DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 234 SP 031 564

AUTHOR Mager, Gerald M.; Corwin, Carol
TITLE The Mentor-Intern Relationship: A Report to the State Education Department on the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program for 1987-1988.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 110p.; For the first year's report, see ED 303 421.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Internship Programs; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Mentors; Program Attitudes; Program Evaluation; State Programs; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Prog

ABSTRACT

The central feature of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program is the establishment of a relationship between an experienced, highly regarded teacher and one who is just beginning the work of teaching or is beginning to teach in a different area of certification. Building on the results of the first year's statewide evaluation, the second year evaluation design was set to pursue many of the same questions that guided the collection of data in the first year, particularly those which bore directly or indirectly on the mentor-intern relationship. Six survey instruments were developed. Interns and mentors were the chief sources of information; local project coordinators were also surveyed for perspective. Interviews at selected sites provided further insight. The first section of the report reviews the backgrounds of the teacher participants. The second section reviews several matters regarding the matches made between interns and mentors. In the third section, descriptions are presented of how the relationships were begun, followed by a section on the problems encountered in the projects. The fifth section reviews experiences in the relationships generally, and expectations regarding the continuation of the relationships in the coming year. (JD)

A Report

to the

State Education Department

on the

New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program

for

1987-1988

THE MENTOR-INTERN RELATIONSHIP

prepared by

Dr. Gerald M. Mager

with

Carol Corwin

Division for the Study of Teaching
School of Education
Syracuse University

November, 1988

Preface

This report is one of a series of reports issued in conjunction with the Statewide Evaluation of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program. It is based on data collected and analyzed in the second year of the Program, 1987-1988. It is intended to focus attention on one of the aspects of the Program that has been judged critical to understanding and making decisions regarding the Program or one of the local projects it sponsors. The entire series of reports should be read to develop an understanding of the Program as a whole and to place each report in perspective.

In preparing this report, special assistance was provided on particular sections by Ms. Rosemary Frenyea of the Plattsburgh City Schools, and Ms. Mary Harder and Mr. Gary DeBolt of the Division for the Study of Teaching at Syracuse University. Those sections are marked in the text as they are presented.

Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

The central feature of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship (MT-I) Program is the establishment of a relationship between an experienced, highly regarded teacher and one who is just beginning the work of teaching or is beginning to teach in a different area of certification. Through this relationship, the primary goal of the Program is pursued: easing the entry of new teachers into the work of teaching and the profession. A highly individualized, personalized induction experience can result.

Much of the resource of the MT-I Program is directed at forming such a relationship and supporting its development over the course of the school year. The intern and mentor are given time, released from instructional responsibilities, so that they may work together on matters that they judge important. Often, project activities are planned to initiate the relationship between the two teachers, and to assist the pair with the developing relationship during the school year. Seminars, training workshops, and written and audio-visual materials on topics of interest to the intern and mentor are provided by the project as means of support. Project planners, the coordinator, and others in the school building and district make decisions and address problems so that the intern and mentor can pursue their work in the most effective and satisfying ways. All of these arrangements and efforts recognize the mentor-intern relationship as the central feature of the MT-I Program.

The Statewide Evaluation of the first-year of the MT-I Program, 1986-1987, pointed to the importance of focusing on and understanding the mentor-intern relationship. The report of that evaluation presented an extensive summary and analysis of data that had been collected over the course of the year from interns and mentors, and a number of other project participants, about the relationships as they had developed in that year's Program. From the analysis, a number of conclusions were drawn, and a series of recommendations to policy makers, project planners, and mentors and interns themselves were set forth. Clearly, however, much was still to be learned about the relationship generally, and the many particulars of how such relationships could be formed and sustained.

In the second year of the MT-I Program, 29 pilot projects were funded through state grants. Of those, only 15 were among the projects funded in the first year. Thus a good number of new projects were initiated, and consequently, a number of different project designs were introduced. Importantly, the numbers of interns and mentors also increased; potentially, the nature and scope of their experiences could be different from that of first year participants.

Purpose of Studying the Mentor-Intern Relationship

In planning the second year's Statewide Evaluation of the MT-I Program, it seemed necessary once again to make the mentor-intern relationship one of the central foci of the study design. As the number of projects increased, as the number of interns and

mentors increased, and as new persons became participants in the various projects, it seemed useful to determine whether the results of the first year's evaluation study would hold true, and to discover what more could be learned from a new set of participants. By documenting and reporting on another year of experiences, the evaluation study effort would expand and deepen the knowledge base regarding the concept and practices of mentoring.

Building on the results of the first year's Statewide Evaluation, the second year evaluation design was set to pursue many of the same questions that had guided the collection of data in the first year, particularly those which bore directly or indirectly on the mentor-intern relationship. The following questions are excerpted from the second year evaluation study design as representative of that focus:

A. What are the demographic and professional background characteristics of the mentor and intern participants?

   1. What are their academic preparations, teaching credentials, and years of teaching experience?

   2. What are the ranges of age represented among mentors and interns, and what portions of each group are male and female?

   3. What are their prior experiences, if any, with mentoring?

   4. What are their understandings of the purposes and structures of the mentor-intern project?

B. What impact does the local project have on the mentors and interns, and the school organization?

   1. What is the short-term (within the first year of teaching) impact of the project on the intern's performance?

2. What is the short-term impact of the project on the intern's satisfaction?

3. What is the degree of congruence between the intern's and mentor's perceptions of the short-term impact of the project?

5. What is the impact of the project on the mentor?

D. What is the nature of the MT-I Program at the mentor-intern relationship level?

1. How does the relationship begin? How does it change? How is it brought to an end?

2. What events occur which chronicle the relationship, perhaps fostering or impeding the relationship?

3. What is the focus of issues addressed between the mentor and intern?

4. What activity structures do the mentor and intern design and use in the relationship?

5. What roles do the mentor and intern set for themselves in the relationship?

If responses to these questions could be developed, the second year evaluation study would contribute, as did the first year study, to the work of policy makers, project planners, and mentors and interns in the coming years. In pursuit of such knowledge, the second year Statewide Evaluation was undertaken.

Procedures Used in Studying the Relationship

As in the first year evaluation study, a number of sources of experience were tapped to collect the data needed to respond to the study questions. Interns and mentors remained the chief sources of information; local project coordinators were also surveyed for their perspectives on the projects and, particularly relevant here, on aspects of the mentor-intern

relationship.

Altogether, six instruments were used in the collection of data regarding the relationship. Distribution of the instruments spanned a six month period, roughly from January to June. In addition to the collection of data through paper-pencil forms, a number of site visits were made to selected projects during which discussions and interviews often focused on the work of the various interns and mentors, providing yet further insight into the mentor-intern relationship.

Data collection proceeded chiefly through direct mailings between the study team and participants in 28 of the 29 projects. In one large project, data collection was undertaken through means set by the local project evaluators. This was done to maximize response rates and to minimize duplication of effort. However, the instruments and schedules used in collecting data in that project differed from the larger statewide effort: the results were less easily integrated into the overall data pool, and thus that project is not well represented in the presentation of results which follows.

The following describes each of the instruments used in collecting data related to the mentor-intern relationship. Also provided are the rates of response, and the general procedure used in analysis of the data collected.

Focused Log (FL). Three instruments were modified from the first year evaluation study as a means by which interns and mentors could provide their perspectives on particular matters

of interest to the Statewide Evaluation team. Included were a combination of open-ended questions and rating scale-like questions. Each FL was one or two pages in length. Separate forms were developed for the interns and mentors. The focus of each of the FLs was as follows:

March Log
- for interns, on their interest and willingness to participate in the project, and problems encountered as a beginning teacher;
- for mentors, start-up of the project, first steps taken as a mentor, and project-related problems;

April Log
- for interns and mentors, the mentor:intern ratio, the matches made, and personal characteristics seen as important in the success of the relationship;

May Log
- for interns and mentors, the experience of participating in the relationship and its continuation;
- for mentors, the difficulty of the intern's teaching assignment for the year.

The numbers of FL forms mailed to participating teachers, the response rates, are displayed in Table 1. The overall response rate for interns was .58, and for mentors .73. These rates are judged to be acceptable.

Responses to the FLs were studied to develop an understanding of the interns' and mentors' views. Responses to open-ended questions were read to identify common and unique experiences; development of categories and counts of frequencies were sometimes undertaken with these data. Responses to the rating scale-like questions were treated quantitatively; frequencies and means of responses were developed.

Table 1
Numbers of Focused Log Forms Mailed and Response Rates

Participant Teachers	Month		
	March	April	May
Interns	341 (.58)	340 (.63)	340 (.53)
Mentors	163 (.72)	163 (.78)	163 (.68)

Note. The whole number in each set represents the number of forms mailed; the numbers in parentheses are the response rates.

Demographic and Professional Background (D&PB) Questionnaire. This instrument was adapted from the similar instrument developed and used in the first year evaluation study. It requested information regarding selected demographics: sex and year of birth. It also requested information on a range of professional background characteristics: academic background, teaching certification, teaching history, and current teaching position. Parallel forms were developed for interns and mentors, the former being three pages in length, and the latter being four.

This instrument was mailed to participating teachers in March. Altogether, 341 forms were mailed to interns, with a response rate of .74; 164 forms were mailed to mentors, with a response rate of .83. These rates of response are judged to be acceptable.

Responses on the D&PB Questionnaire were coded and entered into a computer file for analysis through the use of an available statistical package. Simple frequencies were developed where

appropriate; in some instances, means were calculated.

Beginning Teacher Views of Self (BTVoS) Questionnaire. This instrument was developed and used in the first year evaluation study; with a few minor modifications, it was used again in the second year.

This instrument was designed to provide a measure of the impact of the project on the intern teachers. The instrument asks respondents to describe themselves on a series of 28 items taken from the literature as "areas in which beginning teachers may cite changes in their views of themselves." Generally, the items address matters of planning and delivering instruction, classroom management, becoming part of the school as an organization and social system, and developing undertandings of self as an adult and as a teacher. Respondents report their views by placing themselves on a seven-point continuum. Respondents are also asked to report how many years of teaching experience they have had prior to the internship year, their sex, and the type of teaching certificate they currently hold (temporary/emergency, provisional, or permanent)

The BTVoS Questionnaire would seem, at least to have content validity. The items are drawn from a range of literature on the beginning teacher's experience, and they are similar to items on other instruments developed for parallel but not indentical purposes. By and large, respondents in the first year evaluation study did not relay having difficulty in using the instrument to report their views, suggesting that as a whole,

the instrument was not foreign to their experience. The reliability of the BTVoS Questionnaire was estimated by computing the Cronbach coefficient alpha, or, the interclass correlation on the 28 items; to do so, data from the May, 1987, responses from the intern and comparison group teachers were used, yielding values for alpha of 0.958 and 0.911 respectively.

The BTVoS Questionnaire was first mailed to participating intern teachers in February; at that time, 348 forms were mailed, with a response rate of .70. The BTVoS Questionnaire was mailed a second time in June; 340 forms were mailed with a response rate of .55. These rates of response are judged to be acceptable. The two administrations of the BTVoS Questionnaire made it possible to look for changes in the views of the interns as the year progressed. The February and June respondent groups are not identical because of irregularity of response, but they are comparable. Ideally, the two administrations should have been separated by a longer span of time within the school year in order to detect more precisely the impact on the interns of participating in the projects; logistical constraints in starting-up projects, and in engaging the projects and participants in the Statewide Evaluation made that impossible. Nonetheless, it was judged useful to undertake the effort even with the shorter time span between administrations.

In conjunction with the second administration of the BTVoS Questionnaire to interns, a comparison group of beginning teachers was also surveyed. This comparison group was selected

ramdomly from a statewide list of teachers in their first year of teaching. Teachers in all districts within the state were eligible for inclusion in the group, except those in the 29 project site districts. Altogether, 413 forms were mailed, with a response rate of .51, which is low, but probably sufficient for the purposes for which these data are to be used. Administering the BTVoS Questionnaire to such a comparison group created the opportunity to note similarities and differences in responses between beginning teachers who were participating as interns in one of the state sponsored mentor-intern projects and those who were not involved as such.

The BTVoS Questionnaire data were analyzed by calculating means for each of the 28 items, and developing comparisons between results on the two administrations involving intern teachers, and between results of the second intern administration and the comparison group teachers. Further comparisons within the intern group responses were developed considering years of teaching experience and type of certification.

Local Project Coordinator (LPC) Questionnaire. Three instruments were used to collect information from and the views of the persons who served as the local project coordinators. One of these instruments addressed the mentor-intern relationship. This instrument was adapted from an instrument developed and used in the first year evaluation study.

The LPC Questionnaire #1 was three pages in length, and focused on several different matters: on the matches between the

interns and mentors, training resources, and released time arrangements. The forms were mailed in April to each of the 29 local project coordinators. Responses received numbered 21.

The responses were analyzed to identify facts and events descriptive of the local projects, and particularly relevant to this report, those matters bearing on or descriptive of the mentor-intern relationships.

A Concern about Confidentiality

As in the first year, the Statewide Evaluation team worked to establish a trust between the team and those project participants who would be called on to provide information about their experiences. Given such a trust, participants would provide candid and forthright responses to the questions on survey forms and in interviews, and the evaluation team would assure that no individuals, schools, or districts would be placed in jeopardy. Thus, as in the first year, project participants were assured that their views would be held confidential. And efforts were undertaken to mask the identities of the interns, mentors, project coordinators, and other respondents such that through the data collection procedures, analysis, and reporting no inadvertent harm would come to them or their associates.

First, participants from whom regular responses would be expected were assigned code numbers known only to the study team; these code numbers were the only identifiers placed on the survey forms mailed out. Participants from whom less regular responses would be expected were identified only through more general code

numbers assigned to the projects. Second, all response forms were mailed directly to the participants, and self-addressed, stamped envelopes were provided for direct return of the forms to the Statewide Evaluation team in Syracuse. Thus, there was no opportunity for review of the responses by any persons other than team members. Third, in face-to-face interviews, statements made in one interview were not shared with other participants in subsequent interviews, even for purposes of confirmation or clarity. Field notes and tape recordings made in interviews were held private and were collected and stored in Syracuse.

Though there was regular contact between members of the Statewide Evaluation team and members of the State Education Department staff, under no circumstances were any of the data collected shared with personnel from those offices. Reports about the progress of the study and preliminary results were made without specific references to persons or projects.

In this report and other reports written as a part of the second year Statewide Evaluation, no individuals, nor any specific projects are identified directly. Descriptions offered are general descriptions. Where it is necessary to describe the experiences of particular individuals or districts, steps have been taken to conceal identities.

