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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the issues surrounding the transition into the teaching profession by specifically focusing on teacher induction and mentoring issues while explicitly addressing matters of concern by secondary music teachers in a large suburban school board in southern Ontario. Participants included beginning teachers with fewer than 5 years of teaching, mid career teachers with between 6 and 15 years of instruction, and experienced teachers with more than 16 years of practice. The processes of mentoring and inducting new teachers within the board were examined, along with their relationships between protégés, mentors, and administrators. Further, internal and external programs specifically designed and implemented for newer music teachers were scrutinized and discussed. An analysis of key documents and literature on the subject was performed, and data were collected through 16 personal interviews. The findings suggest that although the necessity of mentoring and induction processes has begun to be recognized, there exists a fundamental relationship between mentoring and induction and the effect of the professional attachments to mentoring; the institutional and administrative supports that are enabled; and essential processes and practices between mentors and protégés. Together these three arms combine to support successful induction and mentoring initiatives that will help ease the transition into teaching.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This is a study of the induction and mentoring practices of secondary music teachers within a large urban school board in southern Ontario. The experiences of teachers at different stages of their career: those new to the profession, established teachers midway through their career, and those with a wealth of teaching experience in the twilight of their profession, were solicited through qualitative interviews. More specifically, the relationships between protégés, mentors, and administrators were examined along with internal and external influences and programs, and how the relationships have changed over time. This chapter outlines the setting of the research problem and provides the general context for informed research. It also defines the background and purpose of the research problem, provides the rationale for the study, and describes the empirical questions to be answered as well as the scope and limitations of the study.

Background of the Study

Descriptions and studies of formal mentoring and induction practices have been in existence within academic journals for a relatively short amount of time, whereas informal mentoring and loose induction initiatives have been commonplace in education facilities for a significantly longer period. Consequently, a noteworthy deficiency of informed action and supporting literature regarding induction and mentoring methods, especially with respect to teachers within specific subjects, exists within Canadian school boards. At the onset of this research study, few such formal programs existed and even fewer studies and papers had been published on these topics within Canada, while in the United States, an abundance of studies and research had been performed within the past 2
decades. Throughout the ensuing years, more research and programs have been initiated by school boards, provincial governments, and nongovernmental agencies within Canada, but much of the foundational material is still drawn from American sources.

The subject of music mentoring and induction has its roots in the United States, where the majority of literature is derived from Michigan and California, although comparisons for most states can be found. Only recently has programming and a focus on retaining newer teachers through mindful induction and mentoring practices become a part of Canadian school boards, as have efforts to curb attrition and migration patterns.

Upon entrance to the teaching profession, a wide swathe of introductory mentoring and induction practices takes place and varies greatly from school to school, board by board, and across provinces, states, and countries. These range from specific programming initiatives within boards and schools to informal mentoring programs within departments or between new colleagues.

The Ontario College of Teachers (OCT) began researching the subject of induction and mentoring in annual studies from the year 2002 onward (2007a, 2007b). This research showed, amongst many issues, that before the new millennium a steady attrition rate, equaling close to 50% of new teachers, left the teaching profession within the first 5 years, regardless of subject and grade level taught. Along with a great number of experienced teachers retiring within Ontario at the same time, the province was facing a staffing shortage within the school boards. The high attrition rate was attributed mainly to a lack of mentoring and ongoing in-service options to retain new teachers. The OCT recommended the implementation of a government-initiated mentoring and induction
program that would help amalgamate mentoring and induction initiatives under one common curriculum program.

In 2006, the Ontario Ministry of Education set aside millions of dollars for the creation of a New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) (2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2006d) which details training and appraisal practices for new teachers, mentors, and administrators alike. Instead of localized induction and mentoring practices, provincial money was designated for standardized provincial training of experienced mentors and administrators in order to introduce new teachers to teaching and retain them for a longer career.

The new program made provisions first for specific mentor and new teacher, or protégé, training, money for in-service institutes, and second for secondment opportunities, which offered experienced teachers the prospect of becoming mentor coaches while being relieved of their school duties at the same rate of pay for a designated term of no more than 3 years. Administrators were given detailed instructions as well as a new teacher appraisal program and support ideas to help protégés and mentors better work together for the benefit of the school and the system as a whole. Further, teachers' unions became involved in the NTIP initiatives by offering training of seconded and in-service mentor teachers at the behest of the government.

Like most school boards in Canada, the large southern Ontario school board on which the study was focused does not have a mandatory induction program for new teachers, although all induction and mentoring opportunities are publicized through various print and electronic means, and teachers and schools are encouraged to become involved in these opportunities. During August, an optional summer institute, organized
by the board along with union and volunteer teacher participation, is provided for new
teachers to the profession. Both elementary and secondary teachers are invited to
participate, although subject matter is geared towards the majority of participants, who
are typically beginning teachers in the elementary stream. Some broad-based initiatives
are talked about, but none are directed specifically towards the arts, in general, or music
in particular.

Likewise, a nonmandatory mentoring program has been initiated within one
school board. According to the Toronto District School Board, which has been the point-
board for the Ontario government and has implemented the majority of the training and
initiatives, approximately half of those within their first 2 years of teaching participate in
an ongoing mentoring program (2007b). Release time being paid by the Ontario Ministry
of Education for both the protégés and mentors, mentor-specific training offered by
boards and the Ontario College of Teachers, and the creation of mentor-coaches who
have been seconded to work with mentors and protégés have been some advancements
achieved with the government’s New Teacher Induction Program. In summary, while the
induction programming has been performed for the better part of a decade, mentoring
programming and its derivatives have been up and running for only the past 2 years.

Statement of the Problem Context

Broad-based induction does not address many needs that exist in arts-based
disciplines in high school. A large percentage of music teachers are the sole provider of
music within their school, regardless of level taught. This includes the large urban
southern Ontario board that was the basis of this study. The same may be said for other
specialist subjects such as drama, dance, and visual art, depending on school population and number of sections of courses.

While some aspects of the education systems between the United States and Canada are similar, a number of programs, such as student access to music in elementary and secondary schools, merit pay, extracurricular activities, and professional training vary by state and province. These differentiating factors render comparing subject-specific inquiries and examinations on the plight of beginning music teachers a difficult task.

The broad-based induction programs now offered provide little content to help arts-based specialist teachers. Although broad-based induction subjects such as classroom management and communicating with parents are important, content-specific arts-based induction and mentoring is expected to retain teachers longer, to prevent migration, and to slow attrition rates. Before this program can be created, however, data are needed on the types of induction programs considered to be important by beginning subject-specialty teachers. Therefore, the need exists to investigate what is required to implement a mentoring and induction program with a specific programming focus on secondary specialist subjects rather than one focused solely on the generalist professional.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the mentoring, induction, and retention needs of secondary school music teachers at varying levels of experience from teachers who are beginning their careers, who are in midcareer, and who are experienced teachers. The goal was to determine what factors might ease newer teachers’ transition into teaching by explicitly investigating arts-based induction practices.
Empirical questions for this study include:

What do participants understand induction to mean?

What do participants understand mentoring to mean?

What have participating music educators experienced concerning administrative and institutional supports for mentoring and induction?

What connections do participating music educators make between professional development and mentoring/induction?

**Rationale**

While a plethora of American data has existed for decades (e.g., Conway, 2003a; Feinman-Nemser, 1993; Gold, 1996; Gratch, 1998), limited Canadian data are available concerning induction and mentoring initiatives for beginning teachers, and even smaller amounts relate to newer secondary music teachers (Grant, 2004; Macadam, 2002, 2004; Williams, 2002, 2003). This study aims to examine the mentoring, induction, and retention rates of Canadian secondary school music teachers through a descriptive analytical study into the practices of music educators at varying points in their teaching career.

Broad-based induction programs for all teachers within the majority of school boards are optional, and follow-up initiatives, including ongoing support and mentoring practices, are in their infancy in terms of programming and practice. Most induction programs have a specific timeline of a few days, weeks, or months, yet the need exists for continued support for teacher induction programs, and follow-up in terms of mentoring and administrative supports is paramount for retaining new teachers. Beyond adding to the Canadian literature, this study will help to address many of the problems faced by
beginning teachers and their mentors in induction programs within arts-based disciplines. This can be achieved by relaying solutions found in the data to various mentoring and induction programs.

Issues specific to beginning music teachers differ greatly from those for teachers in other subjects. However, hardly any specific research exists to make a case for dedicated arts-based specific training within a new teachers' induction program. This research can lead to specific initiatives designed for secondary music teachers within any induction process.

The beneficiaries of this study begin with new secondary music teachers. School boards will gain the knowledge to specifically introduce arts-based teachers to the classroom. This knowledge can be expected to help school boards actively retain these newer teachers, thereby significantly eliminating the need to constantly retrain teachers after they leave the school board. Finally, students will benefit by being taught by teachers who have a grasp of what it is to initially teach in school without having to constantly learn on the job.

This is a new way of thinking about teacher learning. The traditional assumption is that teachers have been sufficiently trained after attending a program of professional teacher education and then placed in a classroom. Yet studies and research have shown that constant professional development, induction models, and tracking ensure the long-term viability of teachers within the profession.

**Scope and Limitations of the Study**

As a newer teacher within the large urban school board in southern Ontario that forms the basis for this study, I knew the majority of the people who were inevitably
interviewed on either a personal or professional basis. While a personal relationship was previously formed by participants and me, in order to mitigate the effects of possible bias, I communicated with participants through voice, print, and electronic means on my personal time and used Brock University instruments and letterhead.

The total possible sample size was small given the limitations initially designated within the parameters of this study: selecting secondary school music teachers carrying a full music course load within the urban school board. After sixteen participants with various teaching backgrounds responded requesting to participate, the parameters were altered to allow all potential participants with a connection to secondary music to take part in interviews over the course of 4 months. This large sample size, which was unexpectedly high considering the small population size, provided a remarkable delineation in terms of issues and a wide swath of experiences and stories from each of the participants and across the three career stages. However, arranging 16 interviews at mutually convenient times was difficult at best, considering time and driving distance.

Using a purposive sampling method, data for this study were collected by performing qualitative interviews with secondary music teachers with varying degrees of experience. All responses for requests for interviews were granted, and a wide swath of experience in teaching was seen from interviewees ranging from beginning teachers to end-of-career professionals. Given the size of the board, some lieu time was granted by the employer for travel purposes, and all interviews were conducted outside of teaching time.
Outline of the Remainder of the Document

Chapter Two constitutes the review of literature related to the purpose of the study. In this chapter, an extensive review explores four main developmental areas: mentoring; induction; attrition, retention, and migration; and administrative and institutional supports, including professional development practices.

Chapter Three centres on the methodology selected for this study. It begins with the purpose and rationale behind the research methods chosen, followed by the site and participant selection process. A discussion on data collection and analysis and the establishment of limitations and credibility ensues, and the chapter finishes with a dialogue on researcher bias and ethical considerations.

Chapter Four begins with an introduction to the participants in the study and the results garnered on the basis of interviews with them. Results are presented as both the process to and the results of the interviews and are centred around the four empirical questions and their subsequent findings.

Chapter Five provides an overview of important findings from this study. A discussion of this study is then embedded in the literature, and the implications are further explored as they relate to theory, practice, and research. Chapter Five concludes with some reflective thoughts and a final summary of the thesis.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

New teachers, specifically new music teachers, face challenges upon entering the classroom. A vast amount of literature has been written regarding beginning teachers and their induction into the teaching profession. Further, a large quantity of writing has been devoted to proposed solutions to the teacher induction issue. As well, a growing body of literature has begun to address the inadequacies of the specific music teacher profession training. This chapter reviews teacher attrition, retention, and migration issues; administrative and institutional supports; mentoring; and induction and professional development related to the literature. In this study, mentoring refers to the practices undertaken by experienced teaching professionals to impart pertinent knowledge to newer teachers. Induction refers to the practice of introducing a new teacher to the teaching profession. A mentor refers to an experienced teaching professional who guides a less experienced teacher who is referred to as a protégé.

Teacher Attrition, Retention, and Migration

When the issue of teacher attrition, retention, and migration was first being researched, Canadian and North American school boards were in the midst of a significant teacher shortage due to an abundance of retirements (Asmus, 1999). This condition has since shifted, with a wealth of qualified teachers graduating from education programs without significant hope for a permanent job, while experienced teachers are not retiring at the rate previously predicted (Ontario College of Teachers, 2007a).

In spite of the increased retention of senior teachers, however, within Canadian school boards, novice teachers are still leaving the teaching profession in droves. More than 40% of school boards report that they face significant challenges in retaining
beginning teachers (Schmidt, 2003). Across Canada, teacher associations report that almost one quarter of newer teachers leave within the first 5 years, half of newer teachers in urban areas leave the profession within their first 3 years, and close to 80% leave after 10 years (Canadian Teachers’ Federation, 2001; Melnychuck & Melnychuck, 2002).

The latest figures from the Department of Education in the United States of America are comparable to Canada’s. Research indicates that the rate of departure from the teaching profession in the United States is within a few percentage points of the Canadian statistics (Ingersoll, 2001, 2002). The numbers in arts-based subject areas, such as music, show a similar pattern. According to a number of leading researchers, including Holtz (2003) and Merrow (1999), approximately 15% of music teachers will leave the profession after one year, 25% by their third year, and close to 50% by the end of year five in the United States.

The Ontario College of Teachers (OCT; 2007a, 2007b) began tracking graduating students in 2002 and has released figures that correlate within a few percentage points of those statistics from the United States. Along with the aforementioned job crisis, it also tracked the employment prospects of teachers in certain subjects such as French and technology and their employability potential. Finally, the OCT has begun to perform research on newer teachers who obtained induction and ongoing mentoring initiatives through the Ontario Ministry of Education’s New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP; 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d).

Bobbitt (1994), followed by Ingersoll (2001), have bestowed three labels upon teachers: stayers, movers, and leavers. Teachers who stay within the profession are considered retained; those who move to another position within teaching are migrating
movers; and those who leave teaching altogether cause attrition within the profession. Gismondi Haser, and Nasser (2003) liken teachers staying, leaving, and moving to a “revolving door” syndrome, where teachers come and stay for a couple of years, learn new knowledge, drain resources from within the board, and then leave. Ingersoll and Smith (2003) argue that high turnover leads to problems in the way an organization functions.

More experienced in-service teachers are leaving the teaching profession than are entering, and the subject of music is no exception. All teaching subjects and disciplines are being affected. According to the Ontario College of Teachers (2003), expanding on data from McIntyre (1999), school boards in Ontario hired approximately 10,000 new teachers each year during the 1990s, yet on average only 9,200 professionals retired each year, and this discrepancy could not be explained by changes in student numbers. Year-by-year statistics from 2000 onwards show a steady decline in both retirements and new hires such that, by 2006, over 7,000 qualified teaching professionals within the province of Ontario who were actively seeking full-time employment 6 months after graduation were unable to secure positions. Of those hired during the same time frame, retention and migration patterns of newer teachers increased while the attrition of new teachers declined due to decreased hiring (Ontario College of Teachers, 2007b).

