

PERCEPTIONS OF EARLY CAREER CHORAL MUSIC EDUCATORS
AND MENTORS TOWARD EFFECTIVE
MENTORING PRACTICES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC AND THEATRE
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

MARCUS J. JAUREGUI, B.M.

DENTON, TEXAS

DECEMBER 2017

© 2017

ABSTRACT

MARCUS J. JAUREGUI

PERCEPTIONS OF EARLY CAREER CHORAL MUSIC EDUCATORS AND MENTORS TOWARD EFFECTIVE MENTORING PRACTICES

DECEMBER 2017

The purpose of this study was to assess the mentoring practices, both formal (initiated by a third party) and informal (initiated by either side of the mentorship) of secondary choral educators within the state of Texas by quantifying the frequency of both music-related and non-music-related assistance and the perceived importance of these skills to mentees and their mentors. In the area of perceived importance, mentees and mentors—whether formal or informal—perceived the same number of non-music related skills (60%) as important. Moreover, mentees in informal mentorships received assistance in areas they believed were important to their teaching 60% of the time while mentees in formal mentorships found their perceived importance aligned with assistance given only 20% of the time. When it came to the perceived importance of music-related assistance, mentees in informal mentorships aligned with their mentors approximately 63% of the time while mentees in formal mentorships saw a 44% alignment. Furthermore, mentees in informal mentorships received assistance in music-related areas that were important to their teaching 44% of the time while formal mentors experienced a 15% alignment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	2
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Rationale	6
Scope and Limitations of the Study	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
Teacher Attrition and Retention in General Education.....	8
Teacher Attrition in Music Education.....	12
Administrative Support.....	14
Value of Mentors	17
Types of Mentors	21
III. METHODOLOGY	25
Participants	26
Instrument	27
Survey Piloting and Data Monitoring.....	27
Survey Section 1	28
Mentee Survey Section 2a	28
Mentee Survey Section 3a	29

Mentee Survey Section 4a	29
Mentee Survey Section 5	30
Mentee Survey Section 6	30
Mentee Survey Section 7	30
Mentor Survey Section 2b	31
Mentor Survey Section 3b	32
Mentor Survey Section 4b	32
Procedure	33
Analysis of Data.....	33
 IV. RESULTS	 35
Research Question No. 1.....	36
Formal Mentorship Described by the Mentee	38
Informal Mentorship Described by the Mentee	39
Mentorship Described by the Mentor	40
Research Question No. 2.....	42
Non-Music Related Assistance from Mentor's Perspective	42
Non-Music Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors from Mentee's Perspective	43
Non-Music Assistance Provided by Informal Mentors from Mentee's Perspective	45
Research Question No. 3.....	47
Music Related Assistance from Mentor's Perspective	47
Music Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors from Mentee's Perspective	49
Music Assistance Provided by Informal Mentors from Mentee's Perspective	51
 V. DISCUSSION	 54
Research Question No. 1.....	55
Research Question No. 2.....	56
Research Question No. 3.....	67
Recommendations for Further Study	84
 REFERENCES.....	 86