Results regarding the Mentor-Intern Relationship

The results will be reported in six sections. The first section will review the backgrounds of the teacher participants. The second section will review several matters regarding the matches made between interns and mentors. The third section will present descriptions of how the relationships were begun, followed by a section on the problems encountered in the projects. The fifth section will review the perceived effects of participating in the projects on the interns and mentors. The final section will review experiences in the relationships generally, and expectations regarding the continuation of the relationships in the coming year.

Demographic and Professional Backgrounds

The participating interns and mentors were asked to provide information regarding selected demographic characteristics and their professional backgrounds. Such information allows for an understanding of the ranges and norms of experience in the backgrounds of the participants. Summaries of the reported information are presented below.

Sex and age. Table 2 summarizes the distribution of the interns and mentors into sex and age categories. Reviewing the table it can be seen that the intern and mentor groups were both overwhelmingly female, though there were proportionally more males among the mentors. More than half of the intern group was under 30 years of age; a majority of the mentors fell into the 36 to 50 age categories. It should be noted, however, that a third

Table 2
Interns and Mentors Distributed by Sex and Age

	Interns (n = 254)	Mentors (n = 137)
Sex		
female	209 (.82)	102 (.74)
male	45 (.18)	35 (.26)
Age		
no response	2	3
under 26	92 (.37)	--
26 - 30	51 (.20)	12 (.09)
31 - 35	26 (.10)	15 (.11)
36 - 40	38 (.15)	34 (.25)
41 - 45	30 (.12)	26 (.19)
46 - 50	11 (.04)	22 (.16)
51 - 55	4 (.02)	17 (.13)
56 - 60	--	7 (.05)
over 60	--	1 (.01)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages.

of the interns were over 36 years of age, and nearly a tenth of the mentors were 30 years of age or younger.

Academic background and certification. The interns and mentors were asked to indicate whether their academic study had been in the field of education. Tables 3 and 4 display their responses. Nearly two-thirds of the interns and three-quarters of the mentors had completed undergraduate study with a degree in education; one-third of the interns and three-quarters of the mentors had completed graduate study in education.

The interns and mentors were asked to name the colleges and universities at which they had studied, the degrees they had

earned, the years in which their degrees had been earned. Tables 3 and 4 display their responses to these questions as well. The majority of the interns held Bachelor of Science degrees, and the majority completed their undergraduate degrees within the last four years. Over a third of the interns had completed graduate study programs, over two-thirds of which were Master of Science degrees. A similar majority of the mentors held Bachelor of Science degrees, but more than a majority had completed their undergraduate studies in 1970 or before. Nearly half of the mentors completed their graduate studies in the 1970's.

Table 3
Academic Backgrounds of the Interns

	number (n = 254)
Degrees in Education	
undergraduate degree	
yes	169 (.66)
no	85 (.33)
graduate degree	
no response	9
yes	85 (.35)
no	160 (.65)
Nature of Undergraduate Institution Attended	
no response or no undergraduate study	9
state college	97 (.40)
small private college	72 (.29)
large private college	37 (.15)
state university	39 (.16)

Table 3, continued

Undergraduate Degree Earned		
no response or no degree earned	7	
Bachelor of Arts	101	(.41)
Bachelor of Science	143	(.58)
Bachelor of Fine Arts	1	(.00)
Bachelor of Business Administration	2	(.01)
Year Undergraduate Degree Earned		
no response or no degree earned	7	
before 1970	30	(.12)
1970 - 1979	50	(.20)
1980 - 1983	38	(.15)
1984	20	(.08)
1985	26	(.10)
1986	31	(.13)
1987	52	(.21)
Nature of Graduate Institution Attended		
no response or no graduate study	161	
state college	16	(.17)
small private college	23	(.25)
large private college	38	(.41)
state university	16	(.17)
Graduate Degree Earned		
no response or no degree earned	164	
Master of Arts	27	(.30)
Master of Science	62	(.69)
doctorate	1	(.01)
Year Graduate Degree Earned		
no response or no degree earned	164	
before 1980	17	(.19)
1980 - 1983	11	(.12)
1984	1	(.01)
1985	--	
1986	13	(.14)
1987	40	(.44)
1988 (projected)	8	(.09)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages.

Table 4
Academic Backgrounds of the Mentors

	number (n = 137)
Degrees in Education	
undergraduate degree	
yes	103 (.75)
no	34 (.25)
graduate degree	
no response	1
yes	102 (.75)
no	34 (.25)
Nature of Undergraduate Institution Attended	
no response or no undergraduate study	5
state college	70 (.53)
small private college	27 (.20)
large private college	22 (.17)
state university	13 (.10)
Undergraduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree earned	4
Bachelor of Arts	55 (.41)
Bachelor of Science	77 (.58)
Bachelor of Business Administration	1 (.01)
Year Undergraduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree earned	5
before 1951	3 (.02)
1951 - 1955	6 (.04)
1956 - 1960	16 (.12)
1961 - 1965	25 (.19)
1966 - 1970	29 (.22)
1971 - 1975	28 (.21)
1976 - 1980	17 (.13)
after 1980	8 (.06)

Table 4, continued

Nature of Graduate Institution Attended	
no response or no graduate study	26
state college	42 (.38)
small private college	14 (.13)
large private college	39 (.35)
state university	16 (.14)
Graduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree earned	26
Master of Arts	31 (.28)
Master of Science	69 (.62)
Master of Business Admininstration	2 (.02)
Certificate of Advanced Study	2 (.02)
doctorate	1 (.01)
school administrator and supervisor certificate	2 (.02)
school district administrator certificate	4 (.04)
Year Graduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree earned	29
before 1960	2 (.02)
1960 - 1969	13 (.12)
1970 - 1979	50 (.46)
1980 - 1983	16 (.15)
1984	4 (.04)
1985	6 (.06)
1986	5 (.05)
1987	9 (.08)
1988 (projected)	3 (.03)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages.

The interns and mentors were asked to describe their teaching certifications. Their reports as summarized in Table 5. Over four-fifths of the interns were awarded their presently used certification based on study at a college or university in New York State; less than one-fifth presumably studied out of state, or were awarded certificates on the basis of experience or on an emergency basis. Of the mentors, over nine-tenths reported using

Table 5
Certifications of the Interns and Mentors

	Interns (n = 254)	Mentors (n = 137)
Certification Awarded after Study at a New York State College or University		
no response	6	2
yes	204 (.82)	125 (.93)
no	44 (.18)	10 (.07)
Certificate Status		
no response	9	1
emergency	16 (.06)	--
provisional	185 (.75)	7 (.05)
permanent	44 (.18)	129 (.95)
Certificate Areas		
no response or no credential	20	2
elementary (K-6, N-6, N-9)	108	72
reading	9	9
English	19	13
mathematics	10	9
social studies	16	9
general science	7	3
Earth science	4	2
biology	10	4
chemistry	5	3
physics	2	1
health	1	3
French	2	2
Spanish	7	4
Italian	--	1
German	1	--
Latin	1	--
TESOL/ESL	10	7
bilingual/multicultural	--	1
art	8	4
music	12	8
physical education	11	6
home economics	3	3
industrial arts	1	2
business education	3	2

Table 5, continued

driver education	1	1
outdoor education	1	--
special education	66	43
speech and hearing	5	4
media specialist	--	3
guidance	4	3
educational administration	--	8

Note. The numbers exceed the total numbers of respondents since individuals may hold more than one certificate.

certificates based on study in New York State; less than one-tenth reported otherwise.

The interns and mentors were asked to describe the status of each of their New York State teaching certificates. Table 5 displays these results as well. Less than one-tenth of the interns were teaching with emergency certificates, three-quarters with provisional certificates, and nearly one-fifth with permanent certificates. Nearly all of the mentors held permanent certificates.

Interns and mentors were also asked to identify the certificate area. Table 5 summarizes their responses to this question as well. Half of the mentors reported holding two or more certificates; about one-third of the interns reported the same.

Mentors' teaching histories and experiences. Mentors were asked to describe their teaching histories by providing the number of years of teaching experience they had, the years of experience in the current school district, and the years of

experience in the current school building. Table 6 displays the results. More than a majority of the mentors had more than 15 years of experience in teaching, and two-thirds had over 10 years of experience in their current school districts.

Mentors were also asked to describe their experience with mentoring: having had a mentor as a new teacher or at some point in their teaching career; and their experience with teacher preparation or induction: having worked with student teachers or with beginning teachers. Table 6 displays the results as well. Less than one-third of the mentors had mentors as they started their own teaching careers; about two-fifths reported that they had mentors at some point in their careers. Three-quarters of the mentors reported that they had experience working with student teachers in teacher preparation programs; nearly all of the mentors reported having assisted beginning teachers.

Table 6
Teaching Histories and Experiences of the Mentors

	number (n = 137)
Teaching History	
years of experience	
no response	1
4 - 5	6 (.04)
6 - 10	20 (.19)
11 - 15	28 (.21)
16 - 20	41 (.30)
21 - 25	25 (.18)
26 - 30	9 (.07)
over 30	7 (.05)

Table 6, continued

years of experience in current district		
no response	1	
1 - 2	3	(.02)
3 - 5	19	(.14)
6 - 10	24	(.18)
11 - 15	29	(.21)
16 - 20	40	(.29)
21 - 25	14	(.10)
26 - 30	5	(.02)
over 30	4	(.03)
years of experience in current school		
no response	9	
1	3	(.02)
2	8	(.06)
3 - 5	23	(.18)
6 - 10	32	(.25)
11 - 15	19	(.15)
16 - 20	32	(.25)
21 - 26, 34	11	(.09)
Experience with Mentoring		
had a mentor at start of career		
no response	1	
no	96	(.71)
yes	40	(.29)
had a mentor during career		
no response	2	
no	78	(.58)
yes	57	(.42)
Experience with Teacher Preparation and Induction		
number of student teachers sponsored		
none	36	(.26)
1 - 3	43	(.31)
4 - 10	36	(.26)
more than 10	22	(.16)
number of beginning teachers assisted		
none	7	(.05)
1	16	(.12)
2 - 3	44	(.32)
more than 3	70	(.51)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages.

Current teaching positions. Interns and mentors were asked to provide information which describes their current teaching positions. Table 7 summarizes their reports. Twenty mentors reported holding no current teaching assignment, but instead serving as full-time mentors. Interns and mentors were distributed across all grade levels, and taught in a great variety of subject areas. About one-tenth of the interns and the same proportion of mentors reported teaching in more than one subject area.

Table 7
Current Teaching Positions of the Interns and Mentors

	Interns (n = 254)	Mentors (n = 137)
No Teaching Assignment		
full-time mentor		20
other responsibilities		2
Grade Level		
no response	4	1
early childhood and elementary (Pre-K - 6)	119 (.48)	46 (.40)
middle/junior high (6 - 9)	63 (.25)	33 (.29)
high school (9 - 12)	38 (.15)	23 (.20)
multi-level	30 (.12)	12 (.11)
Subject Area of Instruction		
no response	16	23
common branch subjects	50	24
reading	12	3
English	20	8
writing	1	--
mathematics	13	7
social studies	13	4
general science	6	1

Table 7, continued

Earth science	2	3
biology	3	3
chemistry	5	2
physical science	2	--
physics	1	--
health	1	1
life science	1	--
environmental science	1	1
humanities	1	1
French	--	2
Spanish	7	2
Latin	2	--
TESOL/ESL	12	6
art	8	4
music	12	4
physical education	11	3
home economics	2	3
vocational education	2	1
business education	1	2
driver education	1	1
computer education	8	2
technology education	1	1
outdoor education	1	--
gifted and talented	1	2
special education	64	30
speech and hearing	6	1
media specialist	1	2
guidance	4	2

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages. Numbers under Subject Areas of Instruction exceed the total numbers of respondents since individuals reported teaching in more than one subject area.

Interns were asked to compare their current teaching positions to experiences they had had as part of their preparation programs. Table 8 displays the results. Two-thirds of the interns rated their current positions from similar to almost identical to their preparation experiences; over one-tenth found them not at all similar. The key features upon which the

Table 8
Interns' Comparisons of Current Teaching Positions to Preparation Experiences

		number (n = 254)
Degree of Similarity		
no response		21
not at all similar	0	28 (.12)
	1	48 (.21)
similar	2	82 (.35)
	3	43 (.18)
almost identical	4	32 (.14)
Key Features of Comparison		
grade level/age		145
subject matter		140
teacher duties/responsibilities		114
student characteristics		101
teaching materials/equipment		96
teaching techniques		95
location		92
management		85
urban/suburban/rural		76
community cultures		70
personal goals		68
organization for instruction		59
contact with teachers		59
community socioeconomic status		50
parental characteristics		47
other features were noted by fewer than one-fifth of the respondents		

Note. Numbers in parentheses under Degree of Similarity are percentages. Numbers under Key Features exceed the total number of respondents since individuals reported more than one key feature.

interns based their comparisons are also given in Table 8. grade level/age and subject matter are the most frequently cited bases of comparison, followed by teacher duties/responsibilities,

student characteristics, teaching materials/equipment, teaching techniques, and location.

The interns were asked to indicate, if they had some familiarity with the school building in which they were teaching, what the bases of that familiarity were. Table 9 summarizes the results. Over half of the interns offered no response. indicating not having any familiarity with the school. Those who reported having some familiarity, indicated three experiences served as the primary bases of their familiarity: substitute teaching, student teaching/field experience, and an interview/visitation.

Table 9
Interns' Familiarity with Assigned School Buildings

	number (n = 254)
Familiarity with Assigned School	
none or no response	140 (.55)
some familiarity	114 (.45)
Basis of Familiarity If Reported	
substitute teaching	69
student teaching/field experience	27
interview/visitation	32
served as paraprofessional or aide	8
own children attend school in the building	7
attended school in the building	6
returning teacher	5
taught in another certification area	4
taught part time in the building	3
other	3

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages. Numbers under Basis of Familiarity exceed the number of respondents reporting some familiarity since individuals reported more than one basis.

Mentors were asked to compare their own teaching positions to those held by their interns. Table 10 displays the results.

Table 10
Mentors' Comparisons of Own Positions to Interns' Positions

		number (n = 137)
Degree of Similarity		
no response		6
not at all similar	0	24 (.09)
	1	36 (.13)
similar	2	60 (.22)
	3	62 (.23)
almost identical	4	85 (.32)
Key Features of Comparison		
grade level/age		99
subject matter		97
teacher duties/responsibilities		90
same administrators		81
location		76
student characteristics		73
teaching materials/equipment		72
teaching techniques		61
departmental characteristics		58
organization for instruction		54
personal goals		46
contact with teachers		45
management		42
parental characteristics		40
community socioeconomic status		34
community cultures		29
urban/suburban/rural		28
other features were noted by fewer than one-fifth of the respondents		

Note. Numbers under Degree of Similarity exceed the number of respondents since mentors considered each of their interns separately; numbers in parentheses are percentages. Numbers under Key Features exceed the total number of respondents since individuals reported more than one key feature.