A high demand for specialized teachers exists in certain subject areas such as French, technology, and the arts, especially in the area of music, yet the attrition rate amongst many new specialty subject teachers’ rivals those of more commonly taught subjects such as English, science, and mathematics (Ontario College of Teachers, 2007b). After leaving the profession, according to Madsen and Hancock (2002), some teachers
decide to reenter the profession later in life. The apex for leaving is within the first 10 years into teaching, as the desire to stay is strongly correlated with the number of years of experience accumulated. Shen (1997) calls this the Human Capital Theory, where rates of attrition are lower as years of experience are accumulated, as people will leave earlier in their career rather than later. Yet less than 20% of teachers leave due to retirement (Darling-Hammond, 2003). In a study produced by Ingersoll (2001), who studied teachers who left the teaching profession in the United States over the course of 15 years spanning 1986 to 2000, the rate of attrition of teachers entering the profession near the end of the study had declined 23% compared to those who entered at the beginning. This was attributed to more awareness of teacher attrition and setting up programs to combat teacher’s leaving.

According to Lautzenheiser (2001), in the United States “the average tenure of a band or orchestra director is approximately 4.6 years” (p. 36). This staggering attrition rate articulates that the average music teacher spends more time in a postsecondary institution learning how to teach music than actually teaching the subject in a school. By contrast, a recently commissioned study by the Ontario College of Teachers (2007a) forecasted a high retention rate of newer teachers due to a high amount of satisfaction based on a variety of factors. According to their survey, well over 80% of teachers between the ages of 18 and 49 plan on remaining a teacher in the next 5 years, with the highest amount of satisfaction expressed in those teachers new to the profession. These recent data contradict the majority of the literature that exists on attrition and retention.

The Ontario College of Teachers has continually completed a yearly survey of new teachers, beginning with graduates from Ontario faculties of education in the year
2002. Amongst their significant findings: Only one third of new teachers had found full-time contract teaching positions after 2 years, while close to 90% of fifth year teachers had full-time placements (Ontario College of Teachers, 2007b). The study goes on to explain that a high rate of satisfaction exists amongst those enrolled in the New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) introduced by the Ontario Ministry of Education (2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d);

According to the Toronto District School Board (2007b), all permanent full-time and part-time newer teachers in their first or second year of teaching should have access to the NTIP program since 2005 and are required to receive two teacher appraisals within each of the first 2 years of teaching. Those who are not under full contract as supply or long-term occasional teachers with a board are frequently disparaged because they do not have full access to the program that is afforded full-time contract teachers. Supply teachers are not regularly attached to one school, thereby making the process of NTIP moot due to lack of mentoring opportunities and steady induction activities.

Teacher attrition statistics are not subject specific. According to Darling-Hammond (2003), teacher attrition does not vary by subject discipline, and the brightest and most talented teachers are more likely to leave sooner. Shen’s (1997) study on teacher attrition states that teachers are more likely to leave good schools in favourable locations than problem schools in impoverished regions (which is a surprising result) and also found that secondary teachers leave sooner than elementary teachers and urban teachers sooner than suburban. Haycock (1998) and Neito (2003) followed up on Shen’s work with their conclusion that nearly half of all new teachers in urban schools quit
within the first 5 years compared to longer amounts of time for their suburban counterparts.

Moore Johnson (2003) states that teachers must satisfy three main aspects in teaching once employed: the opportunity to learn and grow as a professional; assessment; and leadership and more informed choice. The implication of Moore Johnson’s study is that if any or all of these facets are offered at another institution, teaching or otherwise, teachers are more likely to migrate to another prospect or leave their current employment.

A number of reasons exist that prevent teachers from attaining and maintaining employment within a school board. Madsen and Hancock’s (2002) study cited issues surrounding family and personal commitments as well as health and academic pursuits as leading causes of teacher attrition or voluntary sabbatical. Numerous leading authors, including Andrews and Martin (2003) and Boe, Bobbitt, Cook, Whitener, and Weber (1997) continue the discussion by stating that little free time during the school day, too little pay, and a desire for a career change after first starting to teach all play a large part in newer teachers leaving the profession. In addition, Hope (1999) and Williams (2003), amongst others, concluded that some newer teachers felt that they did not receive adequate professional training and were therefore not prepared to teach in the classroom. An overabundance of researchers including Sargent (2003) and Deal and Chatman (1989) cited insufficient support for novice teachers, including mentoring and induction processes once they began teaching, as a leading reason for newer teachers leaving the profession.

One of the often-cited reasons for teachers leaving the profession had to do with money. Salaries for beginning teachers in Canada vary depending on jurisdiction and
amount of postsecondary education. According to the Canadian Teachers’ Federation (2007), provincial comparisons across the country show that the minimum average salary for new teachers is $36,305 while the maximum average salary is $83,158. The Canadian Alliance of Student Associations, a federal nongovernmental lobby organization focusing on postsecondary student issues, asserts that the average student leaves university with a burden of $28,344 worth of student loans, once interest and tax credits have been factored together (Steele, 2004). In the United States, teachers earn close to one third less than people with the same amount of education and experience in other professions (National Commission on Teaching & America’s Future, 1999). All of these studies cite numerous jobs that pay a better starting wage compared to teaching based on a similar amount of postsecondary education qualification. They go on to say that, while teacher and most unionized public-sector job pay increases are on a scale commensurate with years of experience and qualifications, advancement opportunities in the private-sector job market are much better and occur faster. Steele states that the opportunity to make more money in a shorter amount of time is paramount to survival after graduation. With a low starting salary, teaching may not be a viable profession in which to begin a career.

Newer music teachers experience specific issues concerning attrition and migration issues. While some are similar to those of other classroom teachers, a number are specific to the subject of music. Conway (2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003a, 2003b) and DeLorenzo (1992) have written on a variety of issues that affect newer music teachers in their first years. These include larger numbers of students than nonmusic classrooms, making the issues of classroom management a prevalent concern. As the only music teacher on staff, usually in a classroom far from everyone else, music teachers develop
feelings of isolation due to not feeling part of the wider school community and lacking school-wide systems of assistance or support. DeLorenzo and Conway go on to assert that some music teachers are not employed in their craft full-time and are therefore required to take on additional classes and multiple teaching assignments or are given difficult schedules, increased responsibility, and administrative duties, usually outside of their area of comfort and expertise. Conway and DeLorenzo found that regardless of a newer teacher’s level of expertise, there is an unrealistic vision of success equal to that of an experienced teaching professional. This is heightened by external pressures to perform by the school community as well as administrators, and both Conway and DeLorenzo add that a lack of planning time combined with additional tasks such as budget preparation, choosing musical literature to perform, and a personal need to attain additional and multiple qualifications as well as pursue professional musical growth all affect newer music teachers.

Additionally, Krueger (1996, 1999, 2000, 2001) and Youm (2000) cite other specific items that affect newer music teachers. Due to the sole nature of the job, opportunities to discuss issues with those in the same discipline do not exist in the same manner as for other teachers within the school. Both Krueger and Youm go on to say that the opportunity to create a team-teaching base is nonexistent due to the lack of other qualified music instructors in most schools. Because there are few institutional supports, a lack of help with music-related issues such as discipline, attaining the knowledge base to deal with individual students’ different learning styles, and the opportunity to share and network invariably do not exist. Krueger and Youm argue that a feeling of marginalization and being misunderstood within the school is a prevalent reality. They
found that music teachers are regularly left out of the school decision-making process, and because administrators or usually not familiar with how a music classroom is run, an insufficient amount of teaching materials and supplies are provided upon entry to the profession.

A variety of costs are associated with the migration and attrition of teachers. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1999) in the United States of America, two main groups are affected by educators leaving the profession or moving to another school: the classroom program and the students.

The classroom program is affected in many different ways. A lack of coherence and continuity within the school environment is a topic of concern, as consistency within a school is of the utmost importance for students, parents, and the community. A teacher establishes various routines, and inevitably students grow accustomed to the customs and habits of the classroom environment. If the classroom is in constant upheaval because of teacher attrition, little continuity is available to establish a successful program.

According to Ingersoll (2001, 2002) and Darling-Hammond (2003), the issue of attrition is most prevalent in low socioeconomic areas where teacher turnover is 50% greater in higher poverty schools than in lower poverty schools and with urban teacher transfer rates higher than those for nonurban teachers. Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin (1999), in their study on the migration patterns of urban teachers versus their suburban counterparts, come to essentially the same conclusion. Low socioeconomic areas with high needs are most susceptible to teacher migration and attrition rates due to specific issues that these programs and their clientele face.
M. Hanson (2001) and Lehner and Maier (2000), building on the work by Walsh and Ungson (1991), surmise that, especially within music programs, when a teacher leaves, the institutional or organizational memory disappears along with the leader. The next person who takes over faces an uphill climb in attempting to gather information on what took place in the past while establishing themselves in their new position. This unenviable situation exists because of a lack of multiple department members. The cost is an unstable program that can take years to reestablish.

Further, when a teacher departs a school board altogether, there is a financial cost to the school and the board of education. The Ontario College of Teachers (2003) “estimates that it costs the education system, on average, $4,400 to recruit and hire a teacher” (p. 4). In Texas, Andrews and Martin (2003) and Darling-Hammond (2003) argue, the financial figure may reach as high as $8,000 U.S. Andrews and Martin suggest that the time, energy, and monetary loss from a teacher leaving is secondary to a number of other mitigating factors, yet it is one that rests heavily on the administration of a school. Darling-Hammond contends that resources are wasted through retraining newly hired teachers. She goes on to say that “under-prepared teachers are a drain upon schools’ financial and human resources” (p. 8). This financial consideration implies that school administrators should be motivated to ensure that proper retention techniques are employed at the school and board levels and to ensure that teacher-support programs such as proper induction and mentorship programs are established.

Students are the other cost in the equation. Darling-Hammond (1997, 2003) suggests that beyond the stability issues within a program, the quality of teaching may suffer. She goes on to say that as teachers gain experience, their quality and method of
delivery improve. Andrews and Martin (2003) state that an unstable or inexperienced teaching force could lead to reduced student achievement, and the costs continue to soar. Students are often left out of the equation, yet they are arguably the most important factor within the problem, for student achievement and satisfaction are invariably linked to every other issue.

Although new teachers apply to a variety of positions, Halford (2003) states that beginning teachers are frequently hired into less than desirable schools in areas that may not be their first choice. Halford goes on to state that often newer teachers will accept the first job offered to them, with little research made into the school or the area. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (2001), new teachers are often assigned to teach the most disadvantaged students and are frequently given the most difficult teaching loads and most difficult classes (Conway, 2003a) in the lowest performing schools (Andrews & Martin, 2003). This issue helps precipitate migration patterns and speed up attrition rates because teachers are not happy working in such difficult environments. The Commission concludes that educators in these environments are constantly looking to move on to a better working situation, and armed with better research and some valuable experiences, are often able to make a transition to a desirable posting.

Halford (2003) says that, more often than not, teachers do not have any say in their posting. Because of lack of experience and qualifications, newer teachers are often bumped or placed in surplus situations in favour of educators with more experience and additional qualifications. Yet according to the Ontario College of Teachers (2003, 2007a), the teaching profession is a workforce that will see close to 50% of their ranks
retire between 2001 and 2010, and teachers who wish to gain valuable experience will have a hard time achieving their goals.

**Administrative and Institutional Support**

Renard (2003) states that the expectations of new teachers are the same as those of veteran teachers, yet surmised that it is unreasonable to expect rookie teachers to perform the same initiatives as seasoned professionals. It takes hours longer, in some cases, to complete initiatives that veteran teachers can accomplish in a matter of minutes. Halford’s (2003) research indicates that newer teachers see asking for assistance as a sign of weakness. According to Andrews and Martin (2003), building on the research model by Gray and Gray (1985), 92% of new teachers do not seek out help unless required to. Teachers are one of the few professions where beginners are required to assume full responsibilities the first day (Huling-Austin, 1988). New teachers are not finished products (Allen, 2000), and where schools have a pecking order of seniority that extends beyond union seniority, teachers must pay their dues and put in their time (Renard).

Working conditions within schools for new teachers are at times difficult. According to Andrews and Martin (2003), it is commonplace for newer teachers to be relegated to shuffling between numerous classrooms or placed in an undesirable location in the school. They go on to state that unflattering timetable assignments are widespread amongst newer teachers, which presents challenges with students and preparation. Music teachers, states Conway (2001a, 2003b), mostly have a dedicated room in secondary schools, but many teachers in elementary and some secondary are required to visit students in their classrooms instead of having the classes brought to a dedicated music room.
Halford (2003) says that most teachers are not prepared when entering their first years of teaching. They have received theoretical teacher training from a faculty of education, along with a minimum number of hours in their subject area(s) and some practical experience within the classroom (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 2005). This gives newer teachers a good base upon which to draw, but it does not prepare them for interaction with parents, issues with students, and inevitable extra commitments of their time. On top of teaching duties, Conway (2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003a, 2003b) and Conway and Garlock (2002) state that music teachers are expected to conduct various ensembles, purchase music, attend performances with students, and attend other music-related events in addition to their regular teaching tasks. They conclude that these additional responsibilities are important for a viable and successful school music program, yet they are a burden on newer teachers who are struggling with preparing lessons and adjusting to their new profession.

Freiberg (2003) argues that school administrators should provide regular follow-up on staff development combined with regular workshops, new teacher summer induction training, method courses for new teachers, on-line library of veteran teachers’ lesson plans, and a confidential help line to answer new teachers’ questions. Sargent (2003) suggests that new teachers should be included in the following activities before their first day in the classroom: end-of-year meetings, student orientation, classroom visits, summer professional workshops, introductions to colleagues, parents informed of new teachers, and assigned a mentor. Andrews and Martin (2003) advocate the need for administrative support, including the provision of release time for mentoring activities, for without it, teachers feel frustrated and abandoned.
According to Conway (2001b, 2003b), it is assumed that music teachers will automatically take on the leadership role of all musical ensembles within a school program. Conway goes on to add that regardless of what program, most teachers will participate in extracurricular music responsibilities without question. Extracurricular activities in many publicly funded school boards are voluntary, and few teachers within a school, according to Conway, take on so much responsibility, if any at all. Yet some jurisdictions in the United States, as well as many privately funded schools in Canada, compensate their educators with merit pay (Morice & Murray, 2003), which is additional money for additional responsibility. Mentors receive a stipend of up to $1,000 in 12 states and an allowance to attend professional development conferences based on mentoring (Sargent, 2003), while heads of departments already receive compensation through money or lieu time for their administrative work. Morice and Murray argue that monetary stipends do not have to be a foreign concept and indeed would encourage many teachers who are not involved in extracurricular activities to become involved, thereby relieving some of the responsibility of those who are regularly involved. Further, merit pay would help younger teachers attain much-needed additional income as well as help firmly entrench them within their new school community. This will ultimately help attract and retain new teachers.

