructional leaders, and division administrators. Note meetings that you have, topics discussed, and most importantly how these activities are helping you in your development as a new teacher.

Also, at some point prior to each due date, reflect on the prompts below and write a response to each.

Turn in a copy of your journal to the collection box in the Office by mid-January, mid-April, and the beginning of June.

Feel free to handwrite or compose on the computer. Do not worry about spelling, grammar, or structure – just focus on getting your thoughts down on paper. Thank you.

Reflection Journal 1 Prompts: (before due date in January)
Think back to your hire, early communication, and orientation. What advice would you give to the school about hiring new teachers and making them feel included in the community and supported professionally to teach?

Think back to the fall. Is there an event that you feel was your first success story as a teacher? A great lesson, a student you reached, a good connection with a parent, or something else? Describe the event and why it made you feel successful. Who did you most want to share this success with?

Reflection Journal 2 Prompt: (before due date in April)
What do you take home with you after an average day of teaching? Don’t think about the books and papers. Identify the feelings, positive and negative, the impressions, the baggage that lingers after working with kids all day long. Perhaps take the angle of reflecting on a specific memorable day. Or, consider how do you feel on Sunday night with a full week of teaching ahead of you?

Reflection Journal 3 Prompt: (before due date in June)
In what ways do you describe yourself professionally as a teacher to your friends or family? Has this changed in any way over the course of your first year teaching at the school?
APPENDIX F

Mentor-New Teacher Observation Protocol

Qualifying criteria:
1. Interaction between new teacher participant and a formal assigned mentor.
2. Consented to participate.

Purpose:
To observe at least one interaction between a new teacher participant and a formally assigned mentor. To observe actual mentor attributes and behaviors and interactions that influence new teachers’ feelings of satisfaction, efficacy, and connection.

Protocol:
1. Explain purpose.
2. Review informed consent protections.
3. Call attention to the fact that activity is being recorded and why.
4. Researcher-participant observation guide:
   a. What is the purpose of the interaction?
   b. What is the role of the mentor?
   c. What is the role of the new teacher?
   d. What are significant behaviors or attributes displayed by the mentor?
   e. In what ways is this interaction influencing new teacher’s professional satisfaction, efficacy, or connection to the school community?
APPENDIX G

New Teacher Final Questionnaire

Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you a lead teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you an assistant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have you self-identified as a person of color for the purposes of this research study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connection, Satisfaction, and Efficacy

Rate your feelings about the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your connection to the school community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your professional satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your sense of efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe how working with your professional mentor and social mentor have influenced your feelings of connection, satisfaction, and efficacy.

Efficacy

Efficacy describes your perception of your own ability to function effectively as a teacher. How much did the following induction activities contribute to your sense of efficacy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No contribution</th>
<th>Little contribution</th>
<th>Some contribution</th>
<th>Significant contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New employee orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional mentor support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social mentor support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other peer support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
division administrator
October follow-up with head of school
Professional development in faculty meetings
Outside professional development
Observations and feedback from colleagues
Observations and feedback from administrators
Annual review with division administrator

Connection to School Community

How much did the following activities or interactions influence your feelings of connection to the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>A little influence</th>
<th>Some influence</th>
<th>Significant Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Satisfaction