Mentors rated the positions from similar to almost identical in over three-quarters of the cases. The bases on which the mentors reported making their comparisons are also given in the table. Grade level/age, subject matter, and teacher duties/ responsibilities are most frequently the matters upon which they focused in doing so.

The Matching of Interns and Mentors

Given that the mentor-intern relationship is at the heart of the MT-I Program, decisions regarding the selection of mentors and matching the interns and mentors are all the more important. The quality of the matches made may have much to do with the success of the relationship, and consequently, with the success of the induction effort.

Interns and mentors were asked to rate the importance of "making a good match" from their points of view. Table 11 displays the results. Both the interns and mentors place a great deal of importance on making a good match. Mentors are somewhat more moderate in their views, perhaps reflecting their confidence in being able to work well with at variety of persons and circumstances, as needed. At least several of those interns and mentors who judged making good matches not important pointed out that both the interns and mentors are professionals, and that regardless of the match, they ought to be able to work productively together.

Such views of the importance of making a good match. offered after having had some substantial experience in relationships,

Table 11
Importance of "Making a Good Match"

Participants	Degree of Importance		
	not	somewhat	very
Interns	3	33	176
Mentors	4	40	82

Note. Interns = 214. Mentors = 127. Not all respondents addressed this question.

may also reflect, for both the interns and mentors, their sense of satisfaction in building the relationships, and their sense that without such good relationships their efforts would not have been as productive.

Information used in making matches. Local project coordinators were asked what information about the interns and mentors was considered in making the matches. Their responses suggest that while there were differences among the projects, there is also a good deal of commonality. Their responses are summarized below. (The following summary is based on responses received from 21 of the 29 local project coordinators.)

Certification or subject area of instruction was the most frequently (20/21) considered information. Not only is this recommended in state regulation, but it is widely endorsed by local project participants.

Location or building assignment was the second most frequently (14/21) considered information. Some respondents cited the importance of the intern and mentor being in near-by classrooms within the building; others, in projects that may have spanned several counties, also made matches that would minimize the distances between the intern and mentor, albeit those distances were measured in miles.

Personalities of the intern and mentor was the third most frequently (8/21) considered information. Some respondents noted the difficulty of using this information, since often the intern was not well known: one respondent rejected this basis for making the matches precisely for this reason. Some respondents noted that a good deal of effort was made to learn about the personalities of the intern and mentor so that the most compatible matches would be made.

Grade level information was considered by decision-makers in a few projects (4). For some, even differences of one grade level was considered problematic; most, however, were less particular in that regard.

Voluntary participation by the mentor (and, in at least one project, by the intern too) was considered in a few projects (4) in making the matches. Presumably, in some cases, this information was judged more important than some other information on which to form matches.

Earlier contacts between the mentor and intern, and requests by either or both were considered in a few projects (4).

A variety of other information was considered in making the matches: strengths of the mentor and possible weaknesses of the intern (3); recommendations of the selection committee and/or colleagues (3); the experience of the mentor, sometimes including a minimum number of years (3); the mentor's history with staff development and/or union committees (2); scheduling, degree of interest, a mentor's past experience with student teachers, a mentor's participation in summer training for mentoring, and reputation as a good teacher (1 each). In one project mentors themselves played a major role in matching themselves with the interns.

Interns and mentors were also asked to address the issue of what types of information it is important to consider in making matches. They were provided ten bases and asked to rate them, and to add others as they saw fit. Table 12 displays the results. From their responses it is evident that they do not generally consider differences in age and sex to be important factors in making matches, though for some interns and for some mentors this seemed important. Considering the content area of

Table 12
Importance of Bases for Matching Interns and Mentors

Bases Provided	Interns' Views			Mentors' Views		
	not	some	very	not	some	very
difference in age	150	54	5	94	28	5
same content area	9	40	164	9	39	79
same sex	151	48	15	96	29	2
same grade level	28	118	67	39	52	34
similar personal background and interests	84	100	29	66	50	8
same building assignment	63	53	97	22	28	77
similar teaching styles	71	85	57	51	66	10
close proximity within building	71	82	58	29	56	42
compatible schedules	15	70	128	10	25	92
compatible ideologies	16	105	90	19	72	34
Bases Added (selected)						
	mentor experience			similar views of the m-i project		
	phone call away			desire to be part of project		
	sense of humor			mutual respect		
	openness to new ideas			self-confidence		
	caring			educational backgrounds		
	freshness (not tired of teaching)					
	patience					
	mutual respect					

Note. Interns = 214. Mentors = 127. Frequencies of ratings do not always add to the same total since responses were sometimes incomplete or uninterpretable.

instruction, grade level, same building assignment, and teaching schedules were considered more important. Having compatible ideologies was considered somewhat to very important by both interns and mentors; having similar backgrounds and interests was considered somewhat to not important. Other matters received generally mixed ratings. On most of the bases considered

important, the interns generally rated them more so than the mentors, perhaps reflecting their sense of having specific needs and wishing to avoid involvements that would make their first year difficult.

Recall that these ratings were completed some months after both the interns and mentors had begun working together, and thus the ratings might not represent the views the interns and mentors held as they anticipated their relationships. Differences and similarities between themselves they might have indicated at that time as important may now have been judged less so; other matters may have since grown in importance in their views.

The quality of the matches made. Interns and mentors were asked to rate the quality of the matches in which they were involved. Table 13 displays the results. Overwhelmingly, both interns and mentors rated the matches as good; some were careful to point out that they judged the matches to be "excellent."

Table 13
Quality of the Matches Made

Participants	Quality		
	poor	reasonable	good
Interns	16	39	159
Mentors	4	26	104

Note. Interns = 214. Mentors = 127; the numbers in the table exceed the number of respondents since mentors with more than one intern sometimes rated each separately, and in counting the responses particular attention was given to fully representing the number of matches rated as poor.

Local project coordinators were also asked to comment on the quality of the matches in their districts. Their comments reinforce the interns' and mentors' ratings. The great majority of the matches, as they had the opportunity to view them, were judged as good to excellent. In the relatively few instances in which some problems were noted, they seemed to be reported as less than major problems. In many of these instances, steps had been taken to address what were perceived as the sources of concern.

Even though only a limited number of interns and mentors reported that they were matched poorly, their experience and perspective is valuable. In some matches judged by either the mentor of intern to be poor, both the mentor and intern seemed to be aware of problems as reflected in their comments; but interestingly, in other matches no such recognition was evident. This may suggest that in some problematic matches, mentors and interns may be aware of problems but may be unable to successfully address them; other mentors and interns may be simply unaware of how their counterparts feel.

Three of the interns who judged their matches as poor were matched with the same mentor; other interns matched with that same mentor saw their matches as reasonable or good. Such a situation may point to the importance of selecting mentors who can be flexible if they are to work with several different interns. Or it may point to an undesired "group effect" among the interns who work with the same mentor, albeit in this case

not all members of the group seemed to be similarly effected.

Half (including the three above) of the sixteen interns who judged their matches poor were from the same large project. Of course, within large projects where many mentors are selected and many matches are made, there are more opportunities for poor matches to occur. But the other half were from projects that were relatively smaller, where just a few matching decisions had to be made. This perhaps points to the importance of careful matching processes whether that task is large and involves many persons and circumstances, or small and involving few.

Interns and mentors who judged their matches poor typically pointed to factors such as differences in teaching style, differences in content or grade level, or a mismatch of schedules. One intern noted that the mentor behaved very authoritarianly. Another noted that the mentor was friendly, but counting the days until retirement, and not much interested in the matters of beginning a career. One mentor noted that the intern needs to be able to accept criticism. Another mentor noted that there was not a common understanding with the intern of the purpose of the project.

Local project coordinators pointed to similar sources for the problem matches they observed: working in different buildings, sometimes miles apart; mismatches in content; interpersonal communication skills problems; and mentors who had other involvements which limited their commitment to the interns.

Though problems in the matches or the relationships which developed were cited, relatively few changes in the matches were made over the course of the year. Fourteen of the 21 local project coordinators who responded to the questionnaire indicated that no changes had been made in the mentor-intern matches in their projects. The changes reported by the other coordinators were generally made for reasons not directly related to the match or the project: maternity leaves, illness, leaves of absence, and resignations. In two instances changes were made because of problems aranging for released time. But in only two other instances were changes tied to the match: a perceived personality conflict, and a situation in which a frustrated mentor relinquished the intern to another mentor who volunteered to help out.

Mentor:intern ratios. While in most of the projects the mentors and interns were matched on a one-to-one basis, in a number of projects mentors worked with two, three, four, five or more interns. Indeed, one mentor reported working with eleven interns! Differences in the mentor:intern ratio reflect the fact that in most projects, mentors were fulfilling that role on a part-time basis and maintaining substantial teaching responsibilities, while in other projects mentors were serving full-time in that role. It is impossible to provide exact figures on the numbers of matches made using each ratio since those figures changed somewhat over the course of the year. Table 14 displays the figures as they were reported.

Table 14
Mentor:Intern Ratios Used

	Number of Pairs
1 Mentor	
with 1 intern	116
with 2 interns	12
with 3 interns	5
with 4 interns	7
with 5 interns	4
with 6 interns	8
with 7 interns	7
with 8 interns	5

Mentors sometimes worked informally with other beginning teachers beyond the interns assigned to them, or they worked in locally sponsored projects parallel to the state MT-I Program. Thus the ratios presented, and the number of interns they account for, may be a somewhat smaller number than the number the mentors actually served. These figures do suggest, however, that the great majority of mentors have worked in a 1:1 ratio with interns, and their experiences and judgments of the work of mentoring is thus grounded. By contrast, about only one third of the interns worked in a 1:1 ratio with mentors; two thirds shared their mentors with at least one other intern, some with five, six, and seven others.

Interns and mentors were asked to state what they felt were the advantages and disadvantages of working in a relationship developed around the mentor:intern ratio they were experiencing. Though they could draw chiefly only on their own experiences, their responses are instructive.

Interns who worked with mentors in a 1:1 ratio often expressed the belief that such an arrangement was the ideal. They pointed to having the opportunity to form a close, confidential, trusting relationship; some felt they could be more open with a mentor who worked exclusively with them. They valued not having to compete with another intern for the mentor's time and energy. They liked being able to focus the mentor's help on matters that concerned them particularly, not being sure that such an opportunity would exist if they had to share the mentor with other interns. They pointed to ease of scheduling as a further advantage of this arrangement. Some felt that the close bond formed between a mentor and intern in such a ratio might also help sustain the relationship in years to come. The chief disadvantage cited by a few interns was not having greater variety of experiences on which to draw and form a perspective. One intern suggested having a 3 mentors:1 intern ratio to build in variety; several others pointed out that they had undertaken to observe and work with other teachers for just this reason. A few interns commented that having a 1:1 ratio was fine if the relationship worked; but if it did not, it could be disastrous for the intern.

The comments of mentors who were working in a 1:1 ratio often paralleled the comments of the interns. Many expressed doubt that the maximum benefit could be derived if they had worked with more than one intern; they pointed to the closeness of the relationship, the opportunity to focus on the intern's

needs, the opportunity to follow through on plans, and not feeling caught between the needs of several different interns. One mentor noted that a 1:1 ratio would be particularly helpful if problems developed that needed extra attention. Several mentors noted that they did not want to work with more than one intern because they were reluctant to be away more often from their own classrooms; some would not have wanted to be mentors if they could not teach as well. Mentors pointed to few disadvantages of working in a 1:1 ratio: some noted that the intern might get too close and become dependent; one suggested that there is a possibility that both the mentor and intern might expect too much from such a relationship, and be disappointed if it came up short. Several mentors noted that the intern benefits from contact with other interns, and they believed that in a 1:1 ratio that less often occurred; but some of them made arrangements in which interns could meet and discuss their experiences.

Interns who shared their mentors with one, two, or three other interns also reported feeling quite well served in such arrangements. Many noted that they were able to have ample individual time with the mentor, and that they also valued hearing about the experiences of the other interns. Some felt that they were part of a team which addressed issues and solved problems together. A few noted that sharing the mentor with other interns created some distance between themselves and the mentor, which they valued; it allowed them to not feel that the

mentor was taking up too much time. One noted that this arrangement made it possible to become familiar with other buildings and persons within the district. Some of the interns pointed to disadvantages in sharing a mentor: needing to divide the available time, sensing some competition among the interns, and not having the mentor in the same building.

Mentors who worked with two, three, and four interns pointed to many of the same features as did their interns, but they more frequently noted problems, particularly as the number of interns increased. They valued the variety of experiences their interns brought to the relationships, and the perspective that enabled them to develop. With more released time, some felt their schedules were more flexible. But these mentors, who were not full-time in that role, often noted that they felt spread too thin, that there was not enough time for observation, conferencing, or follow through. Some noted that being in separate buildings exacerbated the problem. Some felt like visitors in their interns' classrooms and schools.

Interns who shared their mentors with four or more other interns much less frequently wrote about developing close relationships with their mentors. They valued the variety of experiences they could share with th other interns, and the perspective that derived from that. They sometimes felt that they were part of a network, sharing common problems and pursuing solutions together. But interestingly, many of the interns in this type of arrangement did not know how many other interns

their mentors worked with; presumably they did not get together as a group. Some interns expressed disappointment that they did not have opportunities to meet and talk with their mentors' other interns. Again, while a few valued the distance created by sharing the mentor with other interns, and not having the mentor around too often, other interns pointed to the need to feel that they also had access to the mentor for a 1:1 relationship too. These interns pointed to a number of disadvantages: sensing that the mentor is too busy with too many interns to see; forming less strong connections with the mentor; not being in the same building as the mentor and other interns; not having the mentor available when needed; not being able to follow through on plans. One intern noted that with the limited time, the mentor engaged mostly in observation without conferencing, leaving the intern feeling uncomfortable; other interns noted that there seemed to be no time for observations. One intern felt that the mentor made comparisons among the interns; another supposed that interns who seem to be doing well get less of the mentor's attention.

Mentors who worked with five or more interns were often full-time in that role. Their comments were not unlike the comments offered by their interns. Again, they valued the variety of experiences represented among their interns, and in some cases worked to set up networks among them. Being full-time mentors allowed them greater flexibility of scheduling and the chance to do many and different things with their interns. But their comments reflect, as well, the limits suggested by others

working with several interns: feeling spread too thin; having to work in too many separate buildings; being unable to focus for very long on any one intern's needs; a fear that they are not serving everyone well.

From the range of comments of both the interns and mentors, working together in a variety of arrangements, it seems that two points can be made about the mentor:intern ratio. First, interns have reported feeling well served and mentors have reported feeling accomplished in the full range of ratios used in the various project districts. Nonetheless, and the many successes notwithstanding, as the number of interns working with each mentor increases, especially for part-time mentors but also for full-time mentors, some problems seem to arise: forming a close relationship with each intern, focusing on particular needs, following through on plans, meeting the needs of a variety of interns, being available when needed, and logistics. Second, interns and mentors across the full range of ratios valued having the opportunity to form close working relationships, and the opportunity to share experiences within groups. The mentor:intern ratio alone neither guarantees nor prohibits either of these valued means.