APPENDICES

A. IRB Letter of Approval	96
B. Letter of Recruitment.....	98
C. Mentorship of Early Career Choral Directors Survey	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. State Geographic Regions of Participants' ($n = 58$) Teaching Assignments.....	37
2. School Type of Participants' ($n = 58$) Teaching Assignments	37
3. Method of Assignment of Formal Mentors as Reported by Mentees ($n = 18$)....	38
4. Years During Which Mentees ($n = 18$) Report Receiving Formal Mentorship...	39
5. Formal Mentor's Content Area as Reported by Mentees ($n = 18$)	39
6. Location of Informal Mentor as Reported by Mentees ($n = 21$).....	40
7. Location of Formal Mentor as Reported by Mentors ($n = 15$)	41
8. Third Party Assigners of Formal Mentors as Reported by Mentors ($n = 15$)	41
9. A Comparison of Mentors' ($n = 20$) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided to Novice Teachers (Non-Music Related) .	43
10. A Comparison of Mentees' ($n = 18$) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors (Non-Music Related) .	44
11. A Comparison of Mentees' ($n = 21$) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided by Informal Mentors (Non-Music Related).	46
12. A Comparison of Mentors' ($n = 20$) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided to Novice Teachers (Music Related)	48
13. A Comparison of Mentees' ($n = 18$) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors (Music Related)	50
14. A Comparison of Mentees' ($n = 21$) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided by Informal Mentors (Music Related)	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Bill Bradley, my very first music teacher at John F. Townley Elementary School, sparked an interest and love of music that remains ignited in my heart to this day. Throughout my undergraduate studies, it was my hope to one day fill Mr. Bradley's shoes as an elementary music teacher; however, after one year in the elementary classroom, I discovered that my favorite part of the job was teaching afterschool choir. At the end of that school year, the district fine arts director approached me with an offer to take over a struggling middle school choir program, and I accepted the position. The district assigned a retired fine arts administrator (formerly a band and choir director) to serve as my formal mentor; however, he had spent many years out of the classroom by the time I started teaching and could not always fill in the gaps in my learning. Luckily, Jenny, a fellow choral director at a nearby middle school, took me under her wing. Several days a week, I would drive to her classroom after school or speak with her at length on the phone. Jenny informally mentored me every step of the way and helped me with everything from classroom management, to instructional pacing, to understanding the daunting task of preparing a choir for UIL Concert and Sight Reading assessment. Without Jenny's patient guidance as my informal mentor, I might never have found my way. This positive mentoring experience led me to later serve as an informal mentor to several young choral directors, and to eventually develop a formal mentoring program for the 20 first-year-

teachers on my campus during the 2013-14 school year. My involvement with mentorship provided me with first-hand knowledge of how empowering effective mentoring can be as early career teachers reconcile their pre-service training with the realities of day-to-day teaching.

Background of the Study

Many teachers new to the profession find themselves feeling isolated, confused, and in desperate need of a mentor—a lifeline to help them survive the storms of the first teaching experience. The importance and necessity of mentoring has been extensively studied and acknowledged by leaders in the field of education (Conway, 2003, 2006; Haack, 2006; Haack & Smith, 2000). Various approaches to formal and informal mentoring have been implemented in both large and small school districts throughout the nation within the last decade (Desimone et al., 2014; Klug & Salzman, 1991; Tillman, 2000). Teacher attrition, especially among early career educators, is often linked to a perceived lack of support, which in many cases manifests itself as a lack of sufficient mentoring of novice educators (Conway, 2003). Many early career educators report a sense of isolation and a lack of sufficient preparedness that, without the guidance of a mentor, often leads to leaving the profession within the first three to five years (Wilkinson, 1994).

Callahan's (2016) review of research literature, spanning a four-decade period, confirmed the impact of targeted mentoring of early career educators as a means of raising teacher success and job satisfaction and lowering attrition rates. When leaders in education provide consistent and focused mentoring in order to both support and build

capacity in early career educators, the students benefit, as well. While much of the current research illustrates a macro-perspective of the role mentoring plays within the field of education, few studies have focused on the mentoring of early career educators within specific content areas such as visual and performing arts.

DeLorenzo (1992) served as a pioneer in music mentor research, as she sought to identify the challenges of beginning music teachers and the perceived usefulness of professional assistance offered during the first year of teaching. In the ensuing 25 years, studies have continued to validate DeLorenzo's conclusion that mentoring of early career music educators is paramount to their success (Conway et al., 2002, 2003, 2006; Krueger, 1999). These studies have also concluded that the mentoring needs of novice music educators differ in many ways from those of their peers in general classroom settings. elementary music, secondary band, secondary choir, and secondary orchestra.

Although many studies within the field of music education have acknowledged the need for thorough and intentional mentoring of early career music educators, the specific mentoring practices of secondary choral educators have been largely overlooked. McIlhagga (2006) researched the factors that affect the perceived mentor effectiveness and teacher retention among beginning music educators in the state of Michigan. Although 36 of the 91 participants were choral directors, the survey was not designed in a way that outlined their needs apart from those of their instrumental counterparts. Early career music educators certainly share similar mentoring needs in a general musical sense, but beyond the basics of teaching music literacy, e.g., pitch notation, rhythmic

notation, dynamic markings, etc., many of the specific instructional issues facing an early career music educator in an instrumental setting vary from those in a choral setting.

