Situated Professional Growth in a Mentoring Context:

The Effect of School Culture on the Socialization and Professional Development of a Beginning Teacher and the Importance of a Teacher Mentor

Elizabeth A. Hutchinson, M.Ed.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Paper presented to the

Wisconsin Research Seminar

CLOSING THE GAP: Highly Qualified to Highly Effective

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

June 17, 2008

"*After all I went through at the beginning of my teaching career, it's a wonder I'm still here. Who wouldn't have liked some help?"* (Amy, veteran teacher, 2005)

"I tried teaching; I hated it. No support and too much pressure. I like where I am now. I don't know, maybe if I had someone to help me at the time, well, maybe I'd still be teaching. Who knows?" (MaryAnn, real estate agent, 2004)

"I like helping out, that's why I do it. I'm giving them something none of us ever got – a chance to begin the right way, a chance to feel empowered. It's just so much better for someone to help you learn to teach. I went to a great university but there were still so many things I didn't know. What I'm doing is helping them to learn to teach in the real classroom." (Felicia, mentor teacher, 2007)

"I would be lost without my mentor." (David, beginning teacher, 2007)

Four separate people talking about beginning teaching and the concept of teacher mentoring. Two of the women are still teachers. One woman is a successful real estate broker. David, however, is a beginning teacher who knows the value of his mentor teacher in his life. This paper presents part of his story as well as his mentor's and a peer's. One hears Debbie and David as they navigate differing school contexts with their mentor and guide Joyce.

Literature Review

A confusion of goals

There is disagreement in the literature concerning the goal of mentor teachers serving as "local guides." Ingersoll and Kralik (2004) as well as others pronounce that the overall objective of mentoring programs is to provide the beginning teacher with a local guide (see also Villani, 2002). Others disagree

(Achinstein & Athanases, 2005; Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992a, 1992b; Feiman-Nemser 1998, 2001a, 2001b) and hold that assumptions that new teachers are only focused upon managerial issues have instead given way to awareness that new teachers are capable of much more complex understandings. They point to instances in which new teachers are expected to perform effectively by designing curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of their students rather than simply following prepackaged, directive curricula, as well as new teachers' abilities to gain more sophisticated understandings of their communities' and students' needs.

Another goal of mentoring that is in dispute is what some term the overemphasis on teacher retention. While some authors place retention as the first goal of mentoring programs (Villani, 2002; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004) and retention can certainly be seen as an important reason for enacting mentoring programs, others give it less emphasis. Retention is a naturally occurring by-product of good mentoring (Moir, 2003; Feiman-Nemser, 2003). Teacher mentoring should, more properly, sustain and direct teacher growth rather than simply enabling novices to feel good about the profession.

Even when school districts would agree that what they want is more substantive mentoring programs, it should be noted here that these are not always possible. Financial constraints that plague school districts in an era of increased accountability and decreased funding, sometimes disallow the induction programs that school districts wish they could offer. Instead, watered-down versions of mentoring programs have to fill the void. This means less induction support, especially in the vein of providing much-needed release time to mentors and mentees.

Effective mentoring for beginning teachers

Mentoring that focuses on goals of efficacy and equity, has as its heart enculturation into the professional education community (Feiman-Nemser, 2003) rather than just learning the ropes. First and foremost, there must be significant attention given to the selection and preparation of the mentor teacher. Effective mentoring practice focuses on long-term goals rather than short-term assistance. Long-term

professional development models include support past the first few months of teaching and even past the first year. Though formal mentorship may stop after the first year, an emphasis on building collegial relationships will help the novice throughout his or her career. New teachers must have the chance to learn from their own practice as well as the practice of others. In order for this to happen, districts must commit the time and resources to allow new teachers to observe others' classrooms and have theirs observed by their mentors on an on-going basis. "A high quality induction program should increase the probability that new teachers learn desirable lessons from their early teaching experiences." (Feiman-Nemser, 2003, p. 27). Time is probably the most important variable mentioned in the literature. Mentor teachers must have the time to spend with their mentees, away from their own classroom issues, so that they can turn their attention to the professional development of the new teacher.

Effective mentoring guides new teachers to analyze and reflect upon their own practice with particular attention to student learning. Trusting relationships develop between mentors and mentees that allow the new teacher a safe space in which to critically examine assumptions and push their practice forward (Cruzeiro & Morgan, 1999). Some effective programs use elements of coaching and other strategies to help mentees move forward but not all. It should be pointed out here that there is a difference between the use of these strategies as being mapped onto mentoring (becoming "what we do") and more nuanced, thoughtful integration of tools and strategies with a reflective emphasis (becoming "how we think") (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a).

Effective mentoring practice allows the new teacher to construct his or her own professional knowledge (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). This means that mentoring should be a collaborative effort. Each person's experiences in the classroom will be different and each person brings differing backgrounds to their experiences (Gray & Gray, 1985). Attention should also be given to the new teacher gaining content specific knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge from mentors or colleagues who are excellent teachers.

Mentor behaviors or characteristics

Achinstein and Athanases (2005), in their study of induction leaders in California, found that these leaders identified five knowledge areas mentors needed to understand when mentoring for equity (equity mentoring level) with diverse youth, understanding: 1) youths' context, 2) diverse learners' needs and attributes, 3) the need for a "broad repertoire of instructional strategies" (p. 1497), 4) themselves, in terms of relating to equity and diversity, and 5) "how to focus the new teacher on diversity and equity in mentoring conversations" (p. 1498).

Porter, Youngs, & Odden (2001) argue that mentors should be veteran teachers who are considered excellent. But beyond this, other authors argue that they should have dispositions that allow them to be supportive, trustworthy, and nonjudgmental (Gray & Gray, 1985). They have a great responsibility to interrupt the status quo in order to help the novice move forward. There is a danger that, without support, the novice will simply revert to his or her "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975) of other teachers' practice.