Important personal characteristics of interns and mentors. The interns and mentors were asked to identify the personal characteristics which they believed to be most important to the success of the mentor-intern relationship. Given a list of 18 characteristics, they were asked to select three for the intern

and three for the mentor, and to provide a brief explanation of their selections. Table 15 displays a summary of their responses regarding an intern. From the table, two slightly different profiles of the valued personal characteristics of interns emerges. Whereas the nine most frequently selected characteristics are the same, a difference in the rank ordering is notable. Ability to take criticism is overwhelmingly the most important characteristic selected by interns themselves, but this characteristic ranks ninth for the mentors, who selected receptivity most often. Enthusiasm, willingness to work hard, and commitment to the profession are all highly valued, followed by a positive outlook, cooperativeness, trust, and openness. While neither the interns nor the mentors might be willing to dismiss such characteristics as empathy, tactfulness, candidness, integrity, and intelligence, they collectively did not select these as most important to the success of the relationship.

Table 16 displays the results of their selections of the important characteristics of mentors.(1) From the table it is evident that approachability is by far the most valued characteristic as selected by both interns and mentors. Willingness to spend time and commitment to the profession arethe next most valued qualities. Interns valued empathy, trust, and enthusiasm, while mentors valued enthusiasm, integrity, and tactfulness. Positive outlook is also ranked high based on the selections. Again, though neither interns nor mentors might be

---

1 Mr. Gary DeBolt assisted in the analysis of this data.

Table 15
Important Personal Characteristics of an Intern

Characteristics Provided	Frequency of Selection by Interns	Frequency of Selection by Mentors
empathy	5	--
initiative	27	17
approachability	15	7
sincerity	15	4
tactfulness	5	--
receptivity	59	55
willingness to spend time	23	18
openness	41	29
candidness	9	7
commitment to profession	46	38
ability to take criticism	104	28
willingness to work hard	72	33
enthusiasm	79	32
intelligence	10	11
integrity	9	7
trust	29	30
positive outlook	54	31
cooperativeness	43	31
Characteristics Added (selected)		
	ability to make changes	energy
		commitment to professional development
		sense of humor
		willingness to take risks
		willingness to learn
		willingness to accept ideas

Note. The characteristics are listed in the order in which they appeared on the survey instrument.
Note. Interns = 214. Mentors = 127. Numbers given in the table vary somewhat from the expected total frequencies since some respondents offered no response and others selected four characteristics.

Table 16
Important Personal Characteristics of a Mentor

Characteristics Provided	Frequency of Selection by Interns	Frequency of Selection by Mentors
empathy	56	28
initiative	14	3
approachability	102	56
sincerity	37	22
tactfulness	26	29
receptivity	25	9
willingness to spend time	72	43
openness	34	15
candidness	28	5
commitment to profession	51	46
ability to take criticism	2	1
willingness to work hard	7	6
enthusiasm	43	31
intelligence	16	14
integrity	18	31
trust	50	21
positive outlook	38	27
cooperativeness	25	1
Characteristics Added (selected)		
	confidence in their own knowledge	resourcefulness
	security	autonomy
	energy	humaneness

Note. The characteristics are listed in the order in which they appeared on the survey instrument.
Note. Interns = 214. Mentors = 127. Numbers given in the table vary somewhat from the expected total frequencies since some respondents offered no response and others selected four characteristics.

willing to dismiss characteristics such as ability to take criticism and willingness to work hard, but neither was

frequently selected as among the top three most important to the relationship.

In offering explanations of their selections, many interns and mentors stated that the characteristics were inter-related, complementary. Indeed, their explanations of their selections often incorporated other characteristics they didn't actually list. Some respondents suggested that all the characteristics provided were important; one suggested that having some of the characteristics might make up for not having others. Some interns and mentors noted that several of the characteristics--trust, cooperativeness, willingness to spend time, commitment to profession--were essential building blocks of the relationship; on them, other qualities could be based. One mentor carefully pointed out that the mentor-intern relationship develops over time, and thus the different personal characteristics may come into play at different points of development.

Interns and mentors most often selected a different set of characteristics for each role. Their explanations suggested that they saw the one set as complementing the other in building the relationship. Occasionally, a characteristic was listed for both the intern and mentor; often this was described as the basis of a successful relationship. A small number of interns and mentors selected exactly the same set of characteristics for both roles.

The degree to which the selected characteristics are reflective of the relationships actually formed between the interns and mentors who responded can be only the subject of

speculation. Some interns and mentors specifically stated that their selections were based on their own relationships--their perceptions of themselves and their mentor or intern counterparts. Others, a few, seemed to have built their selections around what they perceived as shortcomings of their relationships. Since the great majority of the relationships had been described as "good matches," it might be inferred that to the greater extent, the personal characteristics selected as important reflect what the interns and mentors perceived as the qualities which actually grounded the relationships in which they were involved.

The Beginnings of the Relationships

Once the match has been made between the intern and a mentor, the initiation of a relationship that was to become the basis of their subsequent work together was undertaken. This section will report on matters related to the start-up of the relationship: timing of the initial contacts and the start of work, the interns' interest in participation, and the mentors' first steps.

Initial contacts and start of work. Mentors were asked to indicate when their work with the interns began, both informally and formally. Table 17 displays the results. As is evident, in a great majority of the cases, contact was initiated informally first, before the project began and formal work in intern and mentor roles started. Frequently, contacts were made by the mentor before the school year began--at school orientation

Table 17
Initiation of Work between the Interns and Mentors

No informal work/contact before formal initiation in 37 cases

Month/Week		Informally	Formally
earlier than August		1	--
August	/first	1	--
	/second	3	--
	/third	--	2
	/fourth	15	8
September	/first	19	22
	/second	9	20
	/third	5	8
	/fourth	3	6
October	/first	3	9
	/second	1	5
	/third	1	2
	/fourth	1	--
November	/all	5	10
December	/all	5	9
after December		1	13

Note. n = 117. The number totals do not equal the number of respondents since some responses were uninterpretable, some counted each intern separately, and some provided incomplete information.

sessions, at faculty meetings, as the interns set up their classrooms, or through phone calls made for purposes of introductions; sometimes the interns and mentors began their work informally at that time. Even after the school year began, many interns and mentors first met each other informally in the school before they were to begin their formal work. In 37 cases, mentors indicated that they did not begin informally, but rather

made initial contacts as the first steps of the formal project; this was often the case with those relationships that were started in October or later.

In the majority of cases, the initial contacts had been made and the work of the mentor-intern pairs had begun by the end of September. It is likely that some interns were not hired and did not begin teaching until later in the school year, thus accounting for some of the later starts. But in a good number of cases, contacts were not made and work was not begun until well into the school year, presumably beyond the time when the intern might have needed the most support. In 6 cases, that point was not reached until February and March. Delays in the start-up of the projects, problems in identifying mentors and matching them with interns, and problems of arranging for released time are all presumably explanations for these situations.

Interns' interest in participation.(2) The interns were asked to reflect back to the start of the year to indicate how interested and willing they were to participate in the project. They were asked whether their interest changed since that time. Table 18 displays the results. The great majority of the interns were either interested in participating in the project or became interested as the work with their mentors proceeded. Within this group, those who were not interested initially, often did not feel well informed about the project at its start; often after

---

2 Ms. Rosemary Frenyea is to be credited with the analysis of the data as it is presented in this section.

Table 18
Interns' Interest in Participation

Levels of Interest		Number
Interested initially; maintained or increased interest		85 (.45)
Not interested initially; became interested		51 (.27)
reasons for lack of interest		
not adequately informed; unsure of the nature of the project	35	
had previous teaching experience	9	
initially not compatible with mentor or had prior negative experience with mentor	7	
reasons for increased interest		
found mentor to be valuable	29	
found project to be helpful	10	
nature of project was explained and better understood	5	
value of replacement teacher	2	
other reasons	5	
Interested initially; interest diminished		42 (.22)
reasons for diminished interest		
need for mentor diminished	10	
project organization was poor or lacking	9	
insufficient time to meet with mentor	8	
other reasons	15	
Not interested initially; no interest developed		11 (.06)
reasons for no interest		
had previous experience	6	
felt scrutinized	1	
position terminated	1	
reasons unclear	3	

Note. n = 189. Numbers in parentheses are percentages.

work with the mentors had begun, they developed a better understanding and began to value their participation in it.

Among those interns who were initially interested but whose interest diminished were a number who judged that their need for

a mentor decreased; presumably they felt that they had reached a level of self-sufficiency; their changes in interest do not necessarily denote problems with the projects. But within this group, other interns' interest diminished because of problems related to the project and its organization; presumably their interest might have been maintained or increased if these problems had not developed or had been resolved.

The majority of those interns who were not interested and did not become so were teachers who had prior experience. One intern in this group felt unduly scrutinized. One's teaching position was terminated.

Mentors' first steps. Mentors were asked to indicate, based on their experience, what they judged to be the important first steps in beginning work with interns. Their responses, though generally brief, taken together present a set of guidelines that might well serve future mentors. The following summary is based on responses from 197 mentors.

Steps most often recommended:

- Begin informally. Make time to meet the intern before the formal work of the project or the school year begins. Help the intern to relax regarding the relationship and the school year ahead, knowing that help is at hand.
- Get to know the intern as a person. Establish a rapport with the intern that is cordial, collegial, and comfortable. Be a good listener.
- Build a feeling of trust and honesty with the intern. Form a bond. Be sure that the intern sees the project and the relationship as non-threatening.
- Take time to talk about the purpose of the project. Define or clarify roles with the intern. State and

discuss expectations regarding the project, the relationship, and self as a participant. Consult with administrators and others regarding questions about the project or roles to be undertaken.

- Come to understand the intern's prior study and experience and the competence which it has developed. Analyze with the intern the specific needs that will most likely present themselves as the work together begins.

- Be clear that the relationship is formed to provide support, not to evaluate the intern's performance.

Steps often recommended:

- Be available for the intern. Let the intern know that it is all right to initiate contact at any time of the day. Expect that the intern will need a lot of attention at the start of the school year.

- Don't come on too strong. Don't be a 'know it all.' Don't try to accomplish everything in the first few weeks. Let the intern play a big part in setting the agenda and the pace of the work.

- Let the intern know that no question is too small or too unimportant to be asked. Establish the sense that in the relationship there should be a free exchange of ideas. Let the intern guide the work through asking questions.

- Find out about the intern's classroom and school situations: rules, policies, procedures, expectations, responsibilities. Help the intern to understand and respond to them.

- Help the intern get set up for the start of the year. Help with classroom arrangements, getting materials assembled, and clerical tasks. Introduce the intern to other teachers in the building, and identify other persons and resources that the intern may want to call on as the year begins. If the intern is new to the area, point out community resources that the intern may need to use.

- Set up and exchange schedules, telephone numbers, and identify important and/or convenient times for getting together.

- Visit each others' classrooms to develop an understanding of the circumstances under which each must teach, how each approaches classroom instruction, and to become comfortable with each others' presence.

- Reassure the intern of the confidentiality of the relationship. Speak with administrators to introduce self and the project, and to insure the understanding that the relationship is to be confidential.

- Set up an overall plan for the year. Set up goals for the year. On both matters be flexible.

Steps sometimes recommended:

- Reflect back on one's own first year of teaching. Help the intern understand that difficulty in the first year is common, and that the intern is not alone. Suggest ways in which having a mentor might be helpful.

- Distinguish, with the intern, those tasks that are immediate from those that can wait until after the start of the school year.

- Engage in staff development activities related to the mentor-intern project. Review research relevant to classroom teaching and mentoring.

- Find common ground. Begin to understand what beliefs and philosophies about teaching are held by both. Recognize that there may be differences.

- Check provisions for released time. Plan together for using replacement teachers. Clarify procedures for released time arrangements under both ordinary and extraordinary circumstances.

- Be available and supportive especially on the first day and in the first week of the school year. Inquire about how things are going. Offer encouraging words.

- Set a positive tone for the year. Display enthusiasm for teaching, for the mentor-intern project, and for the profession.

Several other recommendations regarding the first steps a mentor should take were offered, but they are either largely included in the spirit of those given above, or they refer to local projects rather specifically.

Problems Encountered in the Projects

The mentor-intern relationship develops in the context of the formal project. Project planners have written and submitted a proposal for funding; they have organized and conducted a process by which mentors were selected and matched with interns: they have made provision for training, for released time, and for support services. At the project level, monitoring and project evaluation activities are undertaken. Though the mentor-intern relationship is the key to the success of the MT-I Program, work that occurs at the project level is important particularly because it may bear so directly on the interns' and mentors' experience.

Mentors were asked to describe the one or two most critical problems that they and their interns encountered as participants in the local project. They were asked to indicate whether and how these problems had been resolved. The majority of their responses could be grouped into several large categories. The following summary is presented to illustrate the types of most critical problems reported. It is based on the responses of 117 mentors.

Problems related to purposes, expectations, and roles. Mentors reported that, in some cases, they and/or their interns were unclear about the purposes of the project, the expectations that were held for them, and the roles they were to play. Some mentors reported they were unclear about how the project and their work in it should proceed, and that not having guidelines, guidance, timetables, or signposts by which to direct their efforts, they were uncertain of their progress.

Problems related to time, schedules, and scheduling. Many mentors reported problems in matching schedules with the

interns so they could engage in observation of each others' classes, so they could observe particular classes in which help was needed, so they could plan together and follow-up on their plans, or so they could have some consistency and continuity in their work together. Some mentors reported a problem in finding time during the school day to work with the interns, noting that working after school was not always productive or possible. Mentors who worked with more than one intern sometimes noted the need for time to work with each separately. Many mentors reported that there was simply not enough time to accomplish all that needed to be accomplished. Many mentors cited the need to make schedules adaptable and flexible to address many of these problems.

Problems related to logistics. Some mentors reported that not being in the same building as the interns, having to travel between schools, and either being or working with interns who were itinerant teachers were problems. Mentors reported that some interns felt isolated by not being in the same building with their mentors or other interns. Mentors reported that not starting the projects at the start of the year led to interns not getting help when they needed it most, and to trying to condense too much work into a shortened internship. A few mentors reported that they were uncertain about who was actually in charge of the project, and thus to whom they should turn with their questions and problems.