Other scholars, such as Lautzenheiser (2001), suggest that recruitment of new teachers begins in the classroom as students, with giving ideas and bestowing additional responsibility upon aspiring students. He goes on to suggest that sharing the stage at concerts is but one way to help groom potential music teachers for the future.

Establishing communication links with all levels of administration, parents, and students
is important and goes hand-in-hand with advocating the music department position and showing the world what is taking place within all facets of a program.

Newer teachers are typically placed on probationary status for at least a year and are assessed multiple times through their board appraisal process (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2006d; Toronto District School Board, 2003). According to these documents, the assessment process is spread out over the course of the first 2 years of teaching, with multiple expectations based on an administrator evaluation of a number of preexisting criteria. This comes after research by Boe et al. (1997) and Williams (2003) showing that leadership and administrative support are often not present in a school environment. Their research suggests that principals want results; new teachers constantly struggle to produce said results while grappling with the copious amount of other tasks at hand. One of the most common occurrences with which music teachers labour, according to Conway (2001b, 2003b), is spending an exorbitant amount of time on performance initiatives while curriculum expectations are sacrificed to satisfy results-oriented leadership of administrators.

Beginning teachers experience specific issues with administration. Andrews and Martin (2003) as well as Zimmerman and Stansbury (2000) suggest that some teachers have problems adapting to a new workplace, while Deal and Chatman (1989) find that a change in schedule, however minor, causes concern for newer teachers. As well, a lack of understanding of policies and procedures of a new school are a source of anxiety (Brock & Grady, 1997; Melnychuck & Melnychuck, 2002).

Difficult working conditions for newer teachers may be enlarged by a variety of factors, some of which, according to Boe et al. (1997) and Williams (2003), include
conflicts with administration based on a variety of issues both within and out of the classroom. These involve a lack of peer support as well as what Deal and Chatman (1989) and Zimmerman and Stansbury (2000) suggest is a lack of peer support, isolation, and lack of interaction with peers due to the nature of the job and issues with administration.

Deal and Chatman (1989) found that principals did not provide an adequate orientation for new teachers to a school, while Brock and Grady (1997) discovered a lack of emotional support for newer professionals. Teachers found a lack of participation in decision making frustrating (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003) and their teaching workload (Madsen & Hancock, 2002; Melnychuck & Melnychuck, 2002) as additional sources of friction.

**Mentoring**

The issue at hand is a lack of mentoring, which involves placing a veteran teacher with a newer teacher. Mentoring allows inexperienced teachers, or protégés, to gain valuable insight into the teaching profession firsthand from someone who has actual knowledge. Conway (2003a) suggests that, while a vast a number of mentor support programs have been recommended and implemented, issues surrounding specialist subjects such as music have not been researched to their fullest extent. She goes on to say that most music teachers do not have a colleague or someone with whom to collaborate in the school because they are alone in their subject area. The Ontario College of Teachers estimates that “in 2002, fewer than 20 per cent of Ontario’s new teachers had mentors” and that “fewer than half [of] new [teachers] were satisfied with their orientation and induction” (2003, p. 4). Similarly, Andrews and Martin (2003), Darling-Hammond
(2003), and Deal and Chatman (1989) found a lack of mentoring available to newer teachers in school boards.

According to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (1992), new teachers need someone with whom to talk. The Commission states that, in order to succeed, mentoring programs need a system-wide support mechanism in order to function, and careful thought must be put into placing mentors with new teachers. Halford (2003) goes further to suggest that new teachers need an orientation, not just handed a set of keys and shown the door to their classroom. Both Freiberg (2003) and Conway (2001b) suggest that, without mentoring, teachers are more likely to teach how they have been taught. A well-designed mentoring program, says the National Association of State Boards of Education (1998) and Andrews and Martin (2003), lowers the attrition rate of newer teachers. Southall (2003) and Kindall-Smith (2004) both state that finding a mentor is a good idea, and mentored teachers have shown better results in terms of grasping curriculum initiatives and teaching methods compared to nonmentored beginning teachers.

Andrews and Martin (2003) and Danielson (2002) explain that some reasons to become mentors and being mentored include learning new teaching strategies; stronger classroom management skills; increased job satisfaction; the ability to deal with behaviour and discipline issues; lower levels of stress, anxiety, and frustration for new teachers; and a better understanding of teaching practice for veteran teachers. According to Kindall-Smith (2004), students benefit as well, as well-prepared teachers have the largest impact on student learning, especially in urban settings. Veterans of the teaching profession who wish to become mentors, according to Holloway (2001), need training
and professional development on how to support new teachers. Rowley (1999) identifies six qualities of a good mentor: commitment to the role of being a mentor; acceptance of beginning teachers; skilled at providing instructional support; effective in different interpersonal contexts; a model of a continuous leader; and communicates hope and optimism. Evertson and Smithey (2000) argue that mentors who were trained were better for first-year teachers than those with little or no training. Some jurisdictions in the United States require the services of a mentor in order to attain a teaching license (Music Achievement Council, 2005). The Council goes on to suggest the formation of selection criteria for mentors to ensure they are well suited for and able to complete the task of mentoring protégés. Mentoring also helps veteran teachers refresh themselves, as well as retain teachers and help start teachers on the road to professional development (Moir & Bloom, 2003). While most mentoring programs are only designed for the first-year teachers, Krueger (1999, 2001) and Wong (2002) call for mentoring programs to be extended beyond the first year.

According to the Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario (2002), the benefits of mentorship extend to four groups: the beginning teacher who attains a better beginning to their careers as well as guidance and moral support; the mentor teacher who achieves professional growth and an increased repertoire of skills; the school staff that sees an increase in collaboration and enhanced collegiality; and the school system that realizes a greater retention of and involvement of teachers.

Lipton, Wellman, and Humbard (2003) created five models of mentoring: the broker mentor, who helps when the need arises; the one-to-one mentor, who is a site-based mentor and is matched on an individual basis with a protégé; group mentoring,
where multiple mentors and protégés work together in a variety of situations; informal mentoring, where a protégé casually connects with a veteran teacher through no formal program; and on-line mentoring, for off-site mentoring and through conferences and discussion boards. Multiple models of mentoring may exist in the same worksite, depending on personality, access to resources, and administrative practices.

Some of the most common themes concerning what mentors and protégés may discuss include what Deal and Chatman (1989) describe as difficulties in teaching, which broadly describes what Britton, Paine, and Raizen (1989), Kurtz (1983), and Veenman (1984) suggest includes motivating students as well as planning and time management issues and using effective teaching strategies.

Lipton et al. (2003) argue that being an effective mentor is dependent on the role that is taken. They have identified three roles and stances that mentors often take. The first role is that of a consultant who offers support and provides resources, where the protégé may build a dependency on the mentor. Second, the mentor can serve as a collaborator who creates challenges and encourages personal growth (which will work as long as the relationship is equal between mentor and protégé). Finally, the third role is that of a coach who facilitates professional vision. Yet frustration will ensue if the protégé does not possess an internal resource for idea generation. The idea is to strive towards a coaching relationship between mentor and protégé. This may be done through what Gibbs (2001) states as active listening. Examples include attending to the protégé, nonverbal encouragement, paraphrasing, and reflecting feelings. Some other considerations when coaching include exploring options, planning next steps, and self-evaluation for both the mentor and protégé.
Research by Conway (2003a) has shown that strong mentoring contributes to the retention and success of newer teachers. Additionally, researchers such as Conway (2001b), Conway, Kruger, Robinson, Haack, and Smith (2002), and Haack and Smith (1999) argue that many states and boards have policies that require mentor programs, yet fewer than a half dozen studies talk specifically about music and mentors (DeLorenzo, 1992; Krueger, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2001).

Conway (2003a) states that mentoring helps beginning music teachers. New music teachers want mentors in the same area in which they teach (Conway et al., 2002). Music teachers with mentors outside of their discipline tend to be less satisfied with their programs compared to those with mentors within the same discipline. Early identification of a mentor is important. Those newer teachers with a strong mentor relationship tend not to feel as isolated as their counterparts (Conway et al.). To retain good teachers, mentoring programs must be employed in schools (Darling-Hammond, 2003). She goes on to suggest that teachers need release time, specifically for mentoring.

Although the National Association for Music Education (MENC) in the United States of America has devoted much of the past 2 decades to advocating and establishing a national network of mentors for newer teachers (Promoting the Profession, 2000), as well as retaining and recruiting new music teachers, little evidence exists for their Canadian counterparts. Only in the past few years have groups such as the Ontario Band Association (MacAdam, 2002) who began to establish a mentorship program for their membership, and the Ontario Music Educators’ Association (Grant, 2004; MacAdam, 2004; Williams, 2002, 2003) who started to advocate the need for mentorship through their publication quarterly publication The Recorder, as well as individual boards within
certain provinces have begun to devise mentorship and induction programming initiatives.

**Induction and Professional Development**

According to Freiberg (2003), new teachers must be given support. Induction programs, or initiation courses for beginning teachers, are but one way to help newer teachers prepare for their teaching assignment. Assisting beginning teachers through induction and mentoring is recommended by many researchers, including Conway (2001b, 2003b), Feiman-Nemser, Schwille, Carver, and Yusko (1999), and Halford, 2003), who suggested that induction is not just about retaining teachers but is also about creating a positive induction experience for new teachers. Currently, 38 states in the United States of America require an induction program and/or mentoring program, but few are tailored specifically towards music teachers (Conway et al., 2002).

Comparable Canadian induction programs have recently become mainstays in some provinces (Ontario College of Teachers 2003, 2007a). The Ministry of Education in Ontario (2006a) created the New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP), specifically designed to help new teachers entering the profession by creating province-wide programs for new teachers (2006c), mentors (2006b), and administrators (2006d). This includes money to school boards to train new mentors and hire mentor coaches, to provide Job Embedded Learning Initiatives (JELI) days to allow protégés and mentors to visit other classrooms, to hold institutes to discuss certain teaching initiatives, to offer subject-specific courses, to hire centrally designated instructional leaders to run induction and mentoring programs, to provide provincial guidelines surrounding teacher performance appraisal, and to create publications filled with ideas for both new teachers
and their mentors (Elementary Teachers Federation of Ontario, 2002; Toronto District School Board, 2007a, 2007b). It is ultimately up to individual boards to decide how they wish to use their allotment of Ministry funding.

Moir and Bloom (2003) present a case for secondment for mentors to focus specifically on mentoring. These mentors should receive training, much like an additional qualification available through a faculty of education at an accredited university. Following the mentoring training and a few years devoted to the mentoring experience, they would return to the classroom. This approach was first piloted in the mid-1990s in California, and the great success of the mentor coaches, according to S. Hanson and Moir (2008), has created a strain on institutional knowledge due to mid-and late-career mentor coaches not returning to the classroom after their secondment. Becoming a mentor also helps veteran teachers, and both mentors and new teachers being mentored should receive release time (Darling-Hammond, 2003).

Wong (2002) states that the best way to ensure a community of lifelong learners and to attract and retain teachers is for each school board to create and implement a teacher induction program based on training, support, and retention. He advocates a week-long training session in the summer, combined with constant follow-up over the course of the first 2 to 3 years and, along with Andrews and Martin (2003), advocates for strong administrative support as well as the integration of mentoring into the in-service program and visits to demonstration classrooms before beginning a teaching assignment. Wong goes on to propose that any and all induction programs should help new teachers create classroom management procedures, routines, and instructional practices as well as an understanding of the community in which they will begin teaching.
According to Moir (1999), five phases or stages exist within the first year of teaching. A high level of anticipation exists from the time of hiring and preparing for the first day of classes in September. This is followed by a steep decline into survival by October, once the realities of teaching present themselves and protégés experience situations not previously encountered. Disillusionment occurs after the first 6 to 8 weeks, where new teachers begin to question their commitment and ability as well as their self-worth. After the return from the winter break, a rejuvenation period begins, when new teachers begin to recognize their own strengths and have a sense of accomplishment. At the end of the school year, new teachers have a chance to reflect upon their year and highlight what was successful and what was not. This is followed once again by anticipation for the beginning of the next school year.

Conway (2001b) states that little research has focused on the induction initiatives of music teachers. She goes on to state that generic induction programs for nonspecialist disciplines do not meet the needs of music teachers. Discipline-based help is needed for newer teachers in the arts. Strategies that typically work for so-called normal classrooms do not necessarily work for music classrooms (Conway, 2001a). If induction programs are not tailored towards arts-based induction programs, the teaching profession risks losing the best and the brightest, according to Conway (2001b), Gonzales and Sosa (1993), and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996).

According to Feinman-Nemser (1993), induction programs offer short-term support and help for teachers in their first year and are not seen as a long-term solution.

Frequently, Conway (2001a) suggests, newer teachers are stifled in their efforts to learn and grow in their schools. The opportunity to gain valuable experience by leading
committees, participating in professional development opportunities, supervising clubs, and leading in-school initiatives is frequently not forthcoming, says Halford (2003). Change is a slow process, according to Senge et al. (1999), and attempting to integrate within an established community without prior experience is not an encouraging endeavour. Senge believes that people are resistant to change and that attempting to bring about change may only inhibit progress within an environment. Music teachers, especially newer ones attempting to bring about change in an already established program, with updated technology and fresh ideas, may face significant opposition from a variety of parties (Conway).

Professional development is a good idea for all teachers, according to Hill (2003). Sargent (2003) argues that schools should offer professional development and a social setting so that teachers will enjoy their work. In order to maximize the potential payoff of professional development, Freiberg (2003) and Freiberg and Driscoll (2000) suggest that any initiatives should be built on a framework of research-based initiatives. These include three distinct areas: organizing, which includes planning, lesson design, time use, advance work and classroom management; instructional strategies; and assessing strategies, both student and the teacher. Most beginning music teachers would benefit from content-specific professional development experiences (Conway, 2001a). Studies by Conway (2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003a, 2003b) have found a significant link between teachers who participate in professional development and then mentor other teachers. These studies reported an increased level of confidence for both the mentor and new teacher in their classroom assignment. Holloway (2001) states that ongoing support for
newer teachers should be combined with on-going professional development throughout the academic year and one’s entire career.