This paper takes one slice of a larger study and focuses on what the researcher has judged to be a very effective type of teacher mentoring in one particular school district in Dane County, Wisconsin. In this district, teacher mentors are employed as full-time mentor teachers, released from all regular classroom responsibilities, having been judged to be highly effective classroom teachers, having received initial training from the Dane County New Teacher Project (DCNTP), and willing to take on the caseload of approximately 15 initial educators per mentor. These mentors are supported at the school district level by a community of mentor teachers, as well as receiving ongoing support from the staff of the DCNTP, in the form of multiple support seminars. These full-time mentors offer support seminars mandatory in this district for beginning teachers (defined by this district as teachers in their first three years of teaching) at multiple times during the school year that focus the beginning teachers on the ten Wisconsin Teacher Standards and also seek to create lasting relationships with the teachers in their caseloads by visiting them in their classrooms on a weekly basis. These mentors are there to advise and to assist in the professional growth of these beginning teachers.

Within this one school district, the author has followed the progress of two beginning teachers who share a mentor teacher. Because this study requires both elements of qualitative and quantitative design, the author utilized a mixed-methods approach to answering the research questions. Participants in this study included: mentor teachers, beginning teachers (also called initial educators), school and district administrators, and DCNTP personnel.

The author has chosen, for the purposes of this paper, to focus on two beginning teachers' experience in terms of interactions with the same mentor teacher, the level of district induction support, as well as the highly important school context. As mentioned in the opening paragraphs of this proposal, this school district employs full-time mentor teachers. One of these mentor teachers agreed to be a participant in this study along with two of her beginning teachers. The district context and support remained the same for each beginning teacher but there were also distinct differences between the two. Beyond other factors that will be discussed later, their school contexts were entirely different. Though they both taught in the same school district, one teacher (Debbie) was in a school climate ripe with professional development opportunities. The principal in her setting was a dynamic leader and the teachers in that school, a newer school in the district, took great pride in being district leaders in terms of novel teaching practices. In the other setting (David's school), the school community was much less positive and certainly not as focused on professional development. The principal had been absent often due to personal crises and there was not the esprit de corps that was evident in the newer school. This school was designed as an (architecturally) open concept school and the beginning teacher felt very constrained by this design. Because of such distinct differences in school context, the discussions that this one mentor had with these teachers could not have been more different. The mentor's use of language and her presence in the discussion were vastly different in the two contexts with the supportive school environment creating space for the beginning teacher to begin to take the lead in conversations while the less supportive school culture for the other teacher seemed to hamper his progress, creating a situation in which the mentor had to be more directive. Indeed at the end of the study, the teacher in the

most supportive school environment showed a marked difference in all aspects under study than the second teacher. Though data about teacher efficacy and subsequent discussions of relevance will not be presented here, the two measures of new teacher growth in terms of efficacy and in terms of real teacher practice that are included in the methodology section (see below) also point to more improvement in teacher growth for the teacher in the more supportive school with the dynamic principal.

To gain a sense of the entire study, the author includes a discussion about the design and methodology in its entirety. However for this paper's purpose the author will focus on time spent in mentoring conversations discussing specific contexts and examples of mentoring conversations in the two disparate contexts. Participants in this study included: mentor teachers, beginning teachers (also called initial educators), school and school district administrators, and DCNTP personnel. There were seven research questions that were addressed in four broad categories: 1. The content of the mentoring workshops and support seminars; 2. Mentor teachers' value and use of the workshops, seminars, and tools offered for use therein; 3. Beginning teachers' professional development and efficacy among the various models; and 4. School districts' reasons for choosing the model of mentoring program ultimately implemented.

This paper comes from research on the third category, having to do with beginning teachers' professional development and efficacy. In this third part of the study, three research questions were asked:

1. How do beginning teachers value the mentoring they receive from DCNTP-trained mentor teachers?

2. How does DCNTP mentoring impact beginning teachers' sense of efficacy?

3. How does DCNTP mentoring impact beginning teachers' professional practice?

The author will address the third such question in this paper, excepting a discussion about utilization of a rubric to score teaching events that is not yet complete.

Design and Methodology

Again, this is a piece of a larger study. The design and methodology of this section of the entire study is explained here. A sample of nine mentor-mentee pairs was asked to participate in the development of one year-long comparative, purposive case studies. There were three dyads chosen from three mentoring model (there were three distinct mentoring models identified in the Dane County school districts). However, as the study progressed it was clear that one of the models was not in and of itself a cohesive unit. The two school district that had been thought to be similar enough to create a model were found to be vastly different from one another on almost all counts. All of the beginning teachers were elementary teachers who teach literacy, though the grade level taught varied. Data sources used to investigate this question were in the form of field notes, transcribed interviews, transcribed audio recordings of meetings between mentors and mentees, classroom observations to provide context only, and videotaped examples of literacy teaching events modeled on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), which is detailed below (note: this is not included in this paper because it is not yet complete for all beginning teachers in the study).

Audio recordings of mentoring conversations were analyzed with attention to verbal flow between the participants (i.e. the percentage of time the mentor speaks vs. the percentage of time the beginning teacher speaks); the length of time spent in areas of general pedagogy, content pedagogy, managerial issues, analyzing the teaching event and student work; the amount of time spent using the tools provided by the DCNTP; who initiated different portions of the conversation (Mentor-led or beginning teacher-led); and lastly how mentor teachers provided assistance (i.e. Did they offer solutions? Did they offer advice? How did they scaffold the beginning teacher's learning? Did they lead the beginning teacher into the development of her/his own solutions?). One of the largest questions in this

section is about who controls the discussion and what is discussed. The author utilized conversation coding within the transcripts of these conversations to analyze these conversations. These codes directly relate to the mentoring framework the author has proposed in that the answers to these questions directly link to time spent on survival issues (efficiency), learning (efficacy), and learning for all students (equity), as well as providing insight to the type of assistance the mentor provided in terms of support and problem solving and the direct or indirect nature of this assistance.

Interviews with the initial educators and mentor teachers were semi-structured , occurred at multiple times during the study, and focused on how both value the experience and how the mentor practices taught by the DCNTP were utilized and if they aided the initial educator in the process of learning to teach. These interviews offered the researcher and the participants time to discuss questions that arose from what the researcher saw in their interactions and to clear up any misconceptions the researcher may have had. Member checks were performed. Data were coded from these multiple sources and as topics began to emerge, were included in the development of matrices, which were then used in cross-case analyses. Collective case studies (Stake, 2000) are being written in order to illustrate the phenomenon of mentoring across the three models, with attention to context- or site-specific enactments of the models.