Problems related to continuity of instruction. Many mentors reported that they and their interns were often concerned about the continuity and quality of instruction which their students received. Mentors sometimes reported that replacement teachers were hard to find, and good replacement teachers even harder. Some mentors expressed concern that replacement teachers were not well trained for their work, or that there was not enough time to plan with them for the continuance of instruction. Some mentors reported being unclear about what procedures they were to use in arranging for released time; for some, it was their responsibility to locate and schedule replacement teachers as needed. Some mentors reported that even with released time, and even with qualified replacement teachers, they still felt responsible for the instructional program in their classes, and this represented a conflict for them. Some mentors reported that they did not like taking time from their classes.

Problems related to the interns. Some mentors reported that their interns were reluctant to participate in the projects, because they did not understand the purpose or logistics of the projects, they did not feel that they

were in need of the support of mentors, or they were anxious about being observed. A few mentors reported that their interns were insecure beacuse of their non-tenured status. A few mentors reported that they refrained from observing the interns because they were already being observed many times by administrators and supervisors, and the interns did not want to have yet other persons observing in their classes. A few mentors reported that their interns felt they had no problems with which they needed help, and thus when the mentors wanted to provide feedback regarding matters which they considered to be of concern, they could not hold open discussions with the interns. A very few mentors reported that they felt their interns were not prepared for teaching, that they did not act responsibly in regard to their teaching, or that they were unprofessional. A few mentors reported that their interns were given very difficult teaching assignments, and that they needed more support through the year than the mentor was able to give. A few mentors noted that it was very tough for interns who feel vulnerable as first year teachers to trust mentors who were essentailly strangers to them. A few mentors reported that they did not match their interns in content area, and this left them less able to help them with teaching.

Problems related to project activities. Some mentors reported that they felt they should have been provided training for their roles as mentors. Some mentors reported not valuing the activities that had been planned for them and the interns as part of the projects. Some reported that they would have benefitted by having more opportunities to get together with other mentors and interns in the district or region. Some mentors reported having too much paperwork associated with the record keeping expectations of the project planners.

Problems related to administrators and administrative support. Some mentors reported that their building administrators should have been involved more directly in the projects. Some mentors reported that their building administrators were not supportive of the project, resented the interns and mentors being out of class, resisted providing for released time, and questioned expenses associated with attending conferences related to the project. Some mentors felt that their administrators felt threatened by the mentor role, or that their authority was being eroded. Some mentors reported that their administrators seemed to fear public or parental reaction to the project.

Problems related to feeling supported by other teachers. A few mentors reported that they felt resentment from some of their colleagues, because of their released time, of the opportunity to attend conferences, or because they were given extra pay for serving as mentors. Some mentors noted that their colleagues were not oriented to the purposes and logistics of the project ahead of time, and thus it fell to the mentors and interns to inform their colleagues directly.

In their responses, the mentors did not regularly indicate whether the problems they described had been resolved. In some cases they reported that the problems were resolved, in some cases the problems were partially resolved, and in others the problems were not at all resolved. Some mentors indicated that the problems were currently under discussion, and that they hoped for some resolution soon. Some mentors indicated that the problems they had described were not readily resolvable--they would likely always be a part of the projects since they were related to the basic structure of schools. In some cases the problems could be resolved, but not in the present year: they would be avoided through planning in the coming year. Very often when the problems were resolved, it was because the mentor and intern worked to solve them; in some cases they had the help of other project participants, or building or district administrators.

Impact of the Relationship on the Interns and Mentors

The mentor-intern relationship has the potential for great impact on the intern and the mentor, as well as the school building and district in which projects are planned and initiated. This form of induction to teaching has potential for altering the nature of teacher preparation programs and, in the long run, the profession itself. Much of this impact is beyond the capacity of educators and researchers to measure. And it is well beyond the direct interests and scope of the present statewide evaluation effort. Nonetheless, addressing the matter of impact is an important undertaking.

Several different parts of the data collection effort are related to the impact of the relationship on the interns and mentors. The first is a consideration of the difficulty of the interns' teaching assignments. The second is review of problems encountered by the interns as beginning teachers. The third is an analysis of changes in the views the interns held of themselves. The final part is a description of the interns' and mentors' satisfaction as professional teachers. Each of these parts will be presented below.

Difficulty of the interns' teaching assignments. Providing beginning teachers with the support of a mentor is a means of easing the transition of the new teacher from preparation to practice. But the support of a mentor may not be sufficient to overcome teaching assignments which even veteran teachers would have difficulty performing successfully. While the MT-I Program

provides for reduced teaching responsilibities for the interns, it would also be reasonable for these new teachers to be given responsibilities with which they are more likely to be successful as they complete the transition to practice.

Mentors were asked to view the teaching assignments of the interns with whom they worked, and to rate the relative difficulty of the assignments of each. In doing so, they were asked to consider such information as the students, the number of preparations, other assigned duties, the content area(s), and any other aspects of the assignment that might apply. Table 19 displays the results. As is evident in the table, while almost half of the interns had teaching assignments typical of those held by other teachers in the school, almost an equal number had assignments that were more difficult or among the most difficult in the school. It would seem that while all the interns had the

Table 19
Difficulty of the Interns' Teaching Assignments

Relative Difficulty/Rating			Number
One of the most difficult assignments in the school	/	1	67 (.25)
		2	53 (.20)
Typical of most teaching assignments in the school	/	3	130 (.48)
		4	13 (.05)
One of the easiest teaching assignments in the school	/	5	5 (.02)

Note. Number of mentors responding was 111. Number of interns' teaching assignments rated was 268.
Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages.

support of a mentor, many had as well to deal with teaching responsibilities more difficult than their new and more veteran colleagues.

Problems encountered by the interns.(3) The interns were asked to describe the problem that they encountered as beginning teachers that they considered the most critical. Their responses were studied to develop a set of categories which could be used to group the problems. Table 20 displays the results. From the table it is evident that the interns encountered a wide range of problems that they considered most critical. While the most frequently cited problems were associated with some aspect of the classroom teaching and curriculum, many problems generated from the school as an organization and as a social institution. Problems related to the personal lives and well being of new teachers were also cited by some interns as most critical.

In addition to describing their most critical problem, interns were asked to indicate whether being a participant in the mentor-intern project helped them in addressing the problem cited. In the event that it did, interns were asked to point to the aspect of the project that they found most helpful in addressing the problem. If it did not, interns were asked to indicate how the problem was addressed. Table 21 displays the results. From the table it is evident that the great majority of the critical problems described by the interns were addressed

---

3 Ms. Rosemary Frenyea is to be credited with the analysis of the data as presented in this section.

Table 20
Interns' Most Critical Problems as Beginning Teachers

Problem Types	Frequency	
Teaching and Classroom Performance Problems		86 (.39)
discipline	42 (.19)	
time management in the classroom	15 (.07)	
lesson planning	10 (.05)	
teaching techniques; materials	7 (.03)	
organization	5 (.02)	
pacing, testing, using knowledge gained in college, grading, class size, motivating students	7 (.03)	
Problems related to the Mechanics of Teaching		41 (.18)
awareness of school policies and procedures	18 (.08)	
insufficient materials	12 (.05)	
paperwork	11 (.05)	
Problems of Affiliation		37 (.17)
relations with colleagues	17 (.08)	
relations with administrators	9 (.04)	
school politics	4 (.02)	
dealing with parents	4 (.02)	
dealing with a particular age level and with individual students	3 (.01)	
Problems that Generate from Self		30 (.14)
lack of time	21 (.10)	
lack of confidence; stress	9 (.04)	
Content Area related Problems		25 (.11)
knowledge of curriculum	24 (.10)	
mastery of topics	1 (.01)	

Note. n = 182. Numbers exceed the number of respondents since some interns cited more than one problem.

through the project. In almost two-thirds of these cases, it was work with the mentors, in some form, that the interns found most helpful. In those cases in which the described problem was not addressed through the project, the interns turned to other teachers, administrators, supervisors, and union leaders to get

Table 21
Helpfulness of Project in Addressing Critical Problems

Response		Frequency
Yes/Most Helpful Aspect of the Project		145 (.75)
discussion with mentor or other mentors and interns	65 (.34)	
observation of mentor by intern or intern by mentor	21 (.11)	
visitations to other classrooms and discussions with mentor	19 (.10)	
a combination of activities: workshops, observations, visitations, and discussions	13 (.07)	
released time	10 (.05)	
sharing materials and/or team teaching and discussion	10 (.05)	
workshops and coursework	5 (.03)	
no specified aspect	2 (.01)	
Yes and No, or Somewhat		9 (.05)
No/How Problem Was Addressed		29 (.15)
by working with other teachers	5 (.03)	
by administrators, supervisors, department head, or union	5 (.03)	
problem was not addressed	19 (.10)	
No response		10 (.05)

Note. n = 182. The numbers in parentheses are percentages. The number totals exceed the number of respondents since some interns described more than one problem and offered more than one view of the helpfulness of the project in addressing the problems cited.

help. In one-tenth of the cases, the critical problem was not addressed at all, in the views of the interns.

Interns' views-of-self. The mentor-intern relationship, and for that matter, the whole local project, are intended to support new teachers as they make the transition from preparation to practice. If the transition is successful, the beginning teachers will have developed and used knowledge, skills, and

values appropriate to the particular contexts in which they are practicing, and they will have developed positive images of themselves as teachers and adults. Through the period of the transition, the competence and self-image of the beginning teachers will have "progressed" toward the point at which they view themselves as having a complex of strengths upon which to base their continuing practice and careers.

Yet another way of understanding the impact of the relationships and the projects on the intern teachers is provided by reviewing their responses to the Beginning Teacher Views of Self (BTVoS) Questionnaire. Note that this instrument relies on the self-reports of the interns. It directs respondents to describe themselves on a series of 28 items drawn from the literature on beginning teachers, on which matters new teachers have reported changes in their views of themselves over the course of the early part of their careers. For each item, respondents place themselves on a seven point continuum on which three points are specified:

1
2 = I am just beginning to look at this matter
3
4 = I have made substantial progress on this matter
5
6 = I have developed this matter into one of my strengths
7

Respondents were also asked, on the BTVoS Questionnaire, to indicate, from their points of view, how many years of teaching experience they brought to their internship year.

The BTVoS Questionnaire was administered to the interns in mid-February and again in early June. Concurrent with the second mailing, the Questionnaire was mailed to a randomly selected group of beginning teachers from across the state who were not participants in the MT-I Program. Table 22 displays the 28 items of the Questionnaire and the mean responses for the two administrations to the interns, and the one administration to the comparison group.(4)

On every item, the intern group progressed toward a point of greater perceived strength from the period of February to June. And in contrasting the intern and comparison groups (the June scores), on every item, the intern group reports views-of-self that reflect greater strength; on many items, the difference is substantial.

---

4 Not reported in Table 22, nor in any subsequent table which displays BTVoS Questionnaire data, are the standard deviations for the mean scores for each of the items.

It should be noted that in the June administration, comparison group respondents' scores ranged from 1 to 7 for nearly every item, and the standard deviations hovered around 1.4 for each of the items. The intern group respondents' scores ranged from 1 to 7 on six items, from 2 to 7 on fifteen items, and from 3 or 4 to 7 on seven items; the standard deviations hovered around 1.1 for each of the items.

Table 22
Mean Responses for Items on the BTVoS Questionnaire across Three Administrations

BTVoS Item	Intern Teacher Group Febr (n=243)	Intern Teacher Group June (n=187)	Comparison Teacher Group June (n=209)
1. I know and use a variety of instructional methods appropriate to the content area(s) I teach.	4.6	5.1	4.4
2. I can sequence activities such that student learning is maximized.	4.5	5.1	4.3
3. I have identified individual differences among my students and adjust for those differences in my planning and teaching.	4.8	5.4	4.7
4. I can pace my lessons so that students are neither overwhelmed nor bored.	4.7	5.1	4.5
5. I can adjust a lesson in the midst of teaching it if I feel it is appropriate to do so.	5.4	5.8	5.5
6. I teach in such a way that students do participate or perform as I would like them to.	4.9	5.2	4.9
7. I am well organized for carrying out my work efficiently and effectively.	5.2	5.5	4.9
8. My daily planning consistently results in lessons which turn out the way I intended them to.	4.7	5.0	4.6
9. I know how to use the curriculum guides for my content area(s) which are available in my district.	4.3	5.0	4.0

Table 22, continued

10. I can make reasonably accurate judgment about the progress my students are making.	5.1	5.5	5.0
11. I use several different techniques to evaluate my own teaching.	4.1	4.7	3.6
12. I have established a good rapport with my students, as individuals and as a group.	5.9	6.2	5.9
13. I use management skills which make good use of time and other resources, minimize interruptions, and keep students engaged.	5.0	5.4	4.8
14. I have established class routines which students understand and follow.	5.4	5.7	5.3
15. I have established expectations for students' behavior that they understand and respond to.	5.3	5.6	5.1
16. I discipline students in ways that I feel are appropriate and effective.	5.3	5.6	5.0
17. I understand the general procedures (e.g., attendance taking; classroom materials and supplies acquisition; filling out district forms) used in the building(s) in which I teach.	5.6	6.0	5.3
18. I feel like I have found a place for myself with the faculty and staff in the building(s) in which I teach.	5.5	5.8	5.3
19. I know where to turn in the school(s) when I need to resolve problems.	5.5	5.3	5.5
20. I feel comfortable in approaching and working with other teachers, the school administrators, and other staff.	5.6	5.9	5.5

Table 22, continued

21. I feel I am part of the district as well as my school.	5.1	5.2	4.7
22. I feel comfortable in exchanging ideas with the people with whom I work.	5.7	5.8	5.4
23. I am a participant in the profession (through organizations and associations) which enhances my work and sense of self.	4.7	5.2	4.3
24. I manage well the demands of teaching along with the demands of my personal life.	5.0	5.3	4.7
25. I can see that teaching is work through which I can express myself.	5.6	5.7	5.4
26. I see that as a teacher, I will be able to make an important contribution to society.	5.8	5.9	5.6
27. Teaching has enhanced my sense of self.	5.7	5.8	5.4
28. Through my efforts, I can enhance the quality of the school and district in which I teach.	5.6	5.8	5.4
Reported Years of Teaching Experience	2.2	2.2	1.0

Note. Responses for the 28 items were given on a 7 point scale.

Because the interns and the comparison group teachers differed in the average number of years of teaching experience they reported, the data for the June administrations of the BTVoS Questionnaire were re-sorted by years of experience. Before the results of that analysis procedure are presented, it is useful to note the distributions of the intern and comparison groups by

Table 23
Intern and Comparison Groups' Reported Teaching Experience

Years of Experience	Intern Teacher Group (n = 187)	Comparison Teacher Group (n = 209)
no response	6	8
0	49 (.27)	81 (.40)
1	38 (.21)	74 (.37)
2	25 (.14)	23 (.11)
3	13 (.07)	11 (.05)
4	12 (.07)	4 (.02)
5 or more	44 (.24)	8 (.04)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages.

reported years of teaching experience. Table 23 displays that distribution. From the table it is evident that a surprisingly large number of teachers in the intern group report having 5 or more years of teaching experience. While this fact might be explained in several ways, it nonetheless raises a question as to whether service to teachers with so much experience is indeed a prime goal of the MT-I Program.