Renard (2003) makes a number of recommendations for successful induction of new teachers in the first few years, including no team teaching, no extracurricular activities, planning time for lesson preparation, no committees, less challenging teaching assignments, no split grades, less than two course preparations, their own classroom, less frivolous professional development initiatives and activities, an assigned subject-specific mentor who shares a similar schedule, and time to establish themselves with their subject or grade before moving them to another one. Gradually, duties should be increased to a full set of responsibilities, yet this will allow new teachers to emerge from their first couple of years of teaching feeling empowered, supported, and capable as a new teacher. New teachers should be given ongoing professional support for up to 3 years. This flies in the face of music-specific research conducted by Conway (2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003a, 2003b) and Krueger (1996, 1999, 2000, 2001) which suggests that newer music teachers do not have the opportunity to experience Renard’s recommendations.

Topics that may be touched upon during an induction program or ongoing professional development, according to Andrews and Martin (2003), Melnychuck and Melnychuck (2002), and Youn (2000), include relations with parents and colleagues, assessment of students work, individual student problems, classroom management, and discipline in the classroom.

Darling-Hammond (2003) suggests improving conditions within the school by establishing oneself, taking a stance, and ensuring that positions are advocated and adhered to. Yet this is hard to accomplish in the face of all the responsibilities that newer
teachers face, according to Conway (2001b, 2003b). Conway (2003a) goes on to advocate becoming more prepared through the establishment of mentorship and induction programs. A 2 year induction program may be established at a cost of about $4,000 per new teacher (Ontario College of Teachers, 2003). This figure is a small price to pay compared to the cost of losing a teacher.

**Chapter Summary**

While extensive literature regarding mentoring, induction, and attrition initiatives comes from the United States, the same cannot be said about Canada. Further information about arts-based disciplines such as music is even more scant, with scholars such as Conway (2001a, 2003a) and Krueger (1996, 1999, 2000, 2001) the rare exceptions. The focus of this thesis, therefore, is to address the gap in literature within Canada as well as to provide a focus for arts-based mentoring and induction for music teachers.

Much of the literature surrounding mentoring and induction issues stems from the alarming attrition rates experienced by newer teachers over the last number of years. Leading researchers such as Melnychuck and Melnychuck (2002), Holtz (2003), and Schmidt (2003) tracked newer teachers leaving the profession, with over 50% leaving within the first 5 years. Ingersoll (2001) and Bobbitt (1994) bestowed labels upon teachers as stayers, leavers, or movers. Their findings, along with Shen’s (1997) Human Capital Theory and accompanying study, answered many questions surrounding the reasons why teachers leave the profession and what impact it has upon the school, community, and teaching profession in general, but they did not break their results down into subject-specific outcomes.
Shen's (1997) study provided particularly surprising results, with teachers more likely to leave from good schools than from impoverished ones as well as secondary teachers leaving sooner than elementary teachers and professionals in urban settings faster than suburban. Much of the literature reviewed cited a plethora of reasons, for both broad-based and arts-based teachers, for why teachers may choose to leave the teaching profession. While some authors focused on specific reasons affecting teachers, others chose to explore the effect on both the school and community when a teacher decides to leave. However, a large gap exists when considering these issues within a Canadian context.

One theme studied within the literature by Conway (2001b, 2003b), Halford (2003), and Andrews and Martin (2003) focused on institutional supports for newer teachers and the effects of administrators and the school environment upon a new teacher. These ranged from detailing the difficulty that newer teachers face when starting, such as timetabling and classroom issues, to arts-based teaching problems outlined by Conway (2001b, 2003b) regarding extracurricular duties and the expectations of the school and community for music teachers. While these and other investigators extensively articulate many problems faced by new teachers, much of the research is American based, and it will be helpful to conduct such studies in Canada.

The focus of the Ontario Ministry of Education's (2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2006d) New Teacher Induction Program, as well as the extensive research performed by the Ontario College of Teachers (2003, 2007b), have provided numerous suggestions and criteria for implementing successful mentoring and induction initiatives within the school environment. Advocates such as Conway (2003a) and the Elementary Teachers
Federation of Ontario (2002) extol the virtues of a positive mentoring program for the beginning teacher and the impact upon the school and wider community. Much of the research provides extensive ideas on how to actively introduce mentoring and induction programs into a school with a focus on the role of both the mentor and protégé. Because the program in Ontario is in its infancy, it has yet to be determined what results, if any, there have been. These are the issues that the study reported in this document set out to explore. The following chapter provides the design and methods through which this exploration unfolded.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to investigate mentoring and induction practices within a large urban school board, specifically focusing on secondary school music teachers. Due to the varied experience of possible participants and the anticipated assortment of responses, a qualitative interview methodology was chosen over a quantitative approach. This chapter provides an overview of the methodology and procedures chosen for the study. It begins with a presentation of the methodology and the research design, grounded in qualitative research theory. This is followed by a description of site and participant selection as well as a discussion about how data were collected and analyzed. The chapter concludes with the procedures for establishing credibility and statements concerning ethical considerations.

Methodology and Research Design

A qualitative research approach was selected to guide this study. This approach was chosen due to its inherent flexibility to maneuver around the study question through what Babbie (1998) described as a semistandardized interview structure. According to Berg (2001), qualitative research is based on a social science approach that promotes the use of empirical inquiry to investigate the everyday world as opposed to a quantitative approach which relies on numeric data and specific measurements in the analysis of its data.

The approach to this study is one of description, which has allowed me the opportunity to view the experiences and events of the participants and their experiences with mentoring and induction practices. This allows an arm’s-length view of the participants’ perceptions and interpretation of the subject matter and frame of reference.
rather than my personal acuity. Overall, the descriptive qualitative approach was well suited to this study because of its ability to generate a detailed and accurate picture of the problem, document how things happen, and report on the context of the situation (Neuman, 2000).

When Berg (2001) states that “qualitative research thus refers to the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and descriptions of things” (p. 3), he is inferring that qualitative research allows a depth and detail that a quantitative research does not afford. Berg goes on to say that “qualitative procedures provide a means of accessing unquantifiable facts about the actual people researchers observe and talk to” (p. 7). Because qualitative research is about uncovering the underlying meaning behind actions, it allows the researcher to be somewhat empathetic towards the participants in a study. This characteristic is important to the study, as I am personally interested in the participants’ responses to better understand the subject matter after experiencing mentoring and induction transitions coming into the teaching profession.

**Site and Participant Selection**

The site for this study was a large urban school board located in southern Ontario. The location is one of convenience, as I am also an employee of the school board. Participant selection took place using a purposive sampling method (Babbie, 1998). This method was chosen due to the particular focus of the study. According to Patton (1990), a stratified purposive sampling method facilitates comparisons between groups with similar interests and commonalities. I stratified the sample across career stages to allow for a comparison of insights into the topic across time and experience. Initially the goal of the study was to explore the experiences of secondary music teachers who were carrying a
full course load of music classes, yet finding participants who met both criteria were few and far between. The conditions were amended to include candidates currently employed by the board who taught secondary music courses.

Within the school board selected for the study, fewer than 200 candidates met the eligibility criteria as set out by the parameters of the research study. The decision was made to make a targeted invitation to all potential research participants by a letter of recruitment sent through internal board mail. While the initial target number was 6 participants, 16 potential applicants contacted me through a variety of means, including e-mail, phone calls, and personal contact at various professional development and social occasions. No additional overtures were made, and all respondents were included within the study. Further, only 9 of the 16 participants had a full-time music teaching course load, the remainder taught a partial course load which included some music courses, while 1 was a long-term occasional teacher with the board.

Research participants were categorized into three subcategories depending on years of experience: newer teachers with fewer than 5 years of teaching, of which there were 4 participants, 1 of whom is no longer teaching music; 7 teachers who were midway through their teaching careers with between 6 and 15 years of experience; and 5 teachers who had more than 16 years of experience, including 3 who have since retired from teaching. A detailed profile is located in Appendix C.

**Data Collection**

I wished to obtain perceptions of individuals concerning mentoring and induction initiatives as well as thoughts on a number of related topics such as administrative supports and professional development. A qualitative interview was determined to
provide the best opportunity for both the researcher and participant to interact and attain meaningful data. A semistandardized interview process, as described by Babbie (1998) and further elaborated by Berg (2001), allows a number of predetermined questions to be put forth to the participant, while the researcher is permitted to deviate and probe beyond the fixed questions.

After an extensive review of the literature, ideas for questions to pose were assembled from a variety of sources. The initial questions regarding the participants' employment history and general background were garnered from the Ontario College of Teachers' (2003) survey concerning the employment of Ontario Faculty of Education graduates upon graduation from their pre-service teaching degree.

The majority of questions concerning induction, mentoring, and professional development were adapted from the literature specific to induction, mentoring, and professional development for music educators. Particular emphasis was placed on issues raised by Conway (2003a, 2003b), Conway and Garlock (2002), Krueger (1999, 2001), and Lautzenheiser (2001), because these scholars specifically study musicians and educators who teach music and have conducted studies on a variety of subjects pertaining to teacher induction and mentoring practices.

After reviewing issues identified within the relevant literature, I formulated questions and categorized them on the interview guide according to the four empirical questions related to the study. I followed these primary questions by subsidiary questions related to each empirical question. At the commencement of the study I reviewed and revised the questions to ensure cultural sensitivity and appropriateness. The finalized interview guide is located in Appendix A.
A personal interview approach (Neuman, 2000) was selected to allow the researcher to extract in-depth information that was unique to each participant and also to afford a measure of privacy to each participant. After a request for interview was received, a mutual secured space was predetermined by the interview subject. This allowed a measure of convenience, comfort, and confidentiality for each participant and helped facilitate ease of pursuing answers.

Interviews were planned to be approximately one hour in length, yet most interviews were less than 45 minutes, one was 12 minutes in total, and one was close to 2 hours. The majority of interviews took place at the participants' school usually after hours or during a preparation period within the school day. Private offices or classrooms with doors closed were used to promote an atmosphere of confidentiality and to minimize disruptions. No class time was used for this study. In a few cases, an off-school site was used, such as a coffee shop or personal place of residence. In these situations the measure of confidentiality was not secured due to the public or personal nature of the venue. Questions were given to participants a few minutes before the interview began, and few participants reviewed them in advance or followed along as the researcher asked them.

With the participants' permission, interviews were audio recorded. It was explained that the interviews were being recorded to ensure that the interviewer was able to accurately capture the participants' ideas and opinions and that all electronic evidence would be destroyed at the completion of the study. All interviews were transcribed verbatim for analysis. The names of the participants did not appear on the transcripts, and each participant was assigned the pseudonym *participant* and the number in the order of
which their interview took place. A master list of participants and their assigned pseudonyms was stored in a separate and secure location.

Data were collected using two key data sources: key document analysis and key informant interviews. The literature review comprised the document analysis and was used to inform the development of specific questions to investigate with study participants. It also guided the data analysis, as the philosophy of mentoring and induction practices identified in the literature were used to assist in the structure of the research analysis and findings. Key informant interviews were chosen as the main data collection tool. These interviews were analyzed, and the themes that emerged from the analysis were compared for verification purposes to themes found in the literature surrounding mentoring and induction practices for secondary music teachers.

Data Analysis

Interview transcripts and key documents were coded by category by analyzing the data that was formulated by perpetuating broad categories based on the empirical questions defined for this study. This provided a starting point to code the data from the transcripts.

The content analysis of the material was further delineated by setting up a combination of elements. This analysis began by labeling each empirical question as a theme and searching for distinctive concepts within each label. By constantly cross-comparing what each participant said under each category, a number of themes and subthemes began to emerge. These themes served as the basis for reporting the findings in Chapter Four of this document.
To further guide my data analysis, I followed the system of open coding that Berg (2001) espouses. By cross-comparing the data into broad categories and asking the categorized data a consistent set of questions, I was able to distinguish between relevant and immaterial information that participants provided in their interviews. I then analyzed the data minutely by constantly narrowing the statements to reach a conclusive end. Finally, I frequently interrupted the coding process to write myself a theoretical note. By doing so, I was able to retain ideas that were congruent with other categories and to shape the major themes and ideas for Chapter Four. I chose not to incorporate the final principle of open coding, that of assuming the analytical relevance of traditional variables until they are shown to be relevant. It was determined from the beginning of the data analysis that these would not be factors by virtue of the participant selection process. By following these principles of data analysis, I was able to reduce the transcripts of 16 participants into a manageable set of topics that show the results of the study.

Establishing Credibility

A number of procedural checks were used in order to establish credibility throughout this study. Results were triangulated and grouped across three career stages: newer teachers with fewer than 5 years of teacher experience; midcareer teachers with between 6 and 15 years of teaching; and experienced teachers with 16 or more years of teaching experience. With 16 participants giving interviews, there was a large enough number of participants within the study to ensure that each career stage was well represented in the final results.

After each interview was completed, the process of member checking took place as agreed upon by me and each participant. Transcripts of each interview were e-mailed
to each participant, and edits and revisions were to be made within a set amount of time. The researcher received minimal response from research participants. Likewise, when the cross-analysis summary of the interviews was performed and e-mailed to participants, minimal response was received once again from research participants.

**Ethical Considerations**

Approval for this research was received from Brock University in accordance with the Principles of Ethical Research with Human Participants (see Appendix B). Further, research and ethics approval was sought and obtained from the Research and Ethics Committee of the school board in which the research participants taught, in accordance with the school board’s policies and procedures.

All data collected were retained and stored in a secure location and a confidential manner. In order to ensure that all study participants were able to speak freely about their experiences, participants were assured that their participation and comments would remain anonymous in this report or in future publications, with no identifying features related in the final study to either themselves or their employer.

Each participant signed a consent form waiver before the interview took place, indicating that they were fully informed about the study and that they participated voluntarily in it. Participants were offered a copy of the interview questions at the interview a few minutes before beginning and were given the option not to answer questions that they did not feel comfortable answering or that they found objectionable. The option to withdraw from the study at any time was clearly indicated, both in writing and verbally, before the interview questions were posed. No participants chose to withdraw from the study, although some chose not to answer certain questions.
The researcher and the participants were all employees of the same school board. As such, some unique ethical considerations were implicated in the study, and I therefore developed some additional measures to protect the participants. These measures were understood by both the participants and me throughout the collection of data. While the majority of participants knew me through other means such as professional development sessions, common interests outside the working environment, and general interaction through phone and e-mail communication, a few of the research participants had no knowledge of my connection with the large urban school board to which we were all employed. I assured potential candidates that they should feel no pressure or obligation to participate due to our prior relationship but that they should participate in the study only if they believed they had important information to share, as participation was sought from a purposive sample. Although a working and, in most cases, a personal relationship was established before the interview began, I held no position of authority over any participant and did not anticipate any impact on future interactions with any of the research participants after completion of the study.

**Chapter Summary**

In summary, a qualitative research methodology was chosen for this study for the express purpose of gathering information and insights from a variety of secondary music teachers. Sixteen secondary music teachers with a variety of teaching experience were interviewed using a semistructured format. Key literature was studied to provide an informed foundation into the subject matter and to provide a frame of reference when performing the research. The following chapter provides the key findings from the interviews.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the mentoring, induction, and retention needs of secondary music teachers. Using a purposive sampling method, data for this study were collected by performing qualitative interviews with secondary music teachers with varying degrees of experience. Data collection was guided and informed by an analysis of relevant literature. Data analysis followed the constant-comparison method to identify themes and patterns in the data.