Beginning teachers mentored under the DCNTP models are a diverse group. Depending upon the year, there may be broad differences in the subject areas and levels of incoming teachers. It would be very difficult to compare these teachers to one another in terms of their effectiveness with students, as evidenced by student achievement. Certainly, standardized measures, as articulated in the next section, are not a workable solution. Researchers in other places have begun to use self-reported ratings of beginning teacher efficacy as proxy measures for student achievement (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001; Hoy & Spero, 2005). Based upon the work of Bandura (1977, 1997), these efficacy measures are designed to measure new teachers' perceptions of their own professional practice. Inherent in this view of efficacy is the belief that teachers who demonstrate high

levels of efficacy are able to: a) manage classrooms in ways that enhance student autonomy; b) discover and utilize new strategies of approaching subject matter; c) differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students, particularly those who have difficulty achieving; d) set achievable objectives; and, e) persevere in the face of setbacks (Ross, 1994, 1998).

To measure beginning teacher efficacy under these three mentoring models, the researcher utilized Gibson and Dembo's (1984) teacher efficacy inventory. Using the factor analysis provided by Woolfolk and Hoy (1990), questions were grouped that fell under headings they labeled personal teaching efficacy and teaching efficacy. However, for this study's purpose, the headings personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE) (Hoy & Spero, 2005) were used. As multiple measures throughout the first year will provide a comparison of their own perceived growth, the inventory was administered at the beginning and end of the study and results were compared. Analysis was performed by comparing means and standard deviations of efficacy measures across the three models. In addition, measures will be compared across district contexts within each model as well. Because this measure relies on a six-point Likert scale, higher scores point to higher levels of efficacy.

The question of how this program of mentoring impacts beginning teachers' professional practice was posed by members of the Dane County Superintendents Association. The question itself is highly problematic because there is no comparison group, other than within the three identified models. In addition, the superintendents who posed this question would prefer attention to standardized testing gains as measured by pre- and post-year tests. However, as argued above, not all the districts invest in the same types of testing and even if they did, it would be hardly possible to tie these outcomes to the single variable of mentoring. Since one can't control for all of the possible reasons that students might succeed or fail on a standardized measure after having been in a specific teacher's class, it seems only fair to measure these gains in other ways. Another important note here is that assessment under PI34 is considered formative, not evaluative. As a researcher, the author cannot place herself in the role of

evaluating teachers but can begin to assess growth over time, provided that this information is kept confidential.

The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (or PACT) provided a lens to do just that. Using the rubric developed to score a video-taped teaching segment (teaching event), the researcher assessed the beginning teachers twice in this year-long study: in the first few weeks and then again in the final weeks of the study. These scores are reported in the overall study along with a rich written description of the differences between the two videotaped sessions in order to document professional growth in teaching. Beginning teachers were responsible for deciding what is included in the videotape but were also given a copy of the rubric beforehand. In addition to the videotape, the PACT asks teachers to address, in written form, the content of the lesson plan, a description of what has occurred prior to the teaching event (which can include prior learning as well as explanations of classroom routines), a description of the diversity of student needs and how the teacher is attending to these, how the teacher is assessing the learning taking place, and a reflection on student learning focused both on the successes and failures of the lesson. The PACT rubric allows for delineation into levels one through four, with four being the highest, on issues of planning, instruction, assessment, reflection, and academic language.

The results of the entire study will be reported elsewhere. This paper and presentation will focus on the mentor's differentiated practice between her two very dissimilar beginning teachers. It should be noted here that the term used by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction for beginning teachers is "Initial Educator." For purposes of this paper and discussion, the author will use "beginning teacher" and "initial educator" interchangeably because those terms are used synonymously by mentor teachers and administrators in the Dane County Consortium.

The School District and Participants

Springfield School District is located in a burgeoning suburban area. It has a student population of 5,921 and is growing rapidly. In this school district, teacher mentors are employed as full-time mentor

teachers, released from all regular classroom responsibilities, having been judged to be highly effective classroom teachers, having received initial training from the Dane County New Teacher Project (DCNTP), and willing to take on the caseload of approximately 15 initial educators per mentor. The mentors are selected through a committee process that involves interviews that include mentoring responses to taped segments of beginning teachers' practice. These mentors are supported at the school district level by a community of mentor teachers, as well as receiving ongoing assistance from the staff of the DCNTP, in the form of multiple support seminars. In addition, these full-time mentors offer initial educator support seminars mandatory in this district for beginning teachers (defined by this district as teachers in their first three years of teaching) at multiple times during the school year that focus the beginning teachers on the ten Wisconsin Teacher Standards and also create lasting relationships with the teachers in their caseloads by visiting them in their classrooms on a weekly basis. In this school district mentors are there to advise and to assist in the professional growth of these beginning teachers.

Mentor teacher Joyce is 46 years of age and has taught for 20 years, the past 15 of them in Springfield. She has taught both kindergarten and first grade. Joyce is employed by Springfield School District as a full-time mentor teacher released from teaching with a caseload of fifteen initial educators. This school district employs four full time mentor teachers with similar caseloads. Joyce is a graduate of a local private religious college. Initial educator David is 32 and on his second career, following work in law enforcement. He married and a father of two. He is a graduate of a local private religious college. David teaches second grade at Knotty Pine Elementary School. Debbie, an initial educator, is 23 years of age and is unmarried with no children. She is a graduate of the state university. Debbie teaches first grade at Buena Vista Elementary School.

Knotty Pine Elementary School, where David teaches, is an established elementary school (K-5) built about 25 years ago on the open concept model. Knotty Pine has a school population of 454 students. Of these, 12% receive free or reduced lunch, 15.4% are non-White students, 4.4% are English Language Learners, and roughly 12% are identified as having a disability requiring services through special

education. Buena Vista Elementary School is a newer elementary school (K-5) that opened in the fall of 2006 and it has a student population of 489, of which 19.8% of the students receive free or reduced lunch, 27.4% are classified as non-White, 4.2% are identified as English Language Learners, and 13.9% are identified as having a disability requiring services through special education.