This question is underscored by a review of the BTVoS data re-sorted by years of teaching experience. Table 24 displays the the results of this procedure. As is evident in the table, the intern group with zero years of prior teaching experience reports views-of-self consistently reflecting greater strength. On many of the items, such as #2, 3, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 24, the intern group is far advanced over the comparison group; these items address a wide range of matters important to the development of beginning teachers, including such matters as

Table 24
Mean Responses for Items on the BTVoS Questionnaire by Reported Years of Experience

BTVoS Item	Intern Group Years of Experience 0 (n=49)	1 (n=38)	2 (n=25)	Comparison Group Years of Experience 0 (n=81)	1 (n=74)	2 (n=23)
1. I know and use a variety of instructional methods appropriate to the content area(s) I teach.	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.5	4.2	4.5
2. I can sequence activities such that student learning is maximized.	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.3	4.1	4.6
3. I have identified individual differences among my students and adjust for those differences in my planning and teaching.	5.5	4.9	5.4	4.6	4.6	5.4
4. I can pace my lessons so that students are neither overwhelmed nor bored.	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.4	4.4	4.9
5. I can adjust a lesson in the midst of teaching it if I feel it is appropriate to do so.	5.8	5.5	5.7	5.5	5.4	5.6
6. I teach in such a way that students do participate or perform as I would like them to.	5.1	5.0	5.2	4.8	4.8	5.1
7. I am well organized for carrying out my work efficiently and effectively.	5.4	5.3	5.2	4.8	4.9	5.0

Table 24, continued

8. My daily planning consistently results in lessons which turn out the way I intended them to.	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.6	4.5	4.7
9. I know how to use the curriculum guides for my content area(s) which are available in my district.	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.0	3.8	4.2
10. I can make reasonably accurate judgment about the progress my students are making.	5.4	5.0	5.4	5.0	4.9	5.0
11. I use several different techniques to evaluate my own teaching.	4.5	4.2	4.7	3.6	3.5	3.9
12. I have established a good rapport with my students, as individuals and as a group.	6.3	5.9	6.2	5.8	5.8	6.1
13. I use management skills which make good use of time and other resources, minimize interruptions, and keep students engaged.	5.4	5.1	5.2	4.7	4.8	5.1
14. I have established class routines which students understand and follow.	5.8	5.2	5.6	5.2	5.2	5.9
15. I have established expectations for students' behavior that they understand and respond to.	5.5	5.2	5.6	5.0	5.2	5.5
16. I discipline students in ways that I feel are appropriate and effective.	5.3	5.0	5.6	4.8	5.1	5.4

Table 24, continued

17. I understand the general procedures (e.g., attendance-taking; classroom materials and supplies acquisition; filling out district forms) used in the building(s) in which I teach.	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.2	5.3	5.6
18. I feel like I have found a place for myself with the faculty and staff in the building(s) in which I teach.	5.8	5.4	5.7	5.2	5.2	5.5
19. I know where to turn in the school(s) when I need to resolve problems.	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.3
20. I feel comfortable in approaching and working with other teachers, the school administrators, and other staff.	5.8	5.6	5.7	5.4	5.5	5.8
21. I feel I am part of the district as well as my school.	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.6	4.9	4.9
22. I feel comfortable in exchanging ideas with the people with whom I work.	5.5	5.5	5.8	5.3	5.5	5.6
23. I am a participant in the profession (through organizations and associations) which enhances my work and sense of self.	4.8	5.1	4.7	4.5	4.1	4.5
24. I manage well the demands of teaching along with the demands of my personal life.	5.2	4.9	5.2	4.5	4.8	4.8

Table 24, continued

25. I can see that teaching is work through which I can express myself.	5.5	5.3	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.7
26. I see that as a teacher, I will be able to make an important contribution to society.	5.7	5.4	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.7
27. Teaching has enhanced my sense of self.	5.6	5.2	5.7	5.2	5.4	5.8
28. Through my efforts, I can enhance the quality of the school and district in which I teach.	5.6	5.4	5.6	5.3	5.3	5.6

Note. Responses for the 28 items were given on a 7 point scale. sequencing learning activities, adjusting for individual

differences among students, using techniques to evaluate one's own teaching, understanding building procedures, and balancing professional demands and and personal life. If the differences across the 28 items were additive, the contrast between the two groups would be stark. Contrasting the intern and comparison group teachers with one year of experience, it is evident that while overall the intern group still reports views-of-self reflecting greater strength than the comparison group, the differences are less pronounced, and for nine of the items non-existent or slightly favoring the comparison group. Contrasting the groups with two years of reported experience, the differences diminish even further, although overall advantage still falls to the intern group.

If the differences between the intern and comparison group can be attributed to the interns' participation in a mentor-intern project, then it can be suggested that the impact of their participation was positive. It resulted in the interns developing views-of-self that were clearly reflective of greater strength in a variety of aspects of teaching. Such positive images may in themselves be of value in promoting teacher satisfaction and teacher retention, and even perhaps, teacher effectiveness. To the degree the interns' views of themselves represent the reality of their professional development, their participation in the projects has been substantively beneficial.

An argument can also be made that if participation in the projects has been beneficial, it has its greatest impact on the newest teachers. Teachers who have through some means acquired teaching experience perhaps still benefit from the opportunity to participate in the mentor-intern projects, and perhaps in ways not evidenced in their views of themselves. The overall impact, however, seems to lessen with teaching experience.

Satisfaction of the interns and mentors.(5) Participating in a mentor-intern project has the potential for increasing the satisfaction both interns and mentors feel with their chosen careers: by diminishing the problems of the first year of teaching, by improving the conditions of practice, and by increasing the sense of accomplishment for efforts made. If

---

5 Ms. Mary Harder is to be credited with the work of data collection and statistical analysis of the data as it is presented in this section.

teachers, both new and veteran, have the opportunity to feel more satisfied with their work, it would seem likely that they would also be inclined to commit more strongly to careers in teaching.

All the mentors and one intern associated with each mentor (selected randomly if the mentor worked with more than one intern) were asked to indicate how professionally satisfied they were. Table 25 displays the results. Without a comparison group, it is impossible to know where these data would place the interns and mentors in the full ranks of teachers. The data can at best be used simply for comparing the interns and mentors, and for what understandings can be developed regarding the degrees of satisfaction reported.

As is evident in the table, mentors generally are more professionally satisfied than their interns; this might well be expected given the difficulties of the first year of teaching fresh in the minds of the interns even as they responded. These results might also be expected given the fact that the mentors

Table 25
Professional Satisfaction of the Interns and Mentors

Professional Satisfaction Scale		Interns (n = 81)	Mentors (n = 109)
not at all	1	3 (.04)	--
somewhat	2	23 (.28)	13 (.12)
more	3	41 (.51)	69 (.63)
completely	4	14 (.17)	27 (.25)

Note. The number in parentheses are percentages.

typically had years of experience upon which to have developed a sense of satisfaction with their work; indeed, teachers who are largely dissatisfied may have left their teaching careers. Furthermore, teachers selected as mentors are probably among the more satisfied teachers on their district faculty. Of course, many aspects of the work of teaching may contribute to a teacher's overall sense of professional satisfaction. It is impossible to draw a singular connection between these ratings and the interns' and mentors' participation in the projects alone.

The interns and mentors were, however, also asked to describe their most professionally satisfying experience, not necessarily connected with the mentor-intern projects. Their descriptions provide for an interesting insight. While a variety of aspects of the work of teaching are included among the responses of both the interns and mentors, the latter much more frequently associated their most satisfying experience with participation in the mentor - intern projects.

In only 4 descriptions of over 70 offered by interns was such a connection made. Interns regularly described experiences with their students--seeing them excited about particular learning activities, seeing individual students learn, receiving praise and affection from their students--as their most satisfying experiences. Often interns pointed to receiving recognition from supervisors, administrators, or even parents as having given them great satisfaction. Interns also pointed to

having had lessons go just as planned, and to having received good evaluations based on their classroom teaching. In the few instances in which interns connected their satisfaction with the mentor-intern projects, it was for much the same reasons as these. Consider the description of one intern:

> Recently I was commended by my mentor in regard to the quality of my class' writing in response to a Regents literature essay. Had I not been patted on the back by my mentor, though, I would not have recognized this event and included it here.

For another intern, the praise was less direct:

> When my mentor has used some of my teaching methods and ideas for her lessons.

Clearly, and understandably, interns connected their greatest satisfactions with their students and their classroom performances.

By contrast, and while mentors also regularly pointed to similar sources of satisfaction, of over 110 mentors who offered a description, more than one-third pointed to their participation in the mentor-intern projects as either the most professionally satisfying experience they had had, or included their participation as one of a set of such experiences. One mentor seemed to suggest that the satisfaction extended that which he/she regularly derived from work with students:

> Being chosen mentor for this year has been the most personally and professionally satisfying position so far in my teaching career. I have always received satisfaction, love and respect from my students in the past. I feel, this year, as if what I do and say and think matters. I love the freedom to direct my own actions and schedules and grow professionally.

Some mentors seemed to derive their satisfaction from a sense of being honored and a sense of making a contribution. Consider the following comments from one mentor:

> . . .it has to have been being selected as our district's first mentor teacher. I feel that it demonstrated district leaders' faith in my abilities and trust in my professionalism to choose me to begin an extremely important new program.
>
> It has given me a sense of self-worth in being able to share my knowledge with new teachers. I like being able to give something to others so that their experiences as new teachers are enhanced and smooth.

Another mentor also pointed to the sense of autonomy and responsibility that being a mentor provided:

> Being a full-time mentor has been the most professionally satisfying experience. I've been given "status" in my profession, some decision-making opportunities, and have been accountable only to myself for my responsibilities. This has been very rewarding and also made me do some real "soul searching" -- no one is making me accountable except for me. Now I want even more control of my job as a "teacher" when I return to my classroom.

Yet a third mentor attributed participation in the program as having changed his/her perspective:

> Working as a mentor teacher has totally changed this perspective. Prior to 1986, I would have rated this issue 1 [not at all satisfied]. What has changed? Professional autonomy/freedom from all "babysitting"/ custodial functions (homeroom, study hall, proctoring exams)/arranging my schedule around my 3 classes. I enjoy teaching my 3 classes even though I'm much busier and classes are lower level.

Some mentors' responses pointed out that serving as mentors was satisfying because it provided them opportunities to learn and grow. Sometimes learning occurred in formal workshops and seminars, and at other times it was more informal. Consider the description of this mentor:

> I would have to say without a doubt the mentor teacher-intern program has been my most professionally satisfying experience. The MTIP gave me the opportunity to grow professionally through staff development and "indepth" examination of who I am and what I do in a classroom. My being able to share openly with others (interns) and have them share with me has given me a whole new pool of resources. Mostly the fact that I could work with someone and encourage them to commit themselves to their profession.

For another mentor, the learning took a somewhat different form:

> Mentoring has given me the opportunity to meet many different people and help satisfy many different needs. It was interesting and informative to work in various buildings throughout the district. This job has added more to my professional growth than anything else in the last 20 years.

Finally, for some mentors, serving in this role seemed to be a culminating activity to their careers. It allowed them to "pull together" their experiences and represent them to an interested and appreciative audience of colleagues. One mentor's comments reflect such a view:

> Being a mentor represents a synthesizing of all the skills and talents I possess. Now I call upon all those skills to use and to articulate to others. Realizing how competent and skillful I have become and being able to share that successfully with others is truly an "upper"!

It is evident that, for a variety of reasons, many mentors derived a great deal of satisfaction from their involvement in the projects, and particularly through their associations with the interns. While they had many other types of satisfying experiences as teachers upon which to draw, it would seem that for not a small number of mentors, the projects provided a much valued opportunity for increased professional satisfaction.

Overview of the Projects and the Mentor-Intern Relationship

Interns and mentors were asked to state what they would tell someone who was going to be involved as they were in the project in the coming year. Often their responses took the form of suggestions and recommendations to that person. From their responses, an overview of the projects can be condensed, which reflects not only their reactions to specific aspects of the projects, but also the spirit of their experiences. Both interns and mentors were further asked to comment on whether they expected the relationships they had formed to continue in the coming year.

Interns' views. Interns were overwhelmingly positive about the projects and their participation in them. Of the 179 interns responding, only a handful reported a negative experience, or suggested that the interns were less than enthused about having been a part of the project. Using such a measure, the projects might be characterized as resoundingly successful. But this generalization must be qualified by the presumption that more interns whose experience did not develop as intended probably did not respond to the survey instruments they received; their experiences are unavailable for representation in this analysis.

The responses addressed a variety of aspects of the projects and gave the interns' reaction to them. A number of respondents pointed out that interns should expect the experience to be a learning experience, that they have a lot to learn and would indeed learn a great deal. They pointed to matters of

curriculum, classroom practice, school policies, and student management and relationships, as examples of what they might expect to address over the course of the internship year.

Several interns noted that an intern has to work hard, and work for long hours. Some additional work was generated by the project itself, though several said this demand was offset by the benefits of participating. Several interns pointed to the released time as a particular advantage of being a part of the project. One intern put it this way:

> I would tell him/her that the extra released time will be a big help. The first year teaching experience is almost overwhelming. If I did not have that extra time to prepare, I don't know how I would have survived.

Having the released time allowed interns to prepare for their teaching, to work with their mentors, to observe other classes and other teachers, and to participate in workshops and seminars. Often these were highly valued aspects of the projects.

A few interns pointed out the importance of having administrators who support the project. Seemingly, these interns saw conflicts between the projects and mentors on the one hand and building or district administrators on the other.

Two-thirds of the interns focused their responses on their mentors or more generally the activities of mentoring. Clearly, when these interns thought of the projects, they thought in terms of the mentor-intern relationship as the central feature. As one intern said, ". . .he/she is the most valuable person in your life for the next year." Another intern described his/her mentor as follows:

> As an older beginning teacher, and as a second career person, the first year has been difficult. My mentor, however, has been my life saver and has helped me immensely in my adjustment period.

Yet another intern described the roles that the mentor will play:

> You can expect to benefit from a master teacher who will share his/her expertise. The relationship will be many faceted: a help mate, a guide, a model, a friend, a confidant.

A fourth intern's response offers a similar description:

> It's the best thing that could happen to you as a first year teacher. You will have the expert advice of a pro in teaching, access to material, knowledge and methods used for years. A guide, a buddy, a shoulder to cry on, someone to bounce off your own ideas. Just a great person to be there for you everyday in your greatest moments of need during that "terrible" first year.