The study presented here will assess both formal and informal mentoring of secondary choral educators within the state of Texas by quantifying the frequency of both musical and non-musical assistance and its perceived importance to the success of early career choral educators in the state of Texas. Moreover, the study seeks to create a profile of both mentors and mentees and compare the assistance offered between informal and formal mentoring. Because of its size, Texas often plays a significant role in setting national trends within education from textbook adoptions to accountability standards. A study of the mentoring practices of choral educators within the state of Texas could serve as a guide to campus and district administrators throughout the country in the design of future mentoring programs and/or establish a guideline for best practices in the mentoring of early career choral educators on a broader scale.

Statement of the Problem

The first few years of teaching are often some of the most challenging as educators seek to reconcile lessons learned in formal education preparation programs with best practices discovered on the job. Mentoring is crucial to the success of early career educators, but providing a qualified mentor becomes problematic when no other member of the faculty teaches in the same content area as the early career educator. Such is the case for many novice music teachers. When formal mentoring is provided at the campus level, early career music educators are often paired with colleagues who teach in other disciplines. These assigned mentorship pairings, while helpful in a general sense,

fail to provide the specific content specific support novice music teachers need in terms of curricular planning, instructional support, and access to resources. Informal mentoring, on the other hand, gives inexperienced music teachers the flexibility to select a veteran educator within the same content area (perhaps at a different campus or neighboring district) who can provide them the tools they need to survive and thrive during their difficult early years. In order to outline best practices and guide the future design of effective mentoring programs for early career music educators, data is required that provides a profile of both sides of the mentorship, as well as the type of musical and non-musical assistance provided, and its perceived importance to the success of choral directors during their early career.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess both formal and informal mentoring practices among Texas secondary choral directors to discern whether mentors and mentees place the same value on assistance with various musical and non-musical tasks. Mentors were categorized as formal (assigned by an outside entity) and informal (selected by the mentee). The following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the profile of formal and informal mentors working with early career secondary choral directors in the state of Texas?
2. What are the differences in perceived importance and assistance provided in non-music related skills during formal and informal mentoring?
3. What are the differences in perceived importance and assistance provided in music related skills during formal and informal mentoring?

Rationale

Education is singular among professions that place comparatively high levels of demand upon its novice practitioners. Other professions use clerkships, internships, residencies, apprenticeships, and similar induction processes while the beginning teacher is, essentially, expected to maintain the same job responsibilities as the 20-year veteran after minimal student-teaching experience (Johanson, 2008). The existing education research indicates that mentoring programs are paramount to the success of early career educators. Music educators, in particular, are not only responsible for the daily functions required of all teachers, but they must also prepare public demonstrations of student learning in relatively short order.

Though music education programs prepare pre-service educators with many necessary skills—both music related and non-music related—successful mentoring helps guide early career music educators in the reconciliation of theory and practical application. In 2003, when Conway conducted a study of beginning music teacher mentoring practices in 13 school districts in Michigan, only five other research studies had addressed novice music teachers and their mentors (DeLorenzo, 1992; Krueger, 1999, 2001; Montague, 2000; Smith, 1994). This study seeks to broaden the body of research and provide more recent data regarding mentors' and mentees' perceptions of what type of guidance is most critical to choral music educators during their first years of teaching. The beneficiaries of this study include, but are not limited to: early career choral educators, campus administrators, district arts administrators, district human resources staff, veteran educators serving as mentors, and the students of early career

choral educators who will not have to sacrifice their own learning needs to those of their novice teacher.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was open to secondary choral directors currently teaching in Texas who had experience as a mentor and/or mentee. The Texas Music Education Association currently has over 3,000 active choral educators among its membership. Limitations of this study are associated with the questions included in the survey. It would have been relevant to this study to provide participants the opportunity to voice their intent to remain in the profession or seek other employment as a means of connecting mentoring with retention.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In order to encapsulate the particular set of issues facing early career choral music educators within the state of Texas, it is helpful to first examine the challenges novice teachers confront within the broader field of general education. This chapter outlines teacher attrition and retention in a universal sense before shifting focus to attrition among music educators in particular. The chapter also compares the nature of administrative support that novice teachers say they need with that they actually receive, outlines the value of mentorship from both the mentor's perspective and the mentee's perspective, and discusses the effectiveness of both formal and informal mentoring practices.