Mentoring Conversations Coded and Analyzed

The analysis of teacher language used in mentoring conversations began with coding for mentor language, whether this was responding to the initial educator or initiating the conversation (i.e. was the language directive, indirect, problem solving, questioning, explaining or justifying, suggesting options?). After this, it became clear that what was more important and more telling about the conversations was on which topics these discussions centered. Thus, new codes were established that seemed to point to more overarching themes of conversations (see figure 1). It was obvious when listening to these conversations, and became more obvious during the analysis of written transcripts that certain differences between the two initial educators' school contexts had an impact on what kind of support they needed from their mentor at any given time.

Codes	Relevance
GP	related to general pedagogy
CP	related to content pedagogy
PR	related to school or district policy
CX	related to specific school context
SS	related to social support
DF	related to differentiating pedagogy
CM	related to general classroom management
DI	related to discipline of specific students

Figure 1 Conversational Coding according to topic

The two beginning teachers' conversations with their mentor were examined by percentage of time in each interview speaking about these subjects. The results of this analysis are seen in Figure 2 below.

Codes	Relevance	% of time David	% of time Debbie
GP	related to general pedagogy	42	12
CP	related to content pedagogy	10	43
PR	related to school or district policy	8	2
CX	related to specific school context	16	8
SS	related to social support	5	2
DF	related to differentiating pedagogy	5	25
CM	related to general classroom management	10	6
DI	related to discipline of specific students	4	2

Figure 2 Conversational Coding according to topic, David v. Debbie

Debbie's time was most generally split between differing forms of pedagogical issues, including quite a bit of time (25%) spent discussing differentiation. David also had pedagogical issues as his highest concern (totaling 57% under the three categories) but also spent quite a bit of time with site specific issues (especially related to a perceived lack of leadership in the school). Remarkable here are the differing amounts of time spent between the two beginning teachers on differentiating pedagogy to meet the needs of all students. Debbie spent one fourth of her time in mentoring discussions focused on this issue, whether discussing strategies she was implementing to help her lower performing students or her worries that her higher performing students were not getting enough of her attention. David, on the other hand spent very little time (5%) of his time discussing differentiation.

David

David works at Knotty Pine Elementary, where his principal has been absent quite often due to two separate family issues. At times, the principal has had to go on extended leave. The district hired a former principal to come back during the time when the principal was on leave, but the staff of the school struggled with cohesion. During interviews, David told me that the school had developed cliques of teachers and felt like it had no instructional leader. Because of this principal's personal issues, David and Joyce (his mentor) let me know that the principal was at best, present but disconnected, and at the worst, absent from school. Interestingly enough, this school is one of the more wealthy elementary schools in the district.

Knotty Pine Elementary school was built in the seventies on an open concept architectural model. However, over the years, certain changes to that model have been made. First among these was that kindergartners are no longer housed within the open space. Part of the school has been enclosed in classrooms and those have been put to use for kindergartners to give them some sense of defined space. As one enters the school, its layout is confusing. While most schools' entrances are near the principal's office, in this school the office is in the older open concept section. One enters beside a classroom and a large open area but must go off to the left through a bathroom and hand-washing area before finding the principal's office. While the library (or media center) remains in the center of the open section of the school, as one might expect in this architectural form, over time the teachers have used moveable dividers to establish their own discrete space for what they call their *classrooms,* but these are more clearly defined as *class areas*. Still, it is a confusing place to one unaccustomed to this type of elementary school setting. Therein lays one of the main issues for David.

David is uncomfortable with the open concept model because he believes his students are easily distracted by what's happening in other classrooms. In addition, he feels hampered by the lack of walls because he worries that anything noisy he would do with his class would disturb others. This is a real issue with this type of architecture. Going to and from lunch and recess is an interesting endeavor, requiring absolute silence from seven and eight year-olds as they wind through the *hallways* (roughly

defined by class area dividers), through or around the library space, and into or through the more traditional section of the school. David would really like the ability to close the door to his classroom but since he hasn't a door or a defined room, he seeks to define his space in any way he can. Though this open shared space might seem to be an ideal condition in which teachers could develop multi-class activities and share ideas more easily than the traditional classroom "ice-cube tray structure" to which Lortie (2002) refers, this doesn't seem to be happening here. Teachers, if anything, seem to be holding on to their dividers as if they could wish them into brick and mortar. David, as a beginning teacher, is frustrated with his physical space and in interviews exclaims, "I just wish I had walls! I could do *so much more* with walls!"

Beyond spatial limitations, though, the climate and culture of the school have not served to interest David in professional development beyond the district requirements. New curricular implementations were happening at other schools but rather than resulting in David's desire to be a part of these changes, he expresses a sense of envy because other schools have what he thinks are better, more connected principals. However, David exhibits an interest and also discusses his frustration while implementing a new district wide discipline policy that centers on behaviors that are either "above the line" or "below the line." He wants to understand it and implement it correctly:

> David: I've been teaching it every morning, the above the line below the line, we've been doing it every morning instead of writer's workshop. I haven't started that yet just because I wanted, that's my time where I'm doing things together as far as…
>
> Joyce: Yeah, building community, yeah
>
> David: When I can get the posters made up for triangle, I'll have those up hopefully next week.
>
> Joyce: I like how you said *teaching*, I'm teaching that every day. You know because it's really, people have to stop, step back and teach it. Especially if they're not doing it.

David: I expect to be taught. I don't feel like I have grasp on it yet…Because apparently [another school] won't share what they've done. [The principal has] asked and they said no. That's what she told us at our meeting on Thursday.

Joyce: Oh, because I was working with them last year and they were really happy to share. In fact we were going to try to do like an after school workshop kind of thing with some of the teachers that wanted to kind of go through the process they had gone through.

David: Yeah because that what's we said, you know if you can't come now why don't you have them train us? They've been trained, have them train us. And she said they wouldn't share…

Joyce: Yeah, absolutely. And as a district that should just be an expectation that you're paying a bunch of money to have somebody come in. That should be an expectation that you're going to come back, you know teach others just like [another school] with the writer's workshop and then, you know, they're willing to share the knowledge they learned.