The importance of the mentor-intern relationship to the perceived success of the project becomes more and more evident:

> "Who is your mentor?" would be my first reaction because it is essential that one develops a trusting relationship with him or her in order to get the most out of the Mentor/Intern program. Being an intern made my first year much smoother than it might have been. First of all, one has someone with experience to turn to for any questions, from "Where is the bathroom?" to "How do I deal with this student who is constantly disruptive?". . .
>
> A mentor is not there to evaluate an intern in any way, just to help smooth over any rocky or unsettling moments one would like help with. The greatest benefit to me as an intern was the overall increase in my self-confidence as a teacher, especially after the "rough" days. . .
>
> If one has a good mentor/intern match, then be assured, the program is extremely helpful.

If the mentor-intern relationship explains successful experience as perceived by intern teachers, then it also is at least part of the explanation when the experience seems not to have developed as intended:

> You can expect a lot of pressure and depending on the personality of your mentor and their conception of what their job is; they can be your savior or one more person to please. . .
>
> My last mentor was fantastic! She is what a mentor should be. . .

And from another intern who had two different mentors:

> I have had two mentors during my internship. . .One was very helpful; one was not. Expect to make it (a successful year) mainly on your own creativeness, determination and innate ability. A mentor does not make a teacher but may (or may not) help you fine tune your teaching skills.
>
> My department head was the biggest influence and greatest help during my first year of teaching.

Finally, consider the report of one intern whose experience with the mentor seems to have been wholly negative:

> I have a very poor relationship with my teacher-mentor. I can barely stand her now [let] alone next year. She is a very bossy person. Her answer[s] to my questions are, "No one helped me when I was. . .in my first year". . .
>
> I would advise her [next year's intern] to establish a good relationship with either her building administrator or [her] department administrator because not all intern-mentor relationships are ideal.
>
> Help from a mentor is unusual.

Thus, the relationship between the intern and mentor seems to account, in large measure, for the perceived outcomes of the projects.

Many of the interns felt fortunate to have been hired in districts where mentor-intern projects were planned, and some interns attributed to "luck" their having been assigned good mentors. Some interns, perhaps particularly in the larger projects where more mentor-intern pairs could be observed, seemed sensitive to the fact that while their relationships had been productive, others were not. Consider the analogy used by this

intern:

> Based on my conversation with other interns this year I can tell you that your experience in the Mentor-Intern Program may be completely different than mine. That is to say, I can tell you what my experience has been, but don't make that the basis of your expectations for your experience. It is a program that has the potential to be tremendously helpful, supportive and energizing. It can literally make the difference between a successful year and an unsuccessful year. Whether or not the potential of the program is realized is subject to many variables, some (if not most) outside of the control of the intern.
>
> So, what am I telling you? This: it's a crap shoot and you're listening to a person who rolled a seven telling you it's a good game to play. Be sure to talk to someone who crapped out before you form any definite expectations.

By contrast, a number of interns did not focus on matters out of their control, but on matters which they could influence directly. Some characterized it as "getting out of it what you put into it." Many interns cast the project and the assistance of the mentor as a resource that should be used fully, but toward ends selected by the interns themselves. One intern put it this way:

> I would tell him/her to be prepared to accept constructive criticism from the mentor. The intern should be open to suggestions, but, at the same time, be creative and not afraid to say, "I would really like to try this new method that I have conceived."

Thus, while the great majority of the interns felt well served by their participation in the projects, some attributed their good experience to "the luck of the the draw," and others to their own decisions and efforts.

When the project and particularly the mentor-intern relationship developed as intended, the interns described their

experiences in very positive terms. Such descriptions point to the richness of the relationship, the opportunity to participate in project activities, and the changes that participation has made in the first year experience. The following descriptions are characteristic of this great majority of respondents:

> Firstly, this is going to be a beneficial experience. One that will provide growth in all areas of the teaching profession.
>
> The relationship between you and your mentor will be a very 'special' one -- one in which you'll feel free to really express your fears, doubts or ideas.
>
> An experience you will look back on as very pleasant and rewarding.

And from another intern:

> The most important part of being an intern for me was having someone to talk to about my problems, concerns, successes, and failures. My mentor was always willing to listen a to answer my questions. I didn't feel like I was imposing. I felt like I had gained two years (at least) of experience in this one year. Secondly, I gained a lot from being able to observe my mentor's lessons weekly and have her observe mine without being formally evaluated. By second semester we were trading lessons both ways so I didn't always feel like the taker. Finally, the many workshops and conferences continued my professional development. These usually are not available to beginning teachers so they are an especially valuable perk of this program.

And from a third:

> Each mentor-intern relationship is unique, so it is difficult to predict what yours will be like. I can only base my projections on my own experience.
>
> Expect to have someone to teach you, as well as learn from you -- someone to "show you the ropes," to support your ideas and opinions, and to he frank enough to tell you to re-think something when needed. You will probably not agree with your mentor on many things -- maybe even his/her teaching psychology -- but you will still learn. Use the mentor in any positive way you can, and keep an open mind to everything. Use the released time to watch good teachers teach -- it's great. Go to as many confernces, etc., as you can. They're very helpful and you may never get the

> opportunity again. (Expect other colleagues to be jealous -- they have good reason -- the program is great!)

But when the project and the relationship did not serve as intended, as was the case for a relatively few of the respondents, the descriptions reflect disappointment and even anger. Consider the following two reports:

> Quite honestly, I would wish them good luck and great deal of patience. I do however think that by next year (the 2nd year in the program) my district may have it's act together. They made so many mistakes this year. I don't want to discourage the intern however. I would tell them that you are better off with the program than without. The extra prep time is invaluable. My mentor was not very helpful. She meant well; she just didn't know what to do. . .Don't expect the program to solve all your problems, it won't. I didn't expect much from the program (especially when they gave me a [mentor who teaches a completely different content area]), and I wasn't disappointed. Like I said before, you are still better off with than without.

And:

> Once again, I only saw my mentor twice. The program failed for me and any music teacher that had a mentor! I'd say expect nothing and try to learn as much as possible by asking colleagues and friends in your field!
>
> I'm extremely disappointed in the program and I know of other mentors and interns who recieved class relief time and did nothing in relation to the mentor intern program!!

When asked whether they intended to maintain a relationship with their mentors in the coming year, two-thirds of the interns, again having had good experiences, suggested that they would do so. They commented that they would not hesistate to call on their mentors when in need of them; that they would be teaching in the same building, grade level, or content areas, and would likely have opportunities for working together; and in a few

cases, that they and their mentors had already planned to meet over the summer and would be team teaching or working on common projects in the coming year. One intern responded in this way:

> I would like to maintain contact with my mentor because of the help she has been able to provide me and I feel she would continue to provide on an informal basis in the future. It has been wonderful getting to know her and I feel she knows me as a teacher better than anyone else. I feel I can express my weaknesses and doubts to her and she will respond in a positive, encouraging manner. I have learned so much because she listens and is not intimidating and is non-judgmental. It is great having someone to talk to that understands me and the type of children I work with.

Many interns indicated that while they felt they had learned much from their mentors, their relationships were ones of equality and mutual respect. Many interns pointed out that their relationships had become personal friendships as well, and thus were not bound by the limits of the formal mentor-intern projects. Consider this response:

> I feel a very special bond to my mentor and I feel that our relationship will not end at the end of the program.
>
> She is a giving, gentle human being and her friendship is not conditional to a program.

About one-third of the interns were uncertain whether they would maintain the relationship, or indicated they probably would not do so. Even among these respondents, many indicated that they would like to keep in contact, but were doubtful this would happen since they were not returning to teach in the district: some had obtained positions in other districts, some were moving out of the area or out of state, and some were returning to graduate school. A number of interns pointed out that they and

their mentors would be teaching in different buildings in the coming year, and thus they anticipated less direct contact; if the relationships were to continue, the interns felt they would be notably different from the relationships that had developed during the internship year.

A few interns would not seek to maintain the relationship because it had not served them well. One noted that because they had not been given released time, the relationship never really formed. A few noted that their relationships with their mentors had been strained. Another noted that the relationship had brought added pressure, which he/she would not choose to continue to deal with. A few interns noted that their need of mentors had diminished, and that they had no interest in sustaining their relationships. Finally, a few indicated that they had developed ties with other teachers within their buildings or departments or grade levels, and they would likely turn there first for support and stimulation as their teaching careers developed.

Mentors' views. Like the interns, the mentors were overwhelming in their endorsements of the projects. Many pointed to aspects of the projects that, in their judgments, could be improved; and many shared feelings that clearly indicated that their experiences had both positive and negative sides. But of the 111 mentors responding, only a very few seemed to have had generally negative experiences. Again, a qualification to this generalization must be offered: it is likely that among those who did not respond to the survey instruments sent to them are

other mentors who did not view their year's experience positively; unfortunately, their experiences are lost to this analysis.

On relating to interns. Not surprisingly, the great majority of the mentors' responses focused in some way on their relationships with their interns. Several noted the importance of being compatible with the assigned interns, or developing a comfortable relationship. One mentor put it this way:

> Do you know who the mentee is? It's very important that you are compatible educationally and in temperament. Make sure you speak to the mentee as soon as possible so that you can talk in general terms about the expected year ahead. Try to gain their trust and get them prepared for the first week of school. Point out that your door is always open and you are willing to discuss any concerns at anytime.

Like some of the interns, some mentors felt lucky to have been assigned interns whose qualities they valued:

> The greatest variables are in terms of the compatibility of mentor and intern. I was fortunate to have an intern with an excellent background in his subject (Teaching was a new career after 15 years in industry), maturity and dedication to the profession. The qualities of my intern are not typical of many of the "beginning" teachers of the past.

Some mentors listed the characteristics that they felt to be important for mentors to display, such as did this mentor:

> . . .The qualities I would consider are (not in any special order):
> 1 - trustworthy and open
> 2 - supportive
> 3 - willing to spend lots of time not just for mentoring, but for listening
> 4 - real 100% commitment to the program and the interns you're working with
> 5 - "up beat" attitude
> 6 - being able to share yourself professionally and personally with your interns

Other mentors made recommendations for activities that the mentor and intern ought to engage in: observing each other, observing other teachers, participating in workshops and seminars. Many noted that because there is so much to do, mentors spend a great deal more time associated with the projects than is provided them through released time arrangements. One mentor's response put the matter of time spent in a larger perspective:

> Plan to have 10 times more to do than time in which to do it. Plan on being a very good friend, an ally, and an emergency response hotline. Expect also to learn many new things yourself, as well as to impart to your intern some of what you have mastered. Know that you are dealing with a colleague, and be prepared to treat your intern as such. Expect to feel overwhelmed by work sometimes, but also usually very satisfied with your own professional worth and the recognition of such by colleagues, interns, and administration. Prepare to make yourself easily accessible whenever your intern has a problem or question, even at home by phone. These things don't always happen just during school hours. Prepare yourself to observe and present constructive criticism in a tactful way, and prepare to be observed yourself as you model certain techniques or behaviors. Key yourself always to be tactful. It is a wonderful, satisfying, and very necessary program. Do your best to make it work. Prepare to be idolized as the be-all and end-all of teaching advice.

Though the mentor's role involves giving advice to the intern, it is also the case that the intern may choose not to take and act on that adivce. A number of mentors recognized this possibility, though several of them seemed surprised when it happened with them. Mentors commented on the differences between themselves and their interns, and often valued those differences. Consider the comments of one mentor on this matter:

> If you are matched up with a diligent person who is intelligent, you will find the program to be a bright spot during the day. I was very lucky. The match-up

> was perfect. We are opposite in all our approaches but our philosophy of education is the same: the child comes first -- he/she must learn something before leaving my class.
>
> If the intern is inept, then your hands are full. And if a mutual respect does not exist, you will have a trying year.

Another mentor who addressed such differences divided the response in to positive and negative aspects of the experience:

> Positive - You will be able to share your professional talents, insight, methods. You will need to be generous about sharing your own uniquely developed strategies and materials.
>
> You need to be prepared to have interns do things differently. Their uniqueness has to be acceptable. Be prepared to be very flexible.
>
> You will establish close ties with interns.
>
> Negative - Expect to spend more time with paperwork than you now experience or would anticipate.
>
> Expect to feel ambivalent about your relationship with interns. As much as you want it to be collegial, it is better to keep a distance particularly if the candidate is weak.
>
> Expect that you won't ever fully know the expectations of the program and that communication with other mentors or the supervising group will be lacking.
>
> Know that you cannot clone yourself in your interns.

Some mentors reported they felt they "had a stake in" the success of their interns, though like the mentor quoted above, they recognized that all interns might not be successful. Nonetheless, as one mentor noted:

> You will have a tremendous feeling of responsibility toward making the opportunity of having a mentor be all that it can be.

Another mentor's response again notes the inevitable differences between mentor and intern, and suggests how these differences relate to the mentor's role:

> I would tell this teacher that the experience will be very rewarding and enjoyable as long as he/she

> perceives it as a support system and not an evaluative position. Also, I would tell him/her to focus on being a guide and a resource for the intern and not to feel that he/she needs to be responsible for the total success of the intern. All teachers (including interns) have their own philosophies and their own ideas for classrooms. The mentor's role is not to change these ideas to conform to his/her own but to offer suggestions in areas where the intern is having difficulty or has had no experience and is seeking advice.

A few mentors noted that some beginning teachers probably should not continue in teaching as a career. Consider the comments of one mentor who seems to have been frustrated by the interns' unwillingness to take advice.

> Mentoring to me has been both rewarding and frustrating. I have enjoyed sharing the things I have learned, and feel that I have had an impact in helping bring my interns along more quickly. I have also been reminded again by this experience that we can guide, entice, and encourage, but interns cannot and will not take all of our advice and suggestions. We cannot make excellent teachers of all new teachers. Some of them might even belong in other fields of work.

In such cases, mentors might help the interns to understand and accept such a realization. This was a role that the mentors did not relish, but was one which some felt it their responsibity to take.

On learning by being a mentor. Many mentors commented that having served as mentors had given them the opportunity to learn and grow as teachers themselves. Consider the responses of these two mentors:

> You'll love it. You'll learn alot about yourself as an educator. The enthusiasm of the new teacher is contagious.

and the other,

> As a mentor, you will learn a lot. You will learn from staff development meetings, conferences, workshops. You will learn from observing interns and other teachers. You will notice new things about your own teaching -- your strengths, weaknesses and ways of improving.

Another mentor pointed out that such learning had a revitalizing effect on his/her own career:

> I would tell her/him the truth: expect a lot of work. I found that one of my main duties was to become a "role model." Therefore, I was always on my "best' behavior. And a funny thing happened -- teaching became fun again!
>
> Working with the intern has a reverse effect -- you (mentor) begin learning again.
>
> It's work, but fun -- I'd love to do it again.