In this chapter, I first provide a summary of the secondary music teachers’ perceptions on a number of facets of mentoring, induction, and retention issues. Second, I provide a thematic presentation of the results organized with respect to the original empirical questions and emergent themes.

Participant Profile

The 16 participants were all employed by a large urban school board in Ontario. All participants held degrees in music and education and taught at least one secondary school music course at the time of the interviews; however, only 9 of the 16 participants were teaching music full-time. Two of the participants taught at junior high schools, which included a mixture of elementary and secondary music courses, and 1 was a long-term occasional teacher.

Participant 1 had taught music for 6 years in the elementary system but was considered a new teacher in her first year to the secondary panel, teaching both music and English. Participant 2 had taught secondary music full-time for 29 years, while participants 3 and 4 had taught music for 32 and 30 years respectively. Participant 5 had taught music for 5 years, while participant 6 taught music and English for 2 years, and
participant 7 taught music and math for 7 years. Participant 8 taught a variety of subjects, including music, math, and drama, throughout a 30-year career. Participant 9 was a new teacher, teaching music and geography. Participant 10 had taught music full-time from kindergarten to grade 12 over a 25-year career, while participant 11 achieved the same throughout a 13-year career. Participant 12 taught music full-time over a 27 year career, while participant 13 taught a variety of subjects in the past 2 years. Participant 14 had taught elementary music for 5 years and had taught secondary music full-time for 3 years. Participant 15 taught music and moderns throughout the last 7 years, and participant 16 taught kindergarten to grade 12 during a 13-year career and was currently teaching in the secondary school system. For a summary chart of participants, please refer to Appendix C.

Induction

When asked to define induction, more than two thirds of participants indicated that they did not know what the term meant. Of those who answered, a number of analogies were used, from “being thrown into something” to “being introduced or brought into the teaching profession.” Participant 2 summed up induction for all participants when she said,

I would say it would be a welcoming process from the board that you’re hired to or the group of teachers that will be working with you. It’s sort of like an acceptance that you are now on board with others.

When participants were informed that induction referred to the way that new individuals were introduced to the teaching profession, a wide variety of responses were put forth. Whereas all of the participants with 5 or fewer years of teaching experience had been
exposed to some form of formal induction program, all of the participants with 15 or more years of teaching experience had not had any formal induction programs offered to them. Participants with experience ranging from 6 to 14 years of teaching had minimal contact with induction programs, spanning from full inclusion to absolutely nothing.

Amongst participants with 5 or fewer years of teaching experience, most were aware of a formal induction program offered by the district school board, spanning multiple days at a centrally located secondary school. In 2001, this large urban board of education had put into place a nonmandatory summer induction institute. Originally aimed at all contract teachers new to teaching, it was slowly expanded to include both first and second year teachers, including long-term occasional teachers, as well as those new to the board of education. Further, it was expanded from a 1-day session the first year to the current 3-day session. Features include introductions to the director of education, superintendents, senior administrative team members, workshops on a variety of topics, including what to do the first day of school, marking, and classroom management, to name a few. Sessions were led by experienced teachers and leaders within the board and were usually grouped by subject or grade level. The program was free for participants, lunch was provided each day, and a variety of stakeholder groups, including unions and departments within the board, set up displays with information and items for sale between sessions. In addition to the summer induction session provided by the board, the union to which all participants belonged offered a 1-day session focusing on union-related matters, such as teaching and the law, life insurance, when to call the federation, teachers’ rights, and detail the virtues of their newer teachers’ committees and retreat programming.
Whereas those participants with 3 or fewer years of experience chose to attend the induction sessions, those with 4 or 5 years opted not to. When pressed as to why they would not attend, participant 1 summed up for all participants when she said, “I never went to that... I’m not a big group, go-getter person, so I’d rather do something one-on-one with someone else.” Other reasons cited by participants included not being paid to attend, not knowing anyone that was going, and not feeling that the sessions specifically pertained to them.

Participant 15 chose not to attend the board-wide induction initiatives due to the inconvenient times the programs took place as well as the assumption that there would be an in-school induction program for new teachers. While the latter was true, she felt she was not given a choice by her administration and was pressured to participate in the in-school program, even though programming took place at inconvenient times. “I was too intimidated, because I was always afraid that people would think that I was not ready for the job, not good enough. And they will fire me.” Although she was not fired, she discontinued the in-school induction process as soon as possible and chose not to participate in the mentorship initiative within her school’s induction program.

The data demonstrated that induction programs within schools varied greatly from school to school, largely dependent on the administration and willingness of colleagues to facilitate an in-school induction program. These have ranged from absolutely nothing in the school, to a full-day program, to a series of mutually convenient times such as lunch hours or after school, to answer questions and promote the policies, procedures, and expectations within the school. Although participant 15 was pressured to attend, all
participants who were aware of induction programming within their schools stated that when the initiatives were optional, they felt some pressure to attend, yet when mandatory, their administrators provided lieu time for class coverage, and sometimes lunch, to ensure attendance at their induction program. As participant 16 stated, “I’ll go to anything so long as they’re paying for my time, and [if] they’re going to give me a free meal, I’ll do whatever.” The expectation was that, with any sort of professional development, in addition to coverage and lieu time, a free meal should be included in exchange for participants’ benefit of learning how to survive their initial year of teaching.

Although all teachers with 3 or fewer years of teaching experience chose to attend the board conference, most stated that they gained something from attending but that the sessions fell far short of their stated purpose. Participant 6 summed up their findings by stating,

It was really good. They had workshops on what to expect on your first day, and a chance to meet my superintendent and network, but I think that it was more beneficial to elementary school teachers than it was to secondary. I really think they needed to have some subject-specific things for secondary, because they had sessions that were broader and aimed at elementary teachers.

The chance to network with other teachers in their area as well as meet their superintendent was cited as beneficial and important by all participants who attended the centrally co-ordinated induction process. “I thought that it was good. It gave me the chance to interact with people, not only from the board itself but from my section of the board. So the interaction is a great thing,” stated participant 9. When pressed further
about the people with whom he was able to interact, participant 9 said that there were no arts-based music teaching individuals, nor anyone from his school with whom to interact.

The lack of arts-based programming was echoed by all who attended the summer institute. Programming was aimed at all participants from both the elementary and secondary panels, yet because there are more elementary schools than secondary schools within the board, statistically there will be more elementary teachers than secondary teachers at this event. Participant 9 stated that “it wasn’t very helpful as a music teacher because it wasn’t very specific. It was very generic.”

All participants in the summer institute stated that they would prefer a arts-based orientation and were disappointed by the outcome of the sessions they attended. “None of it was music. They didn’t really try to relate it to their subject, but naturally [you want to know about] what you teach,” continued participant 9. “Having someone who’s been there and doing what you’re going to be doing, in my case that’s teaching music.”

The lone participant with 5 or fewer years of teaching experience who was not aware of induction initiatives provided by her board was participant 5. She stated that “in terms of my first year, I don’t recall any induction programs, any special conference days.” When pressed as to what type of assistance was offered at school, she continued by saying, “everything was pretty much you searching out the answer.” The theme of searching out the answers to common questions, such as what to do during a fire procedure, how to order supplies, and who is in charge of certain programs, for example, was widespread amongst participants.

All of the participants with more than 6 years of teaching indicated that they were neither informed nor were they aware nor had they participated in any formal induction
program upon entering the teaching profession. Practically no help was offered for most of these participants; they were essentially left on their own. “We just basically had to sink or swim, find out for ourselves,” stated participant 14. Many participants related difficult experiences that demonstrated how unhelpful fellow staff members could be. After detailing many common first-year teaching problems, with little or no help, participant 13 said about her fellow staff and administration, “How alienated do you want me to feel? I’m not a stupid person, but I cannot know things that don’t exist if I do not have a frame of reference from which to start.” The assumption of prior knowledge, or lack thereof, was one about which the majority of participants expressed dismay in relation to their first years of teaching.

Most participants did not receive specific training or information regarding day-to-day operating procedures: items that take place outside of the scope of teaching but are necessary for the safe functioning of the school. “They gave us a book, and it said ‘Staff Handbook.’ And we had the staff meeting, where we went through it. So, that was for everybody, more than for new teachers,” said participant 6. The staff handbook is a relatively new article, as no teacher with more than 15 years experience indicated receiving one upon entry to the teaching profession. For some, a multitude of paper was their only source of induction, which led to a sense of helplessness and being lost. Participant 13 stated,

We did get a lot of paper, but paper isn’t induction. I didn’t go into teaching because I can handle paperwork. I’m not good with paperwork. So give me a binder with stuff that has nothing to do with teaching when I’m faced with the
prospect of walking into a classroom with 30 kids in it. Am I going to read about the fire code, or see if there’s any other information? No.

A variety of induction methods beyond binders and paperwork was described by participants, especially for basic operating procedures, or those that do not necessarily concern the day-to-day teaching or affect the specific classroom environment. Of particular concern was interaction with fellow staff members. “There was no warm welcome,” said participant 8, who went on to describe her induction process as “a low key affair....It was somewhat disappointing.” Experienced participants indicated that while there was no formal program in place when they first started, it was the expectation for the individual school or department head to initiate new colleagues into the profession. When asked about his induction experience, participant 3 replied,

I think that there was an expectation that the department head would take care of business, and she did. I don’t recall anything but that. Certainly I never received a curriculum, a course outline, or any materials. It was really do what you want, and it was a bit sparse.

This excerpt echoed the sentiments of all experienced participants. Upon entering the profession, it was assumed that a new teacher was immediately considered a colleague. Participant 3 continued, “I think that people knew you were a neophyte, so they were looking out for you a little bit. Especially the department head, who clearly had a vested interest.” All experienced participants either directly asked for help or were given unsolicited assistance and advice. While some clearly received assistance, some, such as participant 12, upon asking her department head for support, was met with, “‘OK, I can help you out. My piece of advice to you is: good luck.’ I said ‘OK’. That’s all I got.” The
general sentiments amongst experienced participants was that since they were new to the profession, they did not know any better, but upon reflection, seeing what was in place for new teachers over the course of their careers, they felt that they were let down.

Of those participants given the option to participate in induction initiatives, a range of experiences were portrayed in detail. Most described their formal contract signing as their only board-level form of induction offered to new teachers more than 5 years ago. Participant 1 summed this up by saying, “I think that contract signing is a form of induction, because it’s so detailed. And they do tell you every single thing that you need to know.”

Most participants with many years of experience felt that induction and follow-up activities should be concentrated at the board level. However, due to funding cutbacks, distribution of time and teaching duties, and co-ordinator positions lost through redistribution, most of these activities had fallen by the wayside. Participant 2 discussed board level induction and follow-up activities when she first started in the early 1980’s.

We had so many activities for music teachers. We were always having PA days, we were always having get-togethers, even socially, and that really helped, because you could share ideas. And you had more experiences by going to visit other schools. So you get to know more people, your students get to participate, and I found that very, very good, especially being a new teacher to this board. You didn’t know many people. And now I have not seen that at all, and I miss that part.

Most participants were aware of what their school attempted to accomplish with the new Ministry of Education mandated program that exists to help school boards
initiate teachers to the profession. The following excerpt from participant 5 reflects the wishes of most participants who expressed a need for a formal program.

I think that all new teachers, regardless of your teaching subject, need basic information regarding school policies, attendance procedures, report cards, reporting comments. Just basic administrative stuff needs to be introduced to teachers so they don’t have to search out the answers. And then, some type of induction program within the department, and the subject and the course, and perhaps sitting down with teachers with similar teaching assignments and going through what’s in the course, what’s on the course outline, how they structure their course outline. Just maybe guiding through unit by unit would definitely be helpful, regardless of the subject.

However, some experienced participants were unconvinced of new initiatives on induction programs. “I’m skeptical at best, although I can see it being tremendously valuable,” stated participant 3. Other participants, such as participant 12, who was trained in another province, called Ontario’s teacher education programs a “waste of time,” insisting that instead of paying for classroom coverage, incurring the cost of renting space, and feeding participants in order to train them to become productive inductive contributors, the board should reinvest their resources in teacher-specific initiatives such as mentoring programs.
Mentoring and its effects on newer teachers was another key area of inquiry for this study, with varied experiences being received by all participants relating to inductive mentoring. When asked to describe what mentoring meant to them, the majority of the participants used the word “guide” to depict a senior or experienced teacher and their relationship with a junior or inexperienced teacher throughout the induction process. The participants almost always described a “one-on-one situation” to provide support, be a resource, use their wisdom befitting their years of experience, give advice, build upon their strengths, identify their weaknesses, and provide solutions to nurture them to become a productive member of the teaching team.

A number of different analogies were used as descriptors for mentoring, from participant 6 describing it as a “bird under a bigger bird’s wing,” to multiple use of the words “older” or “senior” to describe the mentor and “younger” or “junior” to describe the protégé. Sporting terms such as “coach” to describe the mentor and “rookie” to describe the protégé were also frequently used to describe the relationship throughout the induction process. The majority of the participants spoke of the inherent need to guide and teach new teachers and to be a resource for less experienced colleagues as they were being introduced to the world of teaching.

Mentoring programs inevitably varied from school to school because this locally developed program is at the whim of the administrators within each school. Although program guidelines exist, how the program is run, or if an inductive mentoring program is implemented, is ultimately up to each individual school, their staff, and their administrators. However, some participants were unaware of any such programs, such as
participant 7, who stated, “I know the board is doing something, but I am not aware of what they are doing.”

How participants were assigned to receive or become mentors was seen by many participants as a critical element towards the success of an induction program. Most of the newer teachers expressed frustration at having to seek out their own mentors. Participant 9 described it as the following:

It’s not really assigned to you. You have to search the staff out and find someone that’s suitable to you. It took me a while to find someone, because as the only music teacher I don’t really get out of the music room that much. So I was only able to talk to a few people.

The frustration from participant 9 from his limited choice of mentors, combined with being the only music teacher on staff, delayed his capacity to attain a mentor within a timely fashion.

This idea was echoed by participant 14, who garnered further complications while attempting to attain a mentor. The program in her school was managed by a third party within the school. “I was expected to somehow seek out people who would help me,” she said, yet without any help, she was delayed in getting a mentor until the program had already commenced. By the time she had attained a mentor, both participants indicated that they had missed a portion of the inductive mentoring activities set out for them at the local school level.

The data indicated that a wide variety of induction services were available within each school. Although some new teachers were assigned mentors as part of their in-school induction program, a number chose not to use their mentors for a variety of
reasons. “I was assigned a mentor teacher, but nothing really came of it,” stated participant 7, due to an admitted lack of willingness on both mentor’s and protégé’s part. Ultimately, she found answers when necessary from her department head and administration, which is where most participants turned when not involved in a formal inductive mentoring process.