In a conversation with his mentor teacher about a severe discipline issue with an out of control second grader, David searches for a way to deal with the child, knowing he has no support from his principal:

IE: I had a really good class. Except for one little guy that has some issues.

M: Ok, what's his name?

IE: [says name].

M: [repeats name]. And what would you call these kinds of issues? Can you find a name?

IE: Physically abusive, mentally abusive, or verbally abusive, I guess. Yeah, all day he sits there and tells me he wants to kill me, and he's going to hurt me, and…

M: Does he do that to children too?

IE: Yes.

M: And so then what? That's my big question.

IE: The same issues of discipline exist [discussing his principal]…

M: Yeah, I was feeling bad for you and others that haven't had some consistent leadership.

IE: Yeah, today he took off out of the class. This morning, he took off and I called down to the office and I couldn't find anybody, so I called the secretary and said I need help: a student left. And the response was, "What would you like me to do about it?" And I said somebody has to stop him from leaving the building. So she said, "Okay, I'll try."

M: Okay, so there needs to be a chain of events, I mean there needs to be a chain of command or something. It seems to be missing.

IE: We have this new student rule form that… follows with our above the line below the line. So we check if he's physically aggressive. Of course there's a fine line between that and…

M: This is not a bottom line behavior?

IE: Exactly. Violence, I mean I don't know where you draw the line and no one knows.

Though David has grown over the course of his first two years of teaching, his personality is such that he focuses on the negatives of almost any situation. His mentor, Joyce, while providing content support, helping him to negotiate the difficult political terrain within his school, and discussing continuously classroom management and discipline ideas, also must focus on helping him stay positive.

David: … And actually FOSS is too easy for second graders.

Joyce: Really?

David: I'm kind of disgusted by it. I mean I am at the point where the kids don't want to do it. So it's like me prepping; it is just pulling teeth for me.

Joyce: It's making it not worthwhile?

David: I just can't get into it. I love science.

Joyce: Yeah, so you are the first I've heard that does not like it.

David: Oh, really? Because at our, the last meeting two weeks ago, someone I talked to said the same thing for first grade.

Joyce: Really?

David: And then why does first grade have plants? Because my [friend] works [in another elementary school], she said she would think it would be more for second grade. I'm like well, who looked at it could be a part of it.

Joyce: Yeah, ok.

David: I've been working on solids and liquids, I don't know what we're doing today…

Joyce: …So you're meeting as a grade level district wide or just here for FOSS?

David: Our last meeting, [school district wide grade level] meeting, I was talking to the other teachers and they were saying the same, kids have done this. For example, this is one. [shows card game]

Joyce: And what's the card game supposed to, what's the learning?

David: That one is memory. You are supposed to, this is helping them to remember vocabulary. Bubbles and viscous, transparent, that is transparent because you can see the black line behind the bottle. That is foamy I think, that is viscous; it's sticky and gooey kind of like syrup could be, but I'm like well the picture doesn't really show me viscous. That has color.

Joyce: Very colorful.

David: It's very colorful and that is transparent. Or no it's translucent because you can't see through it. What's the difference between translucent and opaque?

Joyce: I don't know. What is it?

David: I don't know. I guess translucent is a liquid and opaque is a solid, I guess that is the only difference…

Joyce: By doing that, is it working? Can they remember those vocabulary words?

David: I haven't played it yet…

David: So I'm really disappointed and I've had I don't know how many conversations with my team and how to do it.

Joyce: Are they out there? That's because I've heard nothing but good prior to us doing this year. Like oh, we get FOSS, the [teachers in _____ love it].

Joyce, for her part, struggles to find out what is wrong with the FOSS kits and tries to help David find something positive about the experience. She asks about what other teachers in his grade level are talking about but David resists this and tells her about what a friend has told him. She then tries to focus his attention on the actual content but he seems to be focused only on the problems. He then ends with saying he hasn't done it yet. David hasn't been proactive in this situation. He's blaming the materials but not offering himself a solution nor is he taking advantage of the many openings for growth that Joyce is offering him.

Joyce is very careful at times to help David develop the political savvy to deal with his unorganized school setting. She also is, on many occasions, much more direct and explicit about how David can fix a situation. However, more often than not Joyce gently guides David to make his own decisions and to see things more positively. David's needs tend to center around issues of classroom discipline, general pedagogy and content pedagogy when teaching to a new or established curriculum, building and maintaining a positive attitude, and navigating his difficult school environment.

In conversations with both David and Joyce, other factors emerge. Joyce is obviously frustrated and does not feel that she is meeting David's needs and moving forward his practice. However, David openly talks about his frustration with his school and its leadership, or lack thereof, but also points out his

admiration for Joyce. He even calls her his *lifeline*. "I don't know what I would have done without Joyce." When talking about people on his grade level team, folks who teach just across the barricades from him, he mentions one woman as being his friend. However, when asked about if this friendship ever ventures into professional "teacher talk" about the intricacies of teaching second grade, he says that she is only his friend and that they have similar interests outside of school (sports teams and the like). The only people he is talking to about his practice are Joyce and a family member. He is becoming active in his union but only as this pertains to remuneration and benefits. A side note here: David enters and leaves the school each day upon his contractually obligated schedule. The reasons for part of this may be connected to his responsibilities as a father. However, he is an interesting contrast to the other beginning teacher described below.

Debbie

Debbie teaches at Buena Vista Elementary school. Open only two years, it is one of the newest schools in Springfield. Its principal, far from being detached and absent, is present and active and is seen by her own teachers and many other people in the school district as a strong instructional leader and an innovator. Unlike what David experiences at Knotty Pine, the teachers in this school meet in grade level groups regularly and are introduced to new kinds of curriculum. Buena Vista, or rather, its school principal and teachers, are seen as leaders within the school district. Though at 19.8% Buena Vista has a higher percentage of students needing free or reduced lunch than Knotty Pine (at 12%), and a slightly larger percentage of students requiring Special Education services (13.91% to Knotty Pine's 12.11%), teachers at Buena Vista seem more committed to working together to improve instruction for all students. If Knotty Pine is characterized by its lack of collegial groupings of teachers focused upon improving instruction for all students, Buena Vista is diametrically opposed.