Rate how professionally satisfied you are with your first year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentor Support
Which attributes or behaviors did you find helpful in your professional mentor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute/Behavior</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept professional distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed personal relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived by colleagues to be effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same age as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same racial identity as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different racial identity than you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to give critical feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had participated in diversity training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches at same grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches in similar subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar teaching style to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to offer advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped you problem solve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let you figure it out on your own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which attributes or behaviors did you find helpful in your social mentor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute/Behavior</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept professional distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed personal relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived by colleagues to be effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same age as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same racial identity as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different racial identity than you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to give critical feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had participated in diversity training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches at same grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches in similar subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar teaching style to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to offer advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped you problem solve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let you figure it out on your own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Timeline of Actions within the Leadership Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Held preliminary conversations with administration regarding current state of new teacher orientation and mentoring given recent examples of struggling beginning teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Held preliminary conversations with instructional leadership about recent examples of struggling beginning teachers and the need for better support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formed leadership project team consisting of administrators and instructional leadership to investigate new program of induction and mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducted review of literature on best practice in teacher induction and mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Met with focus group of recently hired teachers to gather baseline data on induction and mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership project team held two planning sessions to outline induction and mentoring goals, program structure, roles and responsibilities, orientation activities, mentor training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussed need for Year II mentoring; agreed to revisit topic spring 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sent notes from meeting to full administrative team for review; incorporated comments into final plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepared proposal for fall administrative team planning retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership project team organized mentor training; reported back to division administrators; finalized plans for new teacher orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative team revised new employee and employee orientations according to leadership project team recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Employee Orientation; topics focused on mission, philosophy, school culture, diversity (NCBI), communication, procedures/policies, classroom management, classroom organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opening Division Meetings: supporting new teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Held mentor training; mentor feed-back used to enhance induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study skills specialists held workshops for new teachers and assistants on accommodating individual differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional leadership began to meet with new faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• September faculty meeting topics: Back to School Night and narrative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elementary division administrator began to meet weekly with assistant teachers to review progress, answer questions, and offer mini-workshops on novice teacher topics (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Within first six weeks, professional mentors observed new teachers and met to provide feedback; new teachers observed professional mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional leaders observed at least once</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division administrators began walk-thrus and semi-weekly meetings with new teachers (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• October faculty meeting topics: conferences and student assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division administrators began meeting with instructional leaders to coach them on mentoring (ongoing); highlighted events for mentors in newsletters (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Head of school met with new faculty/staff and social mentors for celebration of first month of school and check-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division administrators and instructional leadership continued to meetings - focus was follow-up to parent conferences and preparing for narrative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty meetings: The content of narratives and student writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional leadership team meeting: Researcher-participant presented to instructional leadership team on how to develop new teacher efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional mentors observed new teachers a second time and met formally to offer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division administrators observed new teachers and offered formal feedback at regular meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division administrators met weekly to discuss mentoring, new teacher progress (ongoing), and to evaluate new program; reported to administrative team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division administrators continued meetings with new teachers and instructional leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty meetings: Intelligence and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructional leaders completed observations and feedback with new teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All new and veteran teachers of color invited to attend NAIS-sponsored People of Color Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Timeline of Actions within the Leadership Project (January 2007-Summer 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Division administrators continued meetings with new teachers and instructional leaders</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Division administrators continued meetings with new teachers and instructional leaders</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Division administrators continued meetings with new teachers and instructional leaders</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Division administrators continued meetings with new teachers and instructional leaders</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Division administrators held annual reviews with new teachers; discussed Year II faculty evaluations</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Collaborated with instructional; leadership team to evaluate 06-07 induction program and plan for Year II mentoring of second-year teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Faculty meetings: Rick LaVoie video - <em>FAT City</em> on learning disabilities</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Faculty meetings: February parent conference / differences from fall / grounds for recommending summer work</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Faculty meetings: Oliver Button is Star video in preparation for March workshop on Human Sexuality in the Curriculum</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Faculty meetings: Reminder to mentors to review end-of-year events with new teachers; US – awards criteria</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Faculty meetings: End-of-year events</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Division administrators held planning sessions in summer to restructure mentor roles, plan for Year II support, restructure Year II faculty evaluation to support development of high-quality faculty; possible continuation of mentoring into Year III for teachers with need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Instructional leaders continued meeting with new teachers – at this time these meetings became increasingly informal</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Instructional leaders continued meeting with new teachers</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Instructional leaders continued meeting with new teachers</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Division administrators met to evaluate induction and mentoring for this year; discussed meeting with instructional leadership team to evaluate with instructional leadership and plan for continuation of mentoring in Year II</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Met with focus group of 06-07 social mentors to evaluate role and make recommendations to instructional leadership team and administrative team for its revision</td>
<td><img src="bullet_list" alt="Bullet list" /> Administrative team retreat – major topics: induction and mentoring for next year; evaluation of 06-07 program; weakness of social mentor role; how to continue mentoring in Year II; how to use second-year teachers in mentoring capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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