Teacher Attrition and Retention in General Education

Academic research focused on the shortage of teachers in America's public schools, along with its many diagnoses and prescriptions, has heightened since the early 1990s. Nationally, schools lose between \$1 billion and \$2.2 billion in attrition costs each year through teachers moving or leaving the profession (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2014). Retention of qualified teachers has been suggested as a solution to the teacher shortage problem (Yost, 2006). At one time, teachers commonly spent 30 or more years in the classroom; however, this is a trend which is seemingly becoming more of the exception than the norm. According to Haberman (2005), the length of the average

teaching career in the United States is 11 years, and the “five-year” mark has become the commonly accepted benchmark for defining early leavers (Mee & Haverback, 2014).

National estimates on teacher attrition vary by study, but by some estimates, as many as 50% of teachers leave the profession within their first few years (Breux & Wong, 2003; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Ingersoll (2002) compared the process of continually training new teachers without retaining the existing teaching force to pouring water into a bucket with a fist-sized hole in the bottom.

In addition to outlining specific rates of teacher attrition, researchers have focused attention on assessing its cause. Four broad categories appear repeatedly in the research literature on teacher retention and attrition: (a) salary and benefits; (b) students; (c) collegial support; and (d) workplace conditions (Harrell, Leavell, van Tassel, & McKee, 2004). Under the umbrella of collegial support and workplace conditions, much of the existing literature points toward inadequate induction of early career educators and isolation from and by fellow teachers and administrators.

Gallant and Riley’s study (2014) of nine beginning teachers revealed that lack of emotional support led to feelings of isolation and eventually resulted in early career exit. Without adequate oversight and guidance from administrators during the induction process, new teachers tend to perceive they have been cast into a “sink or swim” environment, isolated and unsupported, thus prompting them to leave the profession (Colley, 2002). The old adage that “no man is an island” rings especially true in the field of education. Encouragement and support can be instrumental in determining whether a

teacher leaves a school district, or the field of education altogether (Luther & Richman, 2009).

Also, it is important to note that early career exit from teaching is a process, not an event (Gallant & Riley, 2014). Teachers cite lack of administrative support more frequently than any other reasons for leaving the profession, although, administrative support has a variety of interpretations (Robertson, Hancock, & Allen, 2006). Simply stated, the retention and development of quality teachers must be the responsibility of the administration (Luther & Richman, 2009), and the support offered to teachers at any stage of their career needs to be dynamic and on-going (Gallant & Riley, 2014). In order to address the high rate of early educator attrition, more attention must be paid to teacher induction (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2014).

Additionally, studies focusing on retention not only confirm what is known about attrition, but provide additional insight to these multi-faceted issues. Andrew and Schwab (1995) conducted an outcome assessment of graduates of 11 teacher education programs and discovered that the more training early career educators receive during their pre-service education, the more likely they are to stay in the profession. Teacher training programs that provide authentic experiences for teacher candidates, whereby they not only learn what to do (raising competence), but are able to apply it successfully in a variety of contexts (raising confidence), have been found to be most beneficial (Yost, 2006).

Though pre-service training is crucial, novice teachers continue to need guidance and support once they begin their careers. By most accounts, new teachers need three to

four years to achieve competence and several additional years of experience to reach proficiency (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). Minarik, Thornton, and Perreault (2003) proposed a “systems” approach to teacher retention. They argued that the complex issue of teacher retention requires leaders to go beyond traditional linear approaches, mechanistic thinking, and short-term, narrow solutions and make system level changes. Moreover, they maintained that school districts must develop and implement a comprehensive plan for retention of quality teachers.