Some newer teachers, such as participant 1, choose to participate in certain portions of the mentoring program but not in others. “I chose not to opt into the whole formal program. I just need someone there that I can go to and ask questions.” These other portions included board-wide mentor/protégé conferences, which included training for the mentor, and in-service for the protégé on topics such as classroom management, grading, and designing portfolios. A variable level of interaction amongst participants benefited the protégé and ensured that the mentor was able to perform his/her duties without the need to fully participate in the mentoring induction program.

Whereas some new teachers were involved in a mentoring program, others willingly chose not to participate in any sort of induction program within the school. “It was an option for me, but I was so busy in my first year that I didn’t have time to sign up,” stated participant 6. While some schools automatically invited or enrolled teachers into a locally developed induction program, others required sign-up, with no follow-through. When participant 6 wished to participate in her second year, her administrator refused.

Conversely, while many experienced participants acknowledged participating in an induction program as a mentor or taking a student teacher, some, such as participant 8,
felt that they did not have the time due in large part to their experience as a protégé and the rigors of a music program:

I haven’t always seen the clear time to mentor a new teacher. And the day-to-day of the music teacher is sometimes very challenging to turn one’s ensembles over to a new teacher. No offence to them, but if it’s near a concert time, it’s awkward. I went through that myself as a student teacher. So I guess that I carry that one around with me in my heart.

The interference and disruption within their program superseded the experienced teachers’ desire to formally mentor newer teachers.

Data indicated that when local school programs assigned mentors, professional mismatches sometimes inhibited the protégé’s ability to obtain the required knowledge through the program. Participant 14, for example, encountered this issue.

I was supposed to have had a mentor, but that mentor really didn’t suit my needs or didn’t suit my subject areas. Therefore, I had to look for a mentor myself who was someone else on the staff.

Being assigned a mentor who was not in his subject area was a detriment towards the success of his induction program. He continued,

I really wanted to be paired up with the music teacher, because that’s my forte. I had to go and look for that pairing myself. It would be neat if they found out what our qualifications were, or even asked what we wanted in a mentor.

As a consequence of this random assignment of a mentor who did not suit his needs, participant 14 chose not to participate in the induction program at the local level.
The data also indicated that difficulties might be encountered by the mentor with the protégé. Not attending one-on-one meetings, not following through with locally developed induction initiatives, not attending board-sanctioned programming, or not using the mentors sufficiently were common complaints amongst participants who were mentors. Participant 1 stated,

The new teachers really have to be on board for it to work, and I don’t think that that was the situation. The person that I was mentoring wasn’t vocal enough and didn’t ask me enough questions. I tried to probe, and they didn’t use me as a support person as they should have.

The feeling of underusage was commonplace amongst many mentors, while many protégés described in retrospect not using their mentors enough at the time of their induction program. Some mentors, such as participant 11, found it difficult to be a mentor to his assigned protégé, due to an age differential. “It’s a little hard to talk to him and deal with someone who is older, and it’s a weird relationship.”

Ageism was not exclusive to the mentoring process. Sometimes a mentor did not feel that the person they were assigned was going to be an adequate teaching professional. In these cases, the mentor did the best that he/she could, yet their best never seemed to be enough. Participant 16 said,

I did what I could to help her, but I didn’t feel like what I was giving her was adequate. I thought that she was going to get into her classroom and she was going to get eaten alive.

The idea of an arts-based mentor is congruent with the desire for arts-based induction initiatives. However, this was not always possible when locally developed
induction programs randomly assigned mentors to new teachers without first checking their qualifications, or when new teachers were left to fend for themselves and find a mentor on their own initiative. This was especially difficult for participants who were the sole single-subject music teacher within a school, such as participant 13, who said, "We were to find our own mentor, which I suppose was supposed to be self-evident."

Both participant 13 and 14 had varying difficulties obtaining mentors who met their needs as beginning teachers. In both experiences, the inordinate amount of time infringed on their local school induction mentoring program and precluded them from taking part in board-wide programming initiatives.

Yet the opposite was true at other school sites. When the inductive mentoring programs selectively chose the mentors and protégés that would be paired together, some people who wished to be mentors were not able to participate, and in some cases, those who did not initially wish to participate in an inductive mentoring program had to do so. As stated by participant 4, an experienced mentor,

I would like to see the new teachers that have signed up to be mentored have a say in who their mentor is, because it's a very personal thing. And not be told "OK, this is who your mentor will be." regardless of subject, or grade, or whatever you're doing.

Most of the locally developed inductive mentoring programs assigned their protégés a mentor based on variant criteria that worked at that school site. All protégés involved with a local inductive mentoring program indicated that when given a choice, they found it a difficult task to secure a mentor, given their lack of knowledge of people and procedures concerning the school environment.
Some schools, by contrast, were quite successful with an induction mentoring program that randomly assigned mentors to new teachers. In the case of participant 10, her school had great success with this approach.

I am currently mentoring a computer technology teacher who is a first year teacher. We have found this program of mixing teachers of different subjects very effective. Although he is from a different discipline, this is the type of program that we’re trying to instill more and more, instead of like subjects. I suggested that I was interested in a mentoring with some younger teachers, and this is the teacher that needed it the most.

As opposed to those protégés with negative experience in being randomly assigned a mentor, participant 10 and her school had enjoyed a positive experience when assigning mentors that were not subject specific. One of the detractors, participant 14, preferred new teachers to have multiple mentors:

I think that it would have been nice to have had two mentors, one for music and one for my other teachable. That’s why I feel that having just one mentor is not enough, that you should surround yourself with several.

Having several different mentors would provide another perspective on teaching, as participant 11 said, “I think that it would be nice if you had a mentor who wasn’t in your department so you could see a different point of view.”

The case for multiple mentors within a school-level induction program is important, yet some of the experienced participants had taken part in an inductive mentoring program in an unofficial capacity. This “loose” or “indirect” mentoring happened by chance, due to several mitigating factors: close working proximity between
experienced and newer teachers; common interests, subjects, or social initiatives within the work environment that inevitably led to mentoring; or the need for success due to a shared goal from the unofficial mentor, to name a few. Participant 8 made the case for informal mentoring as follows:

I see informal mentoring going on constantly, even with an experienced teacher who’s new here. So I feel, [in] our department, we are all consciously there to make sure he’s comfortable and knows the ropes. It’s not like I’m going to sit him down and tell him how it’s done. But it’s constantly the oldtimers are saying, “Does he know that routine?” So that’s like an informal mentoring through friendship.

While not part of a formal mentoring program within her department, participant 8 made the case that it was important for new teachers to seamlessly slide into the nuances associated with established school protocols. Participant 3 felt that it was his responsibility, regardless of official programs, to mentor new teachers to his department. In most schools where I’ve been, there’s been an unofficial program of assigning young teachers, or anybody new in the department that I was responsible for, would be my responsibility. And it was in a semi official capacity. I was never compensated for that.

This tacit responsibility to ensure the success of newer teachers within a department was considered by participants to be for the benefit of all, not just the new teacher. While the need existed to mentor new teachers within the department, some experienced teachers, like participant 12, did not wish to become involved in an official capacity with an inductive mentoring process. Yet they felt that, out of necessity for the success of their
music department and program, they would mentor new teachers in an unofficial capacity.

I’m not the department head, and I’m not the official mentor, so I don’t want to step on his shoes. So, I do a little loose mentoring. She would ask for help, but I don’t do so in an official capacity. I don’t know how much to say or not to say.

The indecision of helping out yet not in an official way was important for these experienced teachers. For them, the title of being a part of an official mentoring program was not as important as was the act of mentoring new teachers.

Beyond the variances of the different inductive mentoring programs that fluctuated from school to school were some common themes that proved to be a hindrance for the chances of success of these programs. Participant 13 expressed the overarching problem, which was that “there was no time set aside for me to meet with my mentor.” Beyond personal time, such as before or after school or during lunch, programs did not set aside any time to meet, deconstruct events, ask questions, or provide feedback. More often than not, participants did not share a common preparation time with their mentoring partner. Said participant 14,

I feel that mentors really need to give feedback and be able to sit down and have time with their protégés and really find out what their needs are and help them and guide them on their way.

A lack of time prevented the necessary follow-through to ensure success in the inductive mentoring programs. A positive environment where protégés were able to make connections and express their issues was considered to be paramount to the success of newer teachers. Concluded participant 13,
It’s so important for teachers to come together in a safe place where they can actually say what’s going on, cry, or be frustrated, or be self-critical without their being judged. To really have a safe place so you can learn.

Many protégés recalled the frustration and angst of their first years of teaching, and along with sufficient downtime and a chance to deconstruct and reflect with their mentors, all who participated in a local inductive mentoring program expressed their thanks for the efforts of their mentors and administrators for initiating the program at their school.

**Administrative and Institutional Supports**

Support mechanisms at the local level for induction programs between mentors and new teachers within the institution, as well as the level of support from the administrator, were also an important part of this study. A wide variety of supports were reported concerning administration and their thoughts towards induction and mentoring programs by participants. Participant 10 summed up the feelings of participants when she stated,

I’ve experienced a huge variety of support or lack of support. They don’t always understand what I’m trying to do, but they do try to support it, and support me. It’s been frustrating sometimes.

Frustration at a lack of support was a reoccurring theme amongst participants. A rocky relationship between teachers and their administrators, in the case of participant 10, was an ongoing problem,

It’s been rocky. I’ve been through, just in this school alone, in the last 6 years, three principals. You always get different approaches by different principals, and it’s been very rocky. We had a very bad VP, too. She didn’t give us a lot of
support. She wasn’t supporting us at all. But this year we’re getting more support from the administration, at least the principal.

The rocky relationship and lack of support was a prevalent theme amongst most participants. This was reflected by participant 13, who stated that as a first-year teacher, “I don’t feel connected, as a classroom teacher, to the administration ... I don’t feel that I can go to my principal to discuss issues.” Still others, such as participant 1, suggested that “schools need to be more supportive of beginning teachers, especially in the beginning.” The inability to communicate effectively with her administration, coupled with a perceived lack of support, hampered her ability to participate successfully within the teacher induction and mentoring program.

Yet many participants expressed a high level of support from their administrators for a variety of teaching and non teaching practices. Almost every participant articulated their needs were met when discussing issues such as the unique timetabling needs of a music program, as well as professional development initiatives above and beyond the teacher induction program.

However, many newer teachers discussed a lack of support from their administration that their mentor could not help them with, either because they were not in a similar subject area, or had never experienced the problem and were therefore unable to help. Participant 9, for example, had to teach multilevel mixed classes during his first year, but his mentor did not have experience with the concept. “At this point ... multi level classes are an issue.” He did not feel comfortable approaching the administration, even though encouraged to by his mentor, to seek help or attain resources with his
situation. Still others, such as participant 14, discussed a lack of interaction with his principals:

I like the open door policy rather than always walking by the principal’s door being shut and not being available ... I’ve experienced both ... I find that it’s really important to have a good administrator who cares more about the students and teachers than balancing the budget or balancing the books.

Others, such as participant 13, did not feel “connected with the administration. They are the people that just sign off on things.” Administrators who were perceived as unapproachable was a common theme amongst many participants, who almost universally expressed their desire for more interaction and support between newer teachers and administrators.

Two participants found that a close relationship with their administrators, both of whom were former music teachers themselves, was both beneficial as well as detrimental towards achieving their goals in the teacher induction program. Participant 12 had a principal at her current school with whom she had worked as a teacher at a previous school. “[He] was my principal for 6 years, and was very supportive. I had complete autonomy,” she said. His support resulted in many additions in the music program, yet he also did some interesting things as well. “When I was on my maternity leave, he cut my string program without even phoning me ... it would have been nice to have been polite about it [and called].” The support was unwavering for this participant, yet in specific cases issues arose that were out of the participant’s hands.

In the case of participant 6, her department head, who was also her mentor, and her vice-principal had worked together for many years as music educators. “The vice-
principal … helped me through a lot last year. He helped me over a lot of the hurdles,” she said. Yet, “I [found out] that my department head would often go to the vice-principal and say [things about me]. I really don’t think that it’s appropriate for [them] to be having discussions about my performance.” This perceived conflict of interest between her mentor and her administrator was exacerbated due to her inexperience and not wanting to make a perceived conflict worse. She said,

I was a first year teacher, and because I don’t feel, as a first year teacher, it’s mostly because of my colleagues that I don’t have the experience to go to the OSSTF. I did speak to the OSSTF representative from my school about it, but I really didn’t want to stir anything up. I said that I was just going to wait and see what happens … things did get better in my second year.

In both situations, while support was there throughout, the relationship between the teacher and administrator was strained due to specific issues relating to their musical background. While support was there for musical initiatives, that support did not seem to be there when administrative control or issues relating to the performance of the teacher or their initial induction were involved.

Administrators had also left negative perceptions with newer teachers. In her second year, participant 5 applied for a full-time job at another school. Once she applied, “the principal came out and said that with my limited teaching experience, she had some serious concerns about me handling the program. This is without ever meeting me,” she said. Her initial meeting skewed her initial impression of her administrator and continued throughout her year at the school.
This attitude continued after she had to hire me, and I basically had to prove that I could handle the teaching assignment, that I could handle the demands of the program. But I had to work at that over several months, coming from a very negative attitude from her.

As the sole music teacher at the school, this attitude from her administrator had a significant impact on her teacher induction program. Like participant 6, she was not allowed to participate in off-site induction programming, and none was offered to her within the school.

Participants’ perceptions varied as to how they were treated in their initial meetings with administrator. Those participants who had initial experience in an elementary school related differential treatment from administrators depending on which level was taught. Said participant 16, who had many years in the elementary panel before recently switching to secondary,

As a teacher in elementary, they kind of baby you. Oftentimes they don’t treat you as the professional colleague that you are, but in secondary, it’s just assumed. It’s assumed that you’re a seasoned colleague, a professional, and they just treat you as such.

Many participants involved with switching teaching panels echoed this sentiment. This attitude was previously displayed by new colleagues in the secondary panel but was echoed by administrators as well.

Many of the experienced participants observed that a principal’s primary goal was to be there for their staff and the students. Participant 3, with over 30 years experience, said, “A principal to me is about supporting me in doing what I want to do and providing
me with the resources that are necessary to do that … and backing me up in any other eventuality.” This support and backing up was a key plank when participants discussed their interaction with administrators. Thus others, such as participant 8, who had an equal number of years teaching experience, found that she received more support based on the amount of extracurricular involvement she put forth within the school. She said, “It certainly can make or break the year or the time of that person’s reign as principal or vice-principal … I do a lot [and] have generally found the principals to be either cooperative to extremely supportive and encouraging of [what I do].”