It would almost seem to defy logic that Buena Vista's traditional structure of classrooms with walls and doors that shut, actually ends up being a more collaborative place than an open concept school.

Of course, the architecture is not totally traditional. In the midst of long and very wide hallways of classrooms, divided into sections by grade level (kindergarten area, first grade area, etc.), there are computer and technology bays and even some cooking areas. These boulevard-like hallways have been put to use in the medians, as it were. Debbie shares this area with all of the other first grade teachers. In sharing this area and attending weekly grade level meetings, Debbie has been naturally socialized into the group identity of her grade level team. This team is a dynamic group of teachers who, like Debbie, are by in large young and excited about their own professional development and how they see this changing the way they teach their students. Debbie's classroom (with walls and a door) is highly organized and yet colorful and inviting. Students know where they are supposed to be for each different activity due to Debbie's organizational charts. The students may be in one grouping with reading buddies and a wholly different grouping for other activities. As Debbie explains these groupings, it is clear she has thought out why she is putting certain children together and how much time she has put into teaching her students to follow an established routine that efficiently moves students from one activity to another.

At Buena Vista, the very air is ripe with reform. Teachers in this school have piloted new curriculum for the entire school district, such as Reader's and Writer's Workshop. The principal has somehow managed, with the help of a very active and supportive parent group, to send large numbers of teachers to Teachers College at Columbia University in New York City to be trained in these practices. Though these programs are now being implemented throughout the school district, Buena Vista teachers were the first to do so. They are now active in supporting the implementation throughout the school district. One might say they are driving the reform process. Debbie, as a beginning teacher, could be overwhelmed at all of the new ways of teaching. However, it is precisely *because* she is a new teacher that she is interested in finding new and creative ways to teach.

Debbie's interaction with her mentor is different than David's. She needs less content area support because she has her grade level team (though at times she needs her mentor to sort of give her permission to do things her own way). She also needs less political support with her principal because

her principal is both active and approachable. Though she sometimes has minor discipline issues, she is not as consumed with these as David seems to be. Whereas David's personality is reactive, Debbie's is much more proactive, particularly about what she sees as her problem areas. For example, she was given a classroom full of desks for her first graders. She found them difficult to move around to create small communities of students working together; therefore, she went out into the school and found tables that no one was using. She solved her storage issues (each child has to have somewhere to put her things) by getting slim bags that fit on the back of the students' chairs. She has color-coded all of her students' folders (i.e. blue is for writing; green and red have other meanings).

Debbie tends to share her successes more than areas of concern. Here, she walks Joyce through working with literacy lessons and including a child who is technically in kindergarten but whose reading level exceeds her peers to such a high level that Debbie and another teacher decided to try letting her join the first graders.

Debbie: And I took on, _____ had a girl who's at above a 16 starting kindergarten and so she asked if she could join my readers workshop instead of doing kindergarten's right now because she doesn't have any other kids who are even near that level with her. And so once they start more guided groups which I think will be next week I'll start pulling groups for guided reading groups and then a week after that we are starting to write books.

Joyce: And how do you feel about that?

Debbie: I'm ok with that. I mean she asked me if I would be okay with it and I only have a couple kids who are even at the level. So I think it will be good for those kids who are at that level to have another student I think it's… she fit in just fine. She was social; she wasn't shy or anything.

Joyce: Good.

Debbie: We're still doing lots of shared reading, lots of activities. So I'm sure she doesn't feel too out of place. She's obviously reading higher than most of my kids. So that's kind of interesting, [Her teacher] is like, if it doesn't work or you know that you know if she feels awkward and she tells mom or she says anything to either of us you know we can just switch her back in. And then also she'll probably have somebody around her level eventually. But she needs that time right now to let her go do something otherwise she is going to be bored anyways.

Joyce: Yeah and then some behaviors will start. Well, it's really nice to hear how you're teaming and collaborating with other teachers

Debbie: Yeah. Thanks.

Joyce: You're accommodating and being really flexible. So that's nice to let somebody else come in and hopefully with higher kids it will be something where they really work together. And how does it feel that she went to you and no one else?

Debbie: It feels really good. She and I have a positive relationship to begin with because we've known each other. So it feels good that she trusts my teaching as well even though she's never seen me teach. And her husband has only seen me teach math. But she definitely has confidence in the fact that I can teach this kid. And she knew it too, I have three of her kids [from kindergarten], but her highest kid last year is an ELL kid and she knew at least, that her kid tried really hard. He was at a 24. In nonfiction he comprehends like no other. He could list you every fact that was in the book. And he's very self-aware. When he doesn't know stuff he's a smart, smart kid. But, even to put her with him even though she's at a sixteen and he's at a twenty-four, they'll be a good match for comprehension skills. So she knew I had a high one.

It is rare that Joyce finds herself suggesting solutions to Debbie; nonetheless, it does happen in cases of classroom management. In particular, Debbie's new student Keeshawn, is having trouble with classroom routines. Joyce finds herself suggesting a specific strategy.

Joyce: So let's just go to Keeshawn again. Like, so he doesn't like to be moved. And maybe [he likes] the attention drawn to him? So do you think like could that have been his response? Like I'm just going to do something so idiotic I'm not even thinking?

Debbie: No. I think he, I don't think it was the attention drawn to him thing. I think it was just that he was mad because he was no longer sitting in this spot. He thinks this spot he wants to sit in is his spot whether or not it is in between four people in the smallest area possible. And I think that's the problem.

Joyce: Well, there [are] a couple things you could do. I know there [are] like these round circle things. They're just like plastic rubber things that they could sit on. Maybe giving him a choice between you can sit here or here, which are you going to choose today? So you can seize back that power. Sometimes kids, especially boys that have been running all summer and now they have to sit, it's really hard. But even letting him sit in the back on a chair, if he can handle that. So he is up and his feet aren't planted. Or there's the basket of fiddle things.