When tackling the issue of teacher attrition through a systems approach, the formal induction of early career educators is paramount. The need for effective mentoring of new teachers is prevalent throughout the existing literature. Comprehensive induction programs can cut turnover in half and decrease the time it takes beginning teachers to become proficient in their craft (Dillon, 2009). The retention of new teachers depends on effective mentors (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). Well-designed mentoring programs raise retention rates for new teachers by improving their attitudes, feelings of efficacy, and instructional skills (Darling-Hammond, 2003). New teachers who receive no assistance from mentors or other school personnel become discouraged and leave the profession; however, schools that do provide help in the form of well-planned induction programs retain their teachers (Black, 2004). After the inception of a district-level mentoring program in Springfield, Missouri, the district retained 91% of first-year teachers, an increase of 22% from previous years (Moore, 2016). Young teachers who receive targeted and intentional mentoring not only stay in the profession at higher rates, but also

become competent more quickly than those who must learn by trial and error (Darling-Hammond, 2003).

Teacher Attrition in Music Education

While there has been considerable research on attrition and retention of teachers in general, there is a paucity of research on why music teachers leave the profession and at what point in their careers they choose to leave (Madsen & Hancock, 2002). To ensure the future of music education, music teachers must be recruited and retained through a variety of means, including portraying a positive attitude towards the profession, reflecting enthusiasm, providing opportunities for students to teach, being a mentor, staying musically involved in the community, encouraging legislation that increases pay and school funding, and encouraging schools to provide for professional development opportunities (Wilcox, 2000).

In 2000, 33 states indicated music teacher shortages (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2000). Madsen and Hancock (2002) studied 137 music educators in the first decade of their careers, and the data revealed a 34% attrition rate within a six-year span. Though lower than the 50% attrition rate of all teachers, they described this significant loss of music teachers as a consequential exodus from the profession. The following year, Music Educators National Conference (MENC) published a report stating that each year in the United States, approximately 11,000 new music teachers are needed to replace those who leave; however, only about 5,500 new music educators join the profession each year (Hill, 2003). In 2005, The National Association for Schools of Music (NASM) supported the findings of the 2003 MENC research by reporting more

than 5,000 unfilled music teacher openings with new university graduates only meeting 50% of the reported demand (Kimpton, 2005). In a 2009 multi-year study comparing the attrition rates of music teachers and non-music teachers using data from the 1988-89, 1991-92, 1993-94, and 2000-01 National Center for Education Statistic's Teacher Follow-up Survey, turnover of both novice and veteran music teachers was a sizable phenomenon with schools losing 10% of music teachers due to migration and 6% to attrition in a single year. Rates of music teacher attrition, migration, and retention across the four surveys were similar to those of non-music teachers (Hancock, 2009).

As many studies within the body of general education research have indicated (Colley, 2002; Robertson et al., 2006; Luther & Richman, 2009; Robertson et al., 2006), teacher perceptions of administrative support are paramount in determining whether teachers stay or leave the profession; however, the reinforcing nature of music, idiosyncratic teacher prerequisites, and unique demands placed on the in-service music teacher, e.g., performances, obfuscate generalization (Madsen & Hancock, 2002).

Research specifically targeting music educators indicates that the desire for administrative support parallels that of non-music teachers. Krueger's (2000) study of 30 music teachers interviewed during their first 10 years of teaching revealed that insufficient administrative support was viewed as a primary problem, while positive administrative support was considered essential for the well-being and effectiveness of music teachers and their programs.

Beginning teachers measure their expectations against the realities of their classrooms, and if they find that an adequate support system is not available, many new

teachers will look elsewhere (Arnold, Choy, & Bobbitt, 1993). Krueger (2000) reported that teachers voiced feelings of isolation from other music teachers and found themselves solely responsible for building their own support networks. Though data exists and studies have been conducted regarding attrition within music education, the field of music education is unique and requires more discipline-based investigation (Killian & Baker, 2006).

Administrative Support

The single most important variable in staff productivity and loyalty is the quality of the relationship between staff and their direct supervisors (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). The attrition of early career educators is a serious problem for principals.

Teachers, particularly new teachers, are leaving the classroom at an alarming rate and reversing this trend demands their full attention (Watkins, 2005). Administrative support is an area of concern with a majority of early career music educators (Krueger, 2000; Madsen & Hancock, 2002). The strongest influence on job satisfaction is principal support, which influences teacher commitment and, in turn, teacher attrition (Shann, 1998; Singh & Billingsley, 1996). Principals awareness that the first year of teaching is challenging, difficult, and lonely can serve as motivation to provide the support and empathy that novice teachers need to survive and feel successful (Menchaca, 2003). If novice teachers have a supportive, non-judgmental relationship with their principals, they can learn from their mistakes, as well as their triumphs (Wood, 2005).