Differentiated implementation of a teacher induction and mentoring program within schools was a common concern amongst participants. Some administrators took a hands-on role, overseeing every aspect of the program; others delegated it to heads of departments while still remaining involved in the periphery, and still more chose not to become involved at all. Many participants, such as participant 4, expressed frustration at how the program at her school was implemented. A new person was hired into her department, but she was not assigned as the mentor. “[He was] arbitrarily assigned by our principal, and his mentor that was chosen for him couldn’t help because his mentor had never been at this school before,” she said. Although she wanted to become involved in the induction program, she was not offered a mentor position. She said,

What I have found, especially in the past few years, is that the administration would go out and choose who the mentors in the school are going to be. And they would place them with new teachers, regardless of subject.
Not being included in a formal program had prevented her from helping the new colleague in her department. She believed that inclusion in the induction program as a mentor was a forgone conclusion, considering she had a new teacher in her department.

Beyond a broad-based introduction, participant 1 expressed frustration at the lack of administrative involvement for the teacher induction program at her school. She stated, “I think the administration needs to do something right at the beginning of the school year to get the teachers really comfortable with the school. Give them a tour of the school would be one of the things.” She went on to mention that by delegating the teacher induction program to a head, her administrator had practically no involvement with the program.

For many participants, their administration delegated their responsibility to vice-principals, heads of departments, or other interested third parties within the school. This delegation, in the case of participant 13, created a lack of communication and initial frustration with the teacher induction program:

The program wasn’t set up through the mentoring teachers. It was set up by a third party, and the third party didn’t ensure that the mentoring teachers were aware of their role to me.

While she was able to seek out a mentor through a carpool situation, her administrator’s hands-off approach contributed to her frustration and perceived lack of support for her progression through the teacher induction and mentoring program at her school.

Professional Development

Professional development was the last aspect of this study, as most participants considered the teacher induction and mentoring program to be a means towards
professional development. Participant 5 summed up what many were thinking about mentoring, in stating that

This is an ongoing initiative, from the time you are a new teacher right through your whole career. Professional developing is growing, is becoming better, is reflecting on what you do in your profession, and is what you are doing in your classroom. And gaining new ideas, always striving to make it better from year to year and semester to semester.

Most participants participated in some form of professional development throughout their careers, in a variety of ways. Their reasoning for this was that their curriculum delivery “would go stale,” as participant 4 stated, or in the case of participant 6, that a person could “not be a good teacher if you do not learn what is new.” Many interviewed described frustration towards colleagues who decided not to participate in any form of professional development.

When asked what types of professional growth and development opportunities that respondents had experienced or attended, all had been to at least one music professional development opportunity in their teaching career. All of the teachers with 5 or fewer years of teaching consistently attended school-based, board-based, and provincial-based music conferences. All of the teachers with 6 or more years of experience attended school-based and almost all attended board-based initiatives, but only 1 expressed an interest in experiencing provincial-based music conferences. Still others had branched out to other forms of professional development beyond music or induction initiatives, including other areas of the arts, as well as scholarly research, general interest courses, and performance opportunities.
When asked why the experienced teachers did not participate in as much subject-based professional development or decided not to participate in teacher induction or mentoring programs, the sentiment from many participants was that they were receiving information that they had learned previously or that they learn through reading journals and periodicals. Said participant 3 about professional development in general, “I just found so much of that [professional development] incredibly irrelevant.” Participants were divided on whether they would continue with professional development initiatives in the future. Whereas the more experienced teachers talked of curtailing their involvement as they progressed towards retirement, newer teachers indicated a willingness to participate in all different types of professional development. Participant 14 said,

I think that it’s very important to a teacher. I do a lot of it. I encourage my student teachers and also volunteer teachers to do as much of it, because you network with other teachers, because as a music teacher in a school you’re usually by yourself, you’re alone. And it also helps create personal growth for yourself.

Creating professional development opportunities was important for many of the teachers, although varying focuses, depending on personal and school-based interest, seemed to be the standard. Some participants who were not granted release time to pursue professional development felt resentment towards their administrators. “My principal would not release me from the [professional development] at the school to go to [conference], to do my actual PD. And I was forced to sit in PD for something that was irrelevant to me,” said participant 16. Her experience was echoed by many, who went to
great lengths towards attaining the programming that they wished to from their administrators.

Chapter Summary

In summary, a variety of responses were given based on the structure provided by the empirical questions surrounding induction, mentoring, administrative and institutional supports, and professional developments. While most answers from participants were expected or became similar, some responses were surprising and unexpected. These provide the basis for the summary of the study, as well as the discussion and implications in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

This descriptive analytical qualitative study was undertaken to explore the specific mentoring and induction practices while addressing specific concerns of secondary school music teachers as they transition into the teaching profession. This chapter provides a summary of the study; a discussion of the issues; and the implications for theory, practice, and research based on the issues found. Some final reflections on the processes related to writing this work will conclude this chapter, as well as some thoughts on how the research contributes to the knowledge base.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the mentoring, induction, and retention needs of secondary school music teachers at varying levels of experience from teachers who are beginning their careers, who are in midcareer, and who are experienced teachers. A qualitative research approach was selected to guide this study. This approach was chosen due to its inherent flexibility to maneuver around the study question. A large urban school board located in southern Ontario was chosen for the study. A purposive sampling method (Babbie, 1998) was used to select participants across three career stages. The first group consisted of beginning teachers with fewer than 5 years of teaching. The second group comprised midcareer teachers with 6 to 15 years of experience. The final group contained experienced teachers with 16 or more years of teaching. Sixteen participants were interviewed using a semistandardized interview guide (Berg, 2001) and personalized interview process (Neuman, 2000) based on questions from survey studies performed by the Ontario College of Teachers (2003) and augmented
by questions and studies gathered from music education scholars such as Conway (2003a, 2003b) and Krueger (1999, 2001).

Interview transcripts and key documents were coded by category based on Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) principle of grounded theory. Based on the empirical questions guiding the study, each category was further defined by accepting broad themes and searching for common threads amongst each distinct label. These were further cross-compared with what each participant said under each category to form themes and subthemes. By utilizing the four empirical questions as themes, three categories of findings were established, with the literature research of attrition, migration, and retention patterns running throughout all themes.

Results showed that most participants did not receive well-developed induction into the teaching profession. According to the data collected, fewer than 5 participants understood what induction was. None of the experienced teachers had participated in induction initiatives, while only those with fewer than 3 years of teaching experience had elected to participate in initiatives when they were offered. Those who attended found a lack of arts-based programming amongst the general courses and would have preferred an arts-based orientation. Induction programs varied greatly across schools. Experienced participants with more than six years of teaching detailed many common teaching problems experienced in their first years of teaching and stated they received practically no help upon entering the teaching profession. Most participants found their teacher education program to be less than adequate preparation for their job in the classroom.

Like induction programs, mentoring programs varied greatly from school to school. From the management and length of the programs to the number of meetings and
the program content, all had their own intricacies. Most participants were not involved in a formal mentoring program, and those who were expressed frustration at having to seek out their own mentors or the opportunity to become mentors. A variety of methods were utilized to pair mentors and protégés. Some participants wished to participate in certain portions of their mentoring program, while others did not find time to participate due to their classroom teaching demands. A disparity was prevalent amongst those who had a arts-based mentor and those who were with a mentor from another field. Still others advocated for multiple mentors. Participants addressed the issue of informal mentoring and their frustration at not being included in the mentoring processes.

Administrative and institutional supports, along with professional development, were discussed at length. A wide variety of support, from full to none, was indicated by many participants. Most felt they did not have a good relationship with their administrators, especially concerning mentoring and induction issues. Almost all participants saw their administrators as supportive of many other issues, but they were generally unapproachable by and left negative impressions with newer teachers.

Whereas most teachers attended some professional development opportunities at the beginning of their careers, interest waned as years progressed. This was attributed to constant repeating of topics as well as the removal of lieu time to attend conferences. Many participants expressed their aversion to attending nonrelevant professional development. Finally, many participants expressed their desire to be lifelong learners.

Discussion
Three main elements emerged from the data analysis: the first element is enabling supports, which details the assistance provided by the institution and administration at both the local and board level; the second element is creating professional attachments by discussing why both mentors and protégés became involved in the process and the emotional involvement with their commitment; the third element is the process and practices of mentoring which helps participants understand what professional competencies and benefits may be realized by the mentoring and induction process. The following discussion provides details on each element. I begin with enabling supports, move to creating professional attachments, and then to the process and practices of mentoring. I conclude with a graphic representation of the transition into the teaching profession through mentoring and induction.

One of the most compelling outcomes of this study was the light it shed on the relationship between new teachers and school administrators. Participants overwhelmingly stated that they did not feel a connection with their administration. They did not feel that they could go to them for help and found that a lack of interaction with administration helped to contribute to consistent communication breakdowns, regardless of topic. Extensive studies by Krueger (1996, 1999, 2000, 2001) and Youn (2000) confirm that this condition exists specifically amongst newer music teaching staff. The participants in my study wished to have more interaction with their administrative team, which they felt would curb a number of classroom difficulties that were expressed and stated in the studies by Krueger and Youn. Solutions suggested by my participants, which included attendance at concerts and functions, a visit to the classroom, and a better
understanding of what took place within a music classroom, would provide administrators with key information on music-related issues within the school.

A perceived lack of support by administration and general pessimism towards newer teachers by administration has been found in other studies as well. Andrews and Martin (2003), for example, focused on the necessity of institutional supports for newer teachers, and Sargent (2003) and Deal and Chatman (1989) cited insufficient support for newer teachers from administration towards mentoring and induction initiatives. Participants in my study cited numerous forms of the lack of support, the most common items including issues surrounding extracurricular activities, timetabling problems, and multilevel classes.

A general observation from study participants was that the more extracurricular activities a teacher supervised, the more support they received from administrators. Conway (2001b, 2003b) states that music teachers take on a plethora of extracurricular activities without question and regardless of years of experience, while most other teachers in a school do not supervise nearly as much. However, Renard (2003) advocates that newer teachers should not become involved in extracurricular activities for their first 3 years of teaching.

Another nonteaching issue that emerged in this study was the need for administrators to support a cohesive music timetable that is congruent not only for students who take music but also across the entire school. Classroom conflicts and unflattering schedules were consistently cited as predicaments for newer teachers by participants and backed by a study performed by Andrews and Martin (2003). The participants in my study observed that the outcome of poor timetabling by administration
resulted in poor performance with extracurricular activities and not enough preparation time to deliver curriculum in the classroom.

Interestingly, 2 participants expressed a different level of support when they encountered administrators who had been former music teachers. Not only did these administrators give them more support with everyday problems they experienced in the classroom, but they also saw a lot more latitude on certain initiatives, and both felt that these administrators had a better understanding of how their classroom and program were to be run. Conversely, they felt that their administrators had higher expectations for their teaching and output as a result of the administrators’ prior knowledge.

One additional issue that was frequently noted by participants in my study was the problem of multilevel classes. Having multiple sections of music in the same class gave many participants cause for problems when they were new teachers. Conway (2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003a, 2003b) and DeLorenzo (1992) have found in their research that multiple teaching assignments with multiple preparation periods are commonplace amongst newer music teachers. Although this phenomenon is an ordinary occurrence in most schools and classrooms, this issue was found to have been off limits for discussion between protégés and mentors. Newer teachers in my study also found that their administration were unwilling to help them with this issue. One teacher considered going to the teacher union to grieve such a situation but felt that this would cause problems in the school and department and eventually chose not to proceed with the grievance.

A second overarching result of this study centred on the types of induction and mentoring initiatives achieved by the participants in the study. Many experienced participants were not aware of any mentoring or induction opportunities within their
school or board, and those who were familiar with them had experienced a wide variety of programs at their schools, as it was up to each school to determine how to induct new teachers into the teaching profession. This claim is backed up in studies by Darling-Hammond (2003) and Deal and Chatman (1989), who both found a lack of mentoring and induction opportunities within schools.

According to the participants in my study, few school principals were involved with the organization of school-based induction and mentoring programs, with most principals taking a hands-off approach by delegating the management of the program to vice-principals or department heads within the school. This coincides with Deal and Chatman’s (1989) study that found inadequate orientation by administration for new teachers to the school. Andrews and Martin (2003) advocate for administration to be more involved with the induction of new teachers from the beginning of their careers. My study participants felt that delegating induction responsibilities led to inferior programming options and missed opportunities when they compared their induction program to those of colleagues at other schools.

The wide variation of programs at the school level led the participants to call for the school board to provide a common structure to schools for induction services. Most study participants felt that if induction were conducted at the board level, it would provide more consistent programming for new teachers. Wong (2002) backs this up in his recommendations for a board-level induction program that is at least a week long and then extends with follow-up over the ensuing first few years of teaching. In my study, almost all newer teachers with 5 or fewer years of teaching attended a board-level induction program, but they indicated that only parts of it were beneficial, with the
networking opportunities being the best part of the program. One negative comment consistently expressed by induction participants was the lack of arts-based content in the program and the gearing of the subject matter towards elementary teachers. Consistent with Conway’s (2001b) advice that boards need to create arts-based induction programs, all of my participants would have preferred a more focused program geared specifically towards music.

The selection process to become a mentor was an issue that was raised by many experienced study participants. While some were asked by their administrators to join the mentoring process, others had to sign up to indicate their intention. Still others who wished to become mentors but who did not have formal means to specify interest were not selected by their administrators, and no explanation was provided. Such inconsistent selection processes and lack of criteria caused some mentors to resist the program at their school.

The task of matching mentors with protégés varied greatly. Some school-based programs automatically included new teachers in their induction and mentoring programs, while in other situations protégés had to sign up on their own. Whereas some were randomly assigned mentors who may or may not be in their subject area, a number of protégés had to seek out their own mentors. Research by Southall (2003) and Kindall-Smith (2004) states that finding a mentor is a good idea and protégés who are mentored show a better grasp of the curriculum, but Sargent (2003) argues that new teachers should be assigned a mentor, amongst other initiatives, before the first day of school. Because they did not know the staff or who was interested in working with them as a mentor, some protégés in my study chose not to participate in the mentoring and induction
process in their school, delayed their entry into the program, or quit the course as soon as possible. Still other participants in my study chose to join in certain aspects of their mentoring program but to avoid others, citing the need for more time to concentrate on teaching tasks.

Some participants who were assigned a mentor cited professional mismatches, such as personal incompatibility or lack of personal connection, especially when the mentor was not in the same subject area as the protégé. Renard (2003) suggests that protégés be assigned a arts-based mentor upon entering the teaching profession, yet Conway (2001a, 2001b, 2003a, 2003b) and Krueger (2000) state that this is not achievable in most schools due to the lack of teachers within the arts-based area of music. However, some participants relayed stories of great success with an assigned non-arts-based mentor. One participant even went beyond and sought out multiple mentors in a variety of subject areas, which he said provided him with differing points of view on the same topic.