Debbie responds positively to these ideas and says she's going to try them. She moves on to an issue she's having with another student, for whom she is getting support from her team and principal. Later she comes back to Keeshawn and says that this year:

Debbie: I have thirteen boys, but they're all pretty like pleasing, gentle, and whatever boys. And I mentioned Keeshawn, he's a little squirrelly, but he really wants to please you.

Debbie's support and her enthusiasm for her job are infectious. In mid-October, Joyce begins asking her about a reading strategy she has just implemented and is impressed with it, she asks if she might share this with others she mentors.

Debbie: Friday's our reading celebration. So we will look at our goals and see if we met our goals and celebrate that you know everybody read those and met those goals. And then we'll make new goals for next week.

Joyce: How did that go? How did the goal setting go?

Debbie: Good. They were really patient with each other. And I wrote them all. So instead of having them write it because otherwise they would have just gotten frustrated.

Joyce: I'm still glad. This is a great partner aid. This is something I need to share with others that are struggling. Like how do I manage my partners? Just the idea of putting them on charts.

Debbie: What we do, I mean our whole mini lessons have been about how to be with a partner. For first grade. It's been - they're like four or five lessons on partners this month. And then next month we'll go back. So like writing partners, we've done a lot of modeling, like how to sit hip to hip, how to point with your finger when you're reading to your partner, how to talk with a loud, clear voice, how to make sure your partner [understands], you know. And then tomorrow we'll be asking good questions and giving good compliments to your partner, as a listener and then flipping. And then like with reader partners. Today I modeled it with the kids and they're like I did a block like I did Lilly. And I said this book is too hard for me to read, but I read it today and I really liked it, and I know the stories so I'm going to talk to my partner about this so I did the whole thing. And then I said Mallory you go pick a book, and she chose a book. And she chose it, and she

did her whole walk through the book. Showed me where, and you know she did exactly what I did. And then all of the kids today did it. And they really like having partners. But it's a big deal to get into it…

Joyce: How awesome. It's working really well.

Debbie is very conscientious of differentiating instruction and finds herself spending much more time with her lower level readers than her higher level readers. She is very pleased that her lower level students' growth but is concerned that she's not giving enough attention to her upper level readers. Joyce attempts to help her through this by alternating her strategy, which is something Debbie is resistant to at first:

Debbie: It's hard. It can work but I think it's hard when kids are at so many different levels because it's not the same. And a lot of times like it would be, I mean strategy groups are something that they promote.

Joyce: What about strategy groups that are leveled?

Debbie: Yeah.

Joyce: You know because they are going to be in different places with their knowledge. But if you pull all the sevens and focus on, what does a seven look like in this strategy and where do I have to bump this group so that they're moving kind of to the next level in this strategy. And kind of grouping them big enough so that there [are] three groups. Just to try something different to lessen your stress.

Debbie: Right now it's more stress.

Joyce: Yeah, but just pulling a book out of their book totes that they're working on so that you don't have to pull additional books for guided.

Debbie: The advantage is that they, the books that they're reading they should figure out what 95% of the words mean.

Joyce: Right so your books are the instructional level.

Debbie: Like their books are at an easier level. And sometimes I'll like, like you said I might pull if the kid is reading at a six I might pull a seven and do a walk through with them and read two pages with them and let them finish. Like that sometimes is what I'll do as like a conference. They'll sit down with a book and my goal for a lot of my kids especially my six, seven, eight, nine's is to get them to do a really good picture walk on their own. Because I feel like a picture walk is, you know like

Joyce: So you conferencing with all those sevens, could you pull them all as one and say this is what we are going to do for picture walk this morning and I'm going to go around and check when I do my one on ones. So that your conferring then can be more individualized on that but it eases up, maybe your group is bigger, maybe you can do the range a little bit bigger for that strategy group so they aren't so many. How many guided groups do you have right now?

Debbie: There is really no way. They are all, I have a really high one, one that is at a fifteen; I have one that's at about a ten. I have one that's at eight.

Joyce: Okay, so do this again.

Debbie: I might be able to do my, I have like twenties, a group of twenties

Joyce: Okay, and how many are in that?

Debbie: Three. I have a group of fifteen's, and then three of them. A group of ten's and there are three. I have a group of eights. This is the tricky part. I feel like I'm missing a group. A group of fives and there are four. I have a group of like six, sevens and there are three each. And then I have a group of eight's. I'm trying to add them up.

Joyce: Okay, so say the strategy was, what's a strategy that you feel like, let's just think about your sixes, sevens, and eights, and tens. What's a similar strategy that…

Debbie: Chunking.

Joyce: Chunking. Yeah because it seems like they go from, it's takes a while for them to get to five. And then they plateau a bit. And then again at eight to ten is another plateau time. Fifteen is another plateau time and you know looking through those landmarks, times where they plateau and just depending on this group, if they're more sevens I think it's very appropriate to chunk them together. And give them a high, a ten, where they're going to have to work a little bit but your supporting. The whole idea is that they're getting practice chunking. And the more unfamiliar the text, probably the more you can teach it. If it's right at instructional sometimes it gets harder. So the tens might have an easier time but that's ok because the tens just need that. Where the six, sevens, eights, really need some work. So we could group, and then the fives I think that's appropriate and your six, sevens could go either way. But if we do seven that's ten kids right there. And the level five would be four. And that's appropriate to keep at their own little level. But I think, again the fifteen to twenty could be ok to focus on, I mean I would go into one of the eight poster strategy, you know them like connections, or

Debbie: Well and that's what I've been trying to do a lot with my time. Like theory of reading level and such after doing last year. Once my group reaches eighteen, my focus goes strictly to comprehension with that group and that will go for all year.

Although it is troubling for her, Debbie has a clear sense of trying to differentiate her class routines so that her teaching will meet the needs of all of her students.

Debbie and David have very different personalities and Debbie's tends to be more upbeat. Nevertheless, Joyce still has to offer social support when it is needed. At one point during the year, Debbie complains to Joyce that she feels overwhelmed because even though she stays at school late every day to prepare there are times she just doesn't think she can do it all well enough. Her mentor lets her talk it out a bit and then helps her think back to her successes to put things back into perspective. Debbie had a very strong sense of both content and general pedagogy matched with a strong drive for her own professional development. Debbie's need for Joyce centers around differentiated instruction strategies, small instances of classroom management and discipline, and how to juggle teaching, planning, and her own professional growth.