Additionally, open and honest communication is crucial to supporting and guiding early career educators. If the teacher recognizes the principal's genuine desire for her or

him to succeed, the teacher will be less reticent to share concerns with the principal if a classroom problem later develops (Weasmer & Woods, 2000) and may be able to keep small problems from escalating into major ones (Colley, 2002). Moreover, principals' informal, spontaneous, unexpected words of interest and encouragement highly influence whether novice educators remain at the school and in teaching, when they are overwhelmed with adjustments to their first year (Wood, 2005). Approval or acceptance from the principal, who controls future employment, may provide the novice teacher with greater feelings of competence, respect, belonging, confidence, autonomy, and self-esteem, as well as an understanding of expectation, when compared to those other elements of the induction process (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010). Furthermore, increased communication of expectations between principals and early career educators can help ease these teachers' induction process, in that novice teachers need direct personal contact to feel supported (Edgar, 2012). Novice educators also report that administrators can also create a negative, "us vs. them" environment by continually changing rules and by supporting parents and students rather than teachers (Baker, 2007). This supports the notion that principals control the climate of the school, along with teachers' desire to stay aboard or jump ship.

In addition to remaining accessible, principals play a key role in establishing a healthy school climate and meeting the perceived personal needs of novice teachers (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010). A wise school principal will foresee and safeguard against threats to a beginning teacher's success (Weasmer & Woods, 2000). Whether the early years of teaching are a time of constructive learning or a period of coping,

adjustment, and survival depends largely on the working conditions and teaching culture that new teachers encounter (Feiman-Nesmer, 2003). Building administrators who develop an environment that encourages teacher autonomy to contribute to the greater school community are likely to have higher retention rates. Further, such efforts encourage the novice teacher to bring a fresh perspective (Watkins, 2005), and help to establish a healthy school climate in which the teacher can flourish (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010). Part of a healthy induction process includes a mentoring piece; however, even the best induction programs cannot compensate for an unhealthy school culture, a competitive teacher culture, or an inappropriate teaching assignment (Feiman-Nemser, 2003).

A principal's responsibility is to understand and support mentoring programs, making sure there is sufficient time for the relationship to grow and that there is a plan for following up on the mentorship progress (Colley, 2002). Induction programs should be designed to assist novice teachers in becoming better teachers and develop teaching styles that work best for their students (Menchaca, 2003). When a site administrator organizes and/or supports institutional activities that promote professional relationships among novice teachers and experienced teachers, morale is greatly improved and the beginning teacher's self-concept is strengthened (Wood, 2005).

With regard to the specific mentoring of early career music educators, it is important to remember that new teachers cannot be left to figure things out in a vacuum (Watkins, 2005). As instructional leaders, principals need to give regular, systematic feedback to novice teachers about their pedagogical approaches, content knowledge, and

classroom management strategies (Wood, 2005). Unfortunately, administrators' lack of subject-specific content knowledge can make it difficult for them to empathize with music teachers—and more important, to assess teacher and student success (Edgar, 2012). A primary responsibility for principals is to identify their most qualified mentor teachers and then match them carefully with novice teachers (Menchaca, 2003). Early career music educators need explicit musical guidance, and in the likely event that someone on their campus is unable to provide this assistance, an experienced music educator needs to be found and made available to serve as a mentor (Edgar, 2012).

By addressing the unique needs of their teachers, campus principals promote intrinsic motivation, thereby fostering teacher retention (Minarik et al., 2003). Leaders—usually principals, curriculum specialists, or highly proficient teachers—monitor beginning teachers and make sure they receive ongoing, sustained support, from coaching the novices on ways to engage students to providing a listening ear (Black, 2004). Early career educators need support, and by serving as instructional leaders, providing a positive culture, and promoting mentoring relationships, principals can develop a setting that will provide their students with competent, successful, and cheerful teachers (Menchaca, 2003).