Mentors felt that their protégés did not utilize their services to their fullest extent. Similarly, protégés expressed that they did not use their mentors enough. Participants cited a variety of reasons as to why this happened, including personal feelings about their counterpart’s ability to teach and ageism. All participants, however, came to realize that both mentors and protégés had to work as a team. This point is expressed in research performed by Lipton et al. (2003), who strenuously advocate this point in their research on mentoring practices. The bottom line that my study participants expressed was frustration when one party did not uphold what the other participant felt was a fundamental responsibility in the mentor/protégé relationship.
Cases of underutilizing the assigned mentor led to various instances of informal mentoring, where, as suggested by Lipton et al. (2003), protégés sought advice from people not related to the formal mentoring and induction program. Most informal mentors were there by convenience: experienced personnel within the subject-specific department, a commuting partner, or a lunchtime acquaintance, and most happened by chance. The mentor’s job was primarily to answer questions, yet they took it upon themselves to be available to protégés and found that the informal mentoring took place constantly. Informal mentors felt it was their responsibility to help protégés, even if they were not attached to a formal program or compensated through lieu time or monetary means.

Participants frequently mentioned that formal time was not set aside by their administrators to specifically participate in mentoring or induction initiatives within their school beyond a common lunch or preparation period shared by the mentors and protégés. Participants who were protégés mentioned that this did not allow for proper follow-through of ongoing mentoring and induction initiatives, while some participants who were mentors stated that they did not wish to take on any extra responsibility without lieu time. Andrews and Martin (2003) and Darling-Hammond (2003) both state that mentors and protégés should receive release time when conducting induction and mentoring initiatives.

The more experienced participants in my study discussed the lack of professional development (PD) opportunities afforded to them now as compared to when they first started teaching. A number of years ago, PD was an ongoing process, with frequent conferences and opportunities to learn during school time. Some administrators would
not let their newer teachers participate in off-site PD, stating that it was not beneficial for them or the school. Yet the same administrators would give lieu time and afforded those same new teachers to participate in school-based PD. The general consensus amongst participants was that these opportunities that existed in the past no longer existed, but in order to create a vibrant and healthy workplace, they needed to be reinstated.

All participants felt that ongoing professional development is important, which is what Hill (2003) emphasizes in his study. As the total number of teaching years progressed, the amount of PD attended, including mentoring and induction initiatives, waned. Most cited irrelevant materials being taught or a repeat of concepts already learned in earlier years. Protégés and newer teachers expressed frustration towards people who do not participate in PD. Studies by Conway (2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003a, 2003b) show that there is a significant link between those people who attend PD sessions and those who become mentors.

To illustrate the effect that mentoring and induction practices have on both new teachers and those who have experience, I have used the results from my study to develop the *transition into the teaching profession* model. Figure 1 highlights how three essential key planks work together to ensure successful mentoring and induction. The first plank includes the enabling supports, which provide mentoring and induction programs with a significant institutional and administration foundation at both the local level and the board level. The second plank, creating professional attachments, brings both mentors and protégés into an introspective reflection on why they become involved in the mentoring and induction process. By recognizing the emotional aspect of the action and the social ties that it can create through interactions with protégés, other mentors, and
Figure 1. Model for transition into the teaching profession.
administration, this personalized component can ensure their commitment to the program and to the teaching profession. The third plank, the process and practices of mentoring, encourages participants to ask what professional competencies and benefits they can attain from the program while realizing the cognitive, affective, and purposeful pieces to the mentoring and induction puzzle.

Implications

The implications found in this study arise from the suggestions given by the study participants towards what may be done differently or ways to improve the transition into the teaching profession through mentoring and induction. The implications are organized in three categories. First, implications for the practices of induction and mentoring of new teachers will be discussed. Second, implications of the findings as related to the theoretical literature base will be communicated. Third are the implications for new questions and research that may be performed based on the results of this study as well as further methodologies and perspectives that may be of interest to scholars in this area.

Implications for Practice

One of the most important practical applications drawn from this study is a call for more arts-based programming for protégés within induction initiatives. While general information about school procedures and protocols are important topics that must not be glossed over, arts-based induction curriculum is an essential component that must be instituted for new music teachers and can be extended into other disciplines. While the focus of this study has been on secondary music teachers, all teachers need subject-specific induction, as there are subject-specific contextual idiosyncrasies that generic broad-based induction does not accommodate. Further, a focus on secondary teachers’
issues and programming is a second key to having more relevant induction programs, which should encourage more teachers to participate in induction programs.

The relationship between administration and protégés as it relates to induction and mentoring practices must change. It is clear that administrators need to take a more hands-on approach to the induction of new teachers within their schools. This includes implementing the New Teacher Induction Program, helping protégés find mentors, encouraging experienced teachers to become mentors, providing programming within the school that includes practical training and common times to interact and follow up on activities, and creating a continuum of induction activities that extend throughout the school year and the first year of teaching. Further, school boards must ensure that all new teachers from full-time contract to supply and long-term occasional teachers are included in induction and mentoring programs.

Making professional development more meaningful is an important step in creating an inclusive environment for both protégés and mentors by administrators and schools. Allowing new teachers to attend professional development workshops and conferences and encouraging experienced teachers to make time to participate may go a long way to providing cohesiveness and the opportunity to enhance the learning environment of those that take part as well as the school.

Implications for Theory

From the onset, a great deal of the literature base was from the United States, centering on data collected from California and Michigan. Data from Canada were sorely lacking, and one of the purposes behind this study was to enhance the Canadian knowledge base.
For the most part, the findings in this study support the majority of the literature and studies previously performed. The interviews in my study highlighted the trials and tribulations of protégé teachers and their experiences with mentoring and induction processes. While the data collected served to confirm the research already performed, they did provide for a few points not previously discussed, and some points in the literature do not apply to the Canadian public school system.

One point of contention that was debated in the literature was how mentors were selected and paired with protégés. Various scholars indicated that new and experienced teachers should be matched based on a wide swath of criteria. However, music scholars were quite clear: Protégés should be linked with arts-based mentors. The music-based literature goes on to indicate that the majority of music teachers are the sole provider of music within their school, thereby making a arts-based pairing impossible.

The literature does cover protégés having multiple mentors, yet the majority of it may be categorized as having an informal relationship with other teachers that are not the assigned mentor. The research performed for this study encountered a large number of protégés who were taking part in informal mentoring practices, but the literature base is quite scarce within this subject. One of my research participants advocated being formally assigned multiple mentors within a variety of subject areas. Again this was not specifically addressed within the literature.

All participants with fewer than 5 years of teaching experience stated that they asked for help from mentors and colleagues, yet this completely contradicts the findings in the literature that 92% of newer teachers do not ask for help when they need it. More in-depth research is needed to assess what level of interaction is necessary between
protégés and mentors to ensure that newer teachers do not reach the stage where they need to ask for help.

**Implications for Further Research**

While this study reflected the input from 16 music teachers at varying stages of teaching in a large urban board in southern Ontario, it would be beneficial to obtain more information from the broader education community and key stakeholder groups. The perspectives of school administrators have been determined to be an imperative part of this study, yet their voice was absent from the final results. Board-level officials who are charged with implementing the new teacher induction programming were consulted in passing, but they were outside the parameters set out in this study. Provincial-level bureaucrats and faculty of education professors who created and are administrating the New Teacher Induction Program are also an important part of the discussion, as they have now implemented a new set of criteria to judge new teachers with a program that is in its infancy. Finally, the broader school community includes important stakeholders, with students, parents, and the public being important, yet silent voices that were not included in this study and are seldom, if ever, consulted with respect to matters of transition into teaching for newer teachers.

The subject of merit pay as a means to encourage newer teachers to participate in extracurricular activities was addressed in the literature. While merit pay exists in most jurisdictions within the United States, the public school system in Canada does not have such a system in place. It would merit more research to see what other means may be set in motion in order to encourage more teachers to become involved in extracurricular activities.
A quantitative approach to gathering data might yield generalizable results. While it would allow for a greater sample size to include a broader range of groups and stakeholders, it would not provide the flexibility that the qualitative interviews allow. Perhaps a combination of both quantitative surveys combined with random qualitative interviews from stakeholder groups would yield the comparative database that will enhance the results of this study.

The New Teacher Induction Program is still in its infancy, and its impact on new teachers will require further study. It is important to discover if a broad province-wide standardized program will be effective in bringing mentoring and induction practices to the local level, as well as comparing these results to other standardized programs in provinces and states across North America.

Reflections

My greatest amount of learning throughout this thesis process was that of multitasking. I am by nature a person who likes to keep busy, regularly taking on more than I can actually accomplish in a reasonable amount of time. This thesis was no different, having gone through two separate proposals and an inordinate amount of time to write this document. Coming from a music education background, I had not written many major essays, and I found the experience of writing a thesis to be both gratifying and terrifying. I took up the challenge of completing a Master of Education degree in part to satisfy my quest for knowledge and what I felt I was missing from my undergraduate degree. I quickly became adept in writing 20-page essays for graduate courses, yet when it came to writing this thesis, it became a monumental task for which I was not prepared.
This, along with life, has contributed to the inordinate amount of time it has taken to complete the thesis.

While the topic of mentoring and induction practices to support the transition into teaching is an important one, it was not my first choice of topic. It has grown on me because it enabled me to flesh out what I wished to find on attrition and retention rates through a plausible and manageable subject. I came to understand that I had many preconceived notions and a personal bias against the subject matter, having gone through an admittedly poor school-based induction program, no formal mentoring, and only occasional informal interaction with an experienced teacher.

While I was pleased that 16 people offered to become subjects for this study, I soon realized that, with more people involved, it became difficult to delineate between what is important and what is irrelevant in the data. To an extent, based upon my analysis of the literature, I found out what I expected to find based on preconceived notions formed over time and my personal experiences.

The study also presented me with some surprises. As participants truthfully relayed their experiences, I encountered some information and answers that I did not expect, such as only completing professional development if food was provided and advocating for multiple mentors from a variety of subject areas, not just music. I also did not receive some expected answers, specifically concerning the transition into teaching from the teachers who came to the secondary panel after first teaching in the elementary panel. These individuals faced many of the same issues brand new teachers to the profession faced. Other answers came from the unlikeliest sources, such as the insights provided by one of the newer protégés whom I assumed had a wonderful transition into
teaching, yet she expressed the frustration and anguish that she faced throughout her first year in teaching. These helpful insights into the subject matter moved me past my biases, which reassures me that my personal biases were kept in check. In these ways, the experiences of my participants offered key insights into the topic and made a positive contribution to the knowledge base on transition to the teaching profession.

As I move forward in my career in education, I hope to use the knowledge gained through the completion of a Master of Education degree to form the basis for a future in administration. The subject of mentoring and induction will help fuel my enthusiasm toward educating the citizens of tomorrow by providing a solid transition into the teaching profession for new teachers.

**Final Statement**

As a follow-up to this study, it is interesting to note the whereabouts of some of the participants. Of those with fewer than 5 years of teaching experience, 1 has switched schools, 1 has switched school boards, and 1 is no longer teaching music. Of the participants with 6 to 15 years of teaching, one has switched school boards, and 3 experienced participants with over 16 years of teaching experience have since retired, 1 early.

The transition into the teaching profession for newer teachers is an important first step. Institutional and administrative supports enable new and experienced teachers to obtain a proper introduction to the teaching profession. The motivating factors of commitment, emotional connection, and social bonds provide the professional attachments behind why experienced teachers mentor protégés. The processes and practices of mentoring offer the cognitive, affective, and purposeful pieces to the
induction and mentoring puzzle. Only through appropriate induction and mentoring practices may we truly have a functioning school with long-term sustainability in the teaching force.

There remains a great deal to accomplish in order to provide adequate supports for new teachers to make the transition into the teaching profession. It is my hope that this thesis has contributed to the literature base and will provide a foundation for future scholars in realizing the benefits of appropriate induction and mentoring initiatives so that the next generation of teachers and students may benefit.
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Appendix A

Research Questions

Background Questions

1. What type of teaching position or assignment did you hold when you were first hired?
2. Are you teaching full-time music?
3. What type of teaching position or assignment do you hold now?
4. Briefly describe your background (education, additional qualifications, etc.)
5. How many years have you been teaching music?
6. Have you changed assignment, schools, or school boards over the course of your career? If so, how many times?
7. How many schools are you teaching in?
8. What were your biggest challenges as a beginning music teacher?
9. What teaching strategies and methods have most contributed to effective teaching in your classroom?
10. What are your needs as a music teacher?
11. How would you rate your experience during your first years of teaching? Explain why.
12. Professionally, what do you see yourself doing in the next 5 to 10 years?
13. What components of your teacher preparation were most important in preparing you for your first years of teaching?
Empirical Questions

1. What does mentoring mean to you?
   - What experience do you have with mentoring programs?
   - How do you feel about mentoring?
   - Types of support systems in place
   - What perceptions were had before, during, and after mentoring programs?
   - What would be done differently in any future mentoring programs?

2. What does induction mean to you?
   - What experience do you have with induction programs?
   - How do you feel about induction?
   - What type of assistance, if any, was offered?
   - Any suggestions for improvements to induction programs?

3. What characteristics have been experienced concerning administration/institutional supports?
   - Describe interactions with principals/vice-principals or board officials
   - Timetabling/class assignment issues
   - Types of extra curricular activities. Are they voluntary?
   - Describe interaction with colleagues in and out of the school environment

4. What does professional development or growth mean to you?
   - Describe types of professional growth and development opportunities that have been presented or experienced
   - What has been most helpful?
   - What has been least helpful?
   - Will professional development initiatives be on-going? Why or why not?
   - What has been most effective for you during your initial years of teaching?

5. Is there any other information that you feel I need to know?
## Appendix C

### Summary Chart of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Number of Years Teaching Secondary Music?</th>
<th>Full-Time Music Teacher?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>1 years (first six in elementary panel)</td>
<td>No. Music (4 sections) and English (2 sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>29 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>32 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>No. Music (4 sections) and English (2 sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>No. Music (5 sections) and Math (1 section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>No. Music (5 sections) and Math (1 section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>No. Music (5 sections) and Geography (1 section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 10</td>
<td>25 years (first 5 in elementary panel)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 11</td>
<td>13 years (first 4 in elementary panel)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 12</td>
<td>27 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 13</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>No. Music (3 sections) and English (3 sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 14</td>
<td>3 years (first 5 in elementary panel)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 15</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>No. Music (5 sections) and Moderns (1 section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 16</td>
<td>15 years (first 12 in elementary panel)</td>
<td>Yes. Long term occasional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 5 participants with 5 or fewer years of teaching experience  
5 participants with between 6 and 15 years of teaching experience  
6 participants with 16 or more years of teaching experience