Finally, one mentor noted the importance of recognizing the fact that the mentor also learns from the experience as a means of reinforcing the equal status of the intern and mentor:

> . . .You should evaluate your own skills and designate those that are successful. You should always remember the importance of encouragement, confidence-building, and empathy in all of your meetings. Always be sure to mention what you have learned from associating with your intern, professionally and personally. You are always a team; a team of equals.

On feelings from serving as a mentor. Mentors reported experiencing a variety of feelings as a result of serving as mentors. Already evident in the excerpts above are feelings of great responsibility, significant accomplishment, personal gratification, and public reward, but also feelings of being overwhelmed, and of having conflicting interests and values. Also evident are feelings of professional growth and rejuvenation, and joy. Sometimes the feelings generated by serving as a mentor changed rapidly:

> It also has it's ups and downs. Sometimes you will feel overwhelmed and other times you will have extra time and feel guilty. Since you have no guidelines of restrictions of feedback, it is easy to feel superior, adequate and inadequate all in the same week!

The frustration which mentors sometimes reported was linked, in some cases, to the fact that the projects in which they were participants were in their first year of operation; they believed that the problems they encountered--such as beginning their work with interns too long after the start of the school year, not being clear about the mentor and intern roles, not having had an opportunity for training, sensing some disorganization among the project planners, and having to participate in workshops and seminars that they judged to be of little or no value--would be resolved in the second and subsequent years of the projects. From their reports, these frustrations seemed manageable in the present year and avoidable in the future.

But mentors also felt frustration from their work with their interns, and these feelings seemed less easily resolved. Consider the comments of one mentor who worked with three interns:

> You can expect to spend a lot of time planning for each mentor day. Each intern will be at a different level of professional growth and each should be addressed separately. And the things that most teachers take for granted (testing, paperwork, chain of command, discipline, etc.) cannot be taken for granted with the intern. You should start off at step one and gradually cover all areas.
>
> The two interns that I [will likely maintain a relationship with] have grown professionally and have made a genuine effort to learn and improve upon their teaching and professional skills. Although each has grown at their own pace (one a self-starter, one a slow learner). At times, it was frustrating because of the

> "great" differences in each intern's abilities; but overall each has grown. Our relationships will continue. We've become friends and close working colleagues.
>
> With the [other] intern. . .I will not continue involvement with her. She is unprofessional, incompetent and lacks the ability to accept help or suggestions in a mature professional manner. I've had to deal with embarrassing situations with parents, other teachers and administrators. She exhibited total lack of professionalism. I'm embarrassed to even let others know that I've had this relationship with her. She is incompetent and should've never been hired by the district. Our relationship has been more of master-teacher to student teacher or undergraduate methods courses (with a person that doesn't have the abilities, potential, or qualifications). It's been a very frustrating situation and I feel the district has taken advantage of the mentor program in this case.

The report of another mentor suggests that while frustration came from several sources, the relationships with his/her two interns was the greatest:

> I enjoyed my experience as a mentor this past year. I hope you're aware of the facts (1) that is is a lot of extra work, (2) very little cooperation at times from interns, (3) frustrating, (4) the other teachers in your building think of you differently as a result I don t eat lunch in the teachers' room with them, (5) pairing of intern-mentor is not always the best, (6) you may have an interns in another building, (7) may have to deal with several principals. At this time [May] I don't know if I would apply for this position next year.
>
> It has not worked out as well as I expected. We have different styles, objectives, techniques, expectations of students. A lack of professional respect of the intern toward me has been stated. She has lied to make me look as if I haven't been doing my job. She has admitted to the principal that she lied but as of this date I have not received an apology. Both my interns hold temporary licenses, they are NOT teachers. One intern is beyond help, teaching is one of the last things she'd ever enjoy doing. As a result her class has not had a good year. The other intern is interested in teaching [this subject]. But I have lost trust in her because of the lies. She feels very threatened when asked anything and I am at my wits end on how to deal with this person. Any help?

Though cases as difficult as those described here are seemingly not common, they undoubtedly are very disconcerting for the mentors (and perhaps the interns) involved. Such feelings as those expressed here are more difficult to deal with when, as some mentors pointed out, their role seemed to isolate them from others who might normally have been sources of support. Consider the comments of one mentor in this regard:

> . . .Your time will be your own to plan. For me, working in three buildings left me feeling that I belonged everywhere and nowhere. I miss seeing the growth of my own class and being able to follow through on needed work. I also miss my associates with whom I have worked over many years.

On being supported in the mentor role. A number of mentors, like the interns, noted the importance of receiving support from other teachers and administrators in the school and district. Many noted that they were supported, or at least did not feel that this was a source of concern. But some mentors pointed to problems. Consider the comments of one mentor regarding the actions of his/her administrators:

> Teachers can expect their participation in the Mentor-Intern Program to be one of the most stimulating and supportive experiences I have enjoyed in 16 years of teaching. The respect and collegial atmoshpere provided encourage teachers to see their career as a profession and not merely a "job." The program enables teachers to go beyond the petty bureaucracy and politics that often stifle personal and professional creativity and growth.
>
> But -- although NY State provides 100% support and endorsement, mnay teachers can expect to be "removed" from teaching courses they have developed and love because after they leave the program, the egos of some administrators compels them to demonstrate their "authority" with an axe. Although our administrators verbally support this program, their actions are quite vindictive "next year." Administrative efforts to

> select which teachers participate is beginning to produce the same old "yes" people and may turn this outstanding program into the farce of defining excellent teachers as those who say "yes" most often. Please do not let this happen.

But lack of support from fellow teachers, in different forms and with different effects, was also part of the experience of some mentors. Consider the comments offered by these three mentors:

> Expect to be self-sustaining and self-sufficient. Expect mixed support from the school community. Be prepared for a great variety of teaching styles. Hard work is ahead. Be ready to respond to many needs.

and,

> You will be performing a valuable service and one that has been needed for a long time. However, expect to be viewed with suspicion and probably some hostility, jealousy and misunderstanding by your colleagues. . .

and finally, a more extended excerpt,

> You can expect an enriching year filled with joy, tears, and hard work. Although it is satisfying to be helpful to someone and refreshing when that someone is young and inexperienced, it is time-consuming. Therefore, you can expect to complete much of your own school related work at home and during weekends. You can also expect criticism from your colleagues who are not mentors. They are unable to understand what the job of mentor entails. However, since you are a stable, well-informed, experienced teacher, you will lift up your chin and get to the task at hand!

Mentors who have carried such perceptions of support, or lack of support, have undoubtedly had an extra burden during their period of service. These perceptions may have affected how they served as mentors: the forms and content of their work with interns, what resouces they used, and what outcomes they pursued and valued. These perceptions may be sustained beyond their year in the mentor role, leaving them feeling somewhat less enriched than

might otherwise have been the case.

On commitment to the profession. Serving as mentors led some of the respondents to feel that they had made a contribution to the work of education and the teaching profession beyond that which they had made as classroom teachers. One mentor cast the work in this manner:

> You have been selected because you are a person with expertise. It's nice to know you've been selected!
> Now you have another challenge. If you're good at what you are doing and are able to assist a new teacher at being better in the profession, then you know you are having an effect on a great many students other than the ones in your classroom.

In another mentor's response, the connection between expertise and making a larger contribution was again drawn:

> . . .Expect to be challenged, rewarded, enlightened, excited! My experience has been all of those and more because I feel very keenly the successes and occasional setbacks that each of our new teachers experiences.
> In a great many ways it is very gratifying to realize that one has expertise that one can share with others to enable them to have a smoother, more rewarding first year. It has further strengthened my dedication to this profession and to those gifted professionals who have worked to provide us with an internship program that will help to ensure that the best teachers are retained.

Finally, a third mentor, like the first two, places the work of mentoring in the broader education context:

> You can expect a rich and rewarding experience. You will grow and develop new techniques from observing your interns. You will put in long hours -- concentrated efforts and even some sleepless nights. You will do a phenomenal amount of writing (lessons you observe - evaluations - log) and cover a lot of territory in a day. It has been a time of reflection for me -- seeing progress. . .knowing that some suggestions and ideas have helped to make the interns grow. I feel closer to the educational system I belong to as well as to the children who are a part of it. It

> has increased my commitment even more -- and my desire to be a part of the changing role that education is taking.

Clearly for these mentors, whose experience had been challenging and rewarding, serving in this role gave them the opportunity to feel that they were contributing to the fuller education enterprise.

On continuing the relationship. The great majority of the mentors indicated that they expected their relationships to continue in the coming school year. Over two-thirds of the respondents pointed to their desire to build on what had been both a professionally and a personally satisfying experience. One mentor responded this way:

> We teach on the same grade level, next door to each other. Therefore, we have many common concerns. (We also share most students from both classes for various subjects, projects, field trips, movies, etc.).
> We have also become very good friends and have socialized frequently outside of class. We like and admire each other a great deal.

What had started out and developed as a formal relationship between the mentors and interns, for many had evolved into a "natural" association:

> We have become friends as well as colleagues. It would only be natural to communicate and "share the day."

and,

> The key word is "relationship." The program will end but an established relationship will continue beyond June.

Some mentors wanted it to be understood that the relationships they developed with their interns were ones of equality and shared respect:

> I feel that we have achieved the goals we set out to attain this year through the program. However, we have also developed a mutually supportive relationship that I feel will continue, as we both perceive the need and take the initiative to make contact during the coming school year.

Sensing that both parties can continue to benefit from continued contact, these mentors were hopeful that their relationships with their interns would be sustained. Indeed, some mentors noted that they and their interns had already set plans to meet over the summer for both professional and social reasons, and others planned to work together during the coming year:

1. We started late this year. The beginning teachers can benefit from our suggestions for preplanning next year.
2. A rapport has been built by the whole group. This would be good to continue. With a little effort we could keep it growing.

In those cases in which the mentors were uncertain about whether the relationship would continue, or indicated that it would not, most often their comments pointed to the fact that their interns would be leaving the district or area, or they would be teaching in different buildings, making regular contact difficult. Even under such circumstances as these, however, some mentors indicated they hoped to be available for their interns if the need arose. One mentor reported that he/she had been a mentor the year before and had expected that relationship to continue, but it hadn't; he/she felt that, realistically, the relationship built this year might not be sustained, even though it was his/her hope to do so.

Of course, those relationships which the mentors viewed as problematic, they were not inclined to continue. Only a relatively few mentors reported such a relationship (two having been illustrated above). For a few mentors, the relationships in which they were involved simply had not developed productively:

> She hasn't asked for much this year. The relationship is a surface one, so far.

For these mentors (and probably their interns as well), the experience of the mentor-intern project was far less enhancing than it had been for the great majority of respondents.

Conclusions

A fuller and more complete understanding of the mentor-intern relationship may not be attainable. Teachers involved in such a relationship may not be able or willing to describe their involvement in its essence; they may not understand just how the relationship has formed or how it has affected them. Indeed, the variations among the relationships that are formed may make one intern or mentor teacher's descriptions seem odd or off-target when viewed by teachers involved in other pairings. And the forms on which the hundreds of participants have been asked to cast their descriptions--the focused logs, the background questionnaires, and the standardized surveys--may not give them the opportunity to portray well what they know or believe to be important about their experiences. Nonetheless, because the mentor-intern relationship is so central to the MT-I Program, it has been useful to review what they have reported through such

means as described, and to consider what that information argues directly or implies about the relationship. From this review and consideration may come the best knowledge accessible.

The preceding section of this report has presented a great deal of information in a variety of forms. Some of the analyses are simply descriptive and provide a better understanding of the participants and their experiences. Others seem to suggest directions which policy and practice might take. The conclusions which can be drawn from these analyses regarding the mentor-intern relationship are not markedly different from the conclusions presented at the end of the report of the first year's evaluation study. It seems appropriate simply to refer to that report again, but not to repeat it. The present conclusion provides a review of the mentor-intern relationship, as it has been described in the first year and confirmed in this, the second year evaluation.

It is clear that the mentor-intern relationship remains the single most important feature of the MT-I Program. While both interns and mentors sometimes pointed to other aspects of the projects which they valued, almost universally they regarded the relationship in which they were involved as the key to their overall judgments regarding the value of their participation. No other aspect of the projects even begins to weigh as heavily in the experiences of interns and mentors.

The great majority of the interns and mentors had positive experiences as participants in the projects, and more

particularly in their relationships. For the interns, having mentors helped them address a variety of matters related to teaching and the profession. In many cases it helped them solve problems. There is evidence to suggest that their participation led to the development of views of themselves that were positive and becoming more so. For the mentors, the relationship presented an opportunity to learn, to feel accomplished and appreciated, and to make a contribution beyond that which classroom teaching had allowed them to make. In many cases, serving as a mentor was directly associated with a sense of professional satisfaction. Perhaps no other practice within education's present repertoire of teacher induction programs could produce such highly personalized experiences for new teachers, and ones which they so widely value; the fact that participation in such an effort is valued by experienced teachers as well, seems an additional benefit, and one which would escape most other vehicles of induction.

Unfortunately, on the basis of these analyses, not much is known about the interns and mentors who judged their experiences negatively. Though it would seem that their numbers were small, their views would have been important as sources of learning about the projects and the relationship. From the few who did share their experiences, only a limited understanding can be gained. However, knowing that some interns and some mentors had less than positive experiences can serve as a prompt to further study, and to increased sensitivity to that possibility among

project planners, and mentors and interns themselves.

The importance of the mentor-intern relationship points to the importance of several matters related to the initiation and support of such relationships:

- decisions regarding the selection of mentors;
- decisions regarding matching the interns and mentors;
- consideration of the optimum mentor:intern ratios for given circumstances and given individuals;
- recognition of the impact of timing in the informal and formal start-up of the relationships;
- recognition that, while the relationships are potent means of easing the transition to practice for a competent beginning teacher, they should not be expected to offset either the problems generated by incompetence or the lack of preparation for teaching, or the problems of extraordinarily difficult teaching assignments;
- recognition that providing time, released from teaching responsibilities, is key to supporting the relationships;
- creation of a supportive environment in which administrators and other teachers understand and value the efforts of the mentors and interns; and
- provision of opportunities for interns and mentors to discuss and clarify their roles, to share their expectations, to engage in workshops and seminars which they value, and to solve problems that generate from their participation in the projects.

Addressing these matters is important if the mentor-intern relationships are to reach the goals for which they are formed.

The importance of the mentor-intern relationship points, as well, to the importance of the interns and mentors themselves--the attitudes and commitments they bring to their work, the skills and knowledge upon which they base their practice and build a mutual respect, the personal qualities which allow the relationships to deepen and extend beyond the parameters of their formal association. Fundamentally, each relationship remains the creation of two persons, and while much can be done at the project level to assist in that process, it is largely on the interns and mentors themselves that such a responsibility falls. Recognizing the pivotal role they each have in creating such relationships, and culturing their own capacities to do so, are steps they can take toward those ends.