Discussion

Getting to know them, it could not be more plain that Debbie and David are very different people. Debbie is a driven young single woman who is already planning for a master's degree in English as a Second Language (ESL). David is a second career teacher who also takes seriously certain responsibilities as a father with two young children at home. David came to teaching after a career in law enforcement whereas Debbie has had it as her heart's desire to be a teacher for a very long time. They are of different age groups. Debbie was a traditional college student and is now 23 while David is a more established 32. Their teacher preparation was not similar, though it occurred in the same city. David went back to college at a private religious institution to complete his teaching credentials while Debbie was a teacher candidate

in a major university's elementary education program. In that preparation, they had differing numbers of hours of practicum placements and very different student teaching experiences. Now, they teach in strikingly dissimilar schools, albeit within the same school district and the same mentor teacher. They also have similarities in that they both honestly want to do the best they can for the students in their classes. They simply have very different ways of going about it.

For professional development to occur, there must be a sustained level of commitment over time. Rarely does it occur in a vacuum. One shot or even short duration programs of professional development are not, by in large, effective ways of making change. As Loucks- Horsley, S., Love, N., Stiles, K.E., Mundry, S.E., and Hewson, P.W. (2003) point out, professional development works best when there is buy in from those seeking development, a targeted approach that has meaningful content, and ongoing support. Certainly, this is the case in Springfield School District. However, what is not clear is how much impact the school environment plays on the professional development of the beginning teacher. It would be easy to say that David's and Debbie's personalities accounted for the different needs they had for their mentor teacher. One could argue that David's personality was more resistant and Debbie's was more open to learning and developing as a professional teacher. Without trying to make a causal link here, the researcher argues that the school settings did have an influence upon the new teacher's socialization and professional development. How much, we cannot be certain. Debbie would argue that her peer group on her grade level team, her innovative principal, and the high standards that she felt she had to meet all influenced her professional growth. She began early on to use her mentor teacher as one of many resources that she has available to her. David would simply state that no one really helped him besides his mentor teacher and that his school felt disjointed and adrift without a strong leader; this from a man who sincerely cares for his students but whose school environment seems to him to be toxic to his professional growth.

Consider the mentor teacher Joyce who works with fifteen different early elementary teachers in Springfield School District. She sees the difference between all of the schools in which she has beginning

teachers and believes that the support of the school environment, or the lack thereof, is one of the keys to whether beginning teachers become successful or unsuccessful teachers. She certainly knows that she has to work with teachers in differing contexts according to their unique needs.

Implications

School culture matters. Even with the most nurturing and supportive, well-trained mentor teacher, school culture matters. When beginning teachers are placed in schools with ineffective principals and among peer teachers with a lack of desire for professional development, they can become socialized into that school culture even though they have a mentor teacher working with them and trying to interrupt the negative influences. Conversely, when the mentor teacher is only one of the voices encouraging the beginning teacher to become more effective, to reach further in their own professional development, and to take pride in what they do well and work on topics with which they struggle, the beginning teacher tends to accept that this way of being as the norm and works to become like her peers. Expectations from principals and one's peers around what one conceives as a "professional teacher" are strong forces. This teacher mentoring program in this particular district invests heavily in the development and maintenance of these mentor teachers. They receive constant support from the DCNTP as well. This support allows them the time to reflect and to learn how to mentor each teacher, no matter the school context, effectively. This means the mentor teacher must learn to vary or differentiate the type of mentoring given to each teacher in terms of the individual teacher's needs and his/her differing school context. It would be easy to speak of this school district as having one mentoring program but the truth is that context is vitally important to the equation and that means that for every beginning teacher there is a different induction program, tailored to meet his/her individual needs. This type of mentoring takes time, training, and a true investment in teacher professional development.

References

Achinstein, B. & Athanases, S. Z. (2005). Focusing new teachers on diversity and equity: Toward a knowledge base for mentors. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, pp. 843-862.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, pp. 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Cruzeiro, P.A. & Morgan, R.L. (1999). *Mentoring: A collegial partnership*. Rural Special Education for the New Millennium. Conference Proceedings of the American Council on Rural Special Education. (Albuquerque, NM, March 25-27, 1999). Retrieved April 7, 2005 from ERIC. ERIC number: ED429753.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1998). Teachers as teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 21*(1), 63-75.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001a). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001b). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education 52*(1), pp 17-30.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2003). What new teachers need to learn. *Educational Leadership, 60*(8), pp. 25-29.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Parker, M. B. (1992a). *Los Angeles mentors: Local guides or educational companions?* Research Report 92-10. National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. East Lansing, MI. Downloaded November 1, 2005 from http://ncrtl.msu.edu/research.htm.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Parker, M. B. (1992b). *Mentoring in context: A comparison of two U.S. programs for beginning teachers.* NCRTL Special Report. National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. East Lansing, MI. Downloaded November 20, 2005 from http://ncrtl.msu.edu/research.htm.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, pp. 569-582.

Gray, W.A. & Gray, M.M. (1985). Synthesis of research on mentoring beginning teachers. *Educational Leadership, 43*(3), pp 37-43.

Hoy, A.W. & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, pp. 343-356.

Ingersoll, R.M., & Kralik, J.M. (2004). *The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says*. ECS Research Review, Denver, CO: Educational Commission of the States. Retrieved March 9, 2005 from http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/50/36/5036.htm.

Lortie, D.C. (2002). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study* (2nd ed.). Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Loucks- Horsley, S., Love, N., Stiles, K.E., Mundry, S.E., and Hewson, P.W. (2003). Designing Professional Development for Teachers of Science and Mathematics. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Moir, E. (2003). *Launching the next generation of teachers through quality induction*. National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. New York: Author.

Porter, A., Youngs, P., & Odden, A. (2001). Advances in teacher assessments and their uses. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching (4th ed.)*, pp. 259-297. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Stake, R.E. (2000). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), pp. 202-248.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), pp. 783-805.

Villani, S. (2002). *Mentoring programs for new teachers: Models of induction and support.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Woolfolk, A.E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* p. 81-91.