Value of Mentors

Whether new teachers come to the classroom as a second career or directly from a teacher education program, they all share the need for support and belonging (Watkins, 2005). McCann, Johannessen, and Ricca's (2005) study of new teacher attrition revealed that it is better for a school to have no mentoring program at all than to have an

ineffective one. Ingersoll and Strong's (2011) review of induction research confirmed the empirical claim that support and assistance for beginning teachers has a positive impact on three sets of outcomes: teacher commitment and retention, teacher classroom instructional practices, and student achievement. Ninety-five percent of beginning teachers who are nurtured through an induction program experience success during their initial years. These teachers remain in teaching after three years, and 80% of them remain after five years (Wilkinson, 1994).

A mentor can explain procedures, introduce the new teacher to other faculty and staff, and ease acclimatization (Weasmer & Woods, 2000). Rowley (1999) lists six essential qualities to look for in a mentor:

1. Commitment to the role of mentoring
2. Acceptance of the beginning teacher
3. Skill at providing instructional support
4. Effectiveness in different interpersonal contexts
5. Modeling learning
6. Ability to communicate hope and optimism.

Beginning teachers need time to improve their skills under the watchful eye of experts—and time to reflect, learn from mistakes, and work with colleagues as they acquire good judgment and tacit knowledge about teaching and learning (Black, 2004).

An extensive body of research has been conducted on mentoring novice teachers in the field of music education. While mentorship requirements of early career music educators vary from state to state (Conway, Krueger, Robinson, Haack, & Smith, 2002),

the necessity of quality mentorship has been the topic of numerous studies (Conway, 2003, 2006; Haack, 2006; Haack & Smith, 2000; Kahrs & Wells, 2012; Krueger, 1999, 2001; McIlhagga, 2006; Roulston, Legette, & Womack, 2005). An examination of the profiles of successful mentorship pairings indicates the need for mentors who can offer frequent, content-specific instructional support. Novice teachers benefit from asking curricular questions and interacting with experienced music mentors in meaningful ways (Conway, 2003). Because music teachers often teach in isolation (Roulston et al., 2005), it is important to find mentors from other campuses or districts who share not only the same content area, but the same grade levels (Conway et al., 2002). Pairing a beginning middle school choir teacher with an experienced middle school band teacher is less helpful than finding an experienced middle school choir teacher, even if this requires off-campus or out-of-district mentors (Conway, 2003).

An important part of the process of developing new skills entails feedback from knowledgeable teachers (Krueger, 2001). Early career music educators profit from school district administrators who understand the value of content-specific professional development experiences for new music teachers (Conway & Christensen, 2006). Moreover, establishing professional learning communities could provide music educators in the same content area the opportunity to explore their field and to interact with one another (Conway, 2007). Early career music educators should be allowed to observe their mentor and the mentor, in turn, needs to watch the novice teacher in the classroom (Conway et al., 2002). Some mentors may not realize how important their persistent

coaching and feedback activities are for the mentee. Without the right attitudes on the part of their participants, mentoring programs can be counterproductive (Haack, 2006).

Moreover, mentorship pairings matter and the needs of the mentee—both musical and non-musical—should be unequivocally met. However, quite often there is a gap in what novice teachers believe they are achieving and what, in reality, is actually being achieved (Yourn, 2000). Lack of attention to the needs of beginning teachers may lead to their job dissatisfaction and ultimately leaving the profession (Johanson, 2008). Among beginning music teachers, isolation from experienced teachers and other resource people is a frequent problem (Conway et al., 2002). Although most district-sponsored programs attempt to focus on classroom management (non-music function), music educators teach in such diverse types of classrooms, using instructional methods that are so different from traditional classrooms, that music teachers gain little pertinent information by generic classroom management discussions (Conway, 2006). Beginning teachers consistently express a yearning for feedback relative to their teaching practices (Kahrs & Wells, 2012). The professional needs of mentees, whether musical or non-musical, is often contextually driven according to the work setting and individual teacher skills (Roulston et al., 2005). It is the responsibility of the mentor to tailor assistance to the specific needs of his or her mentee.

In addition to content-specific assistance, McCann et al. (2005) identified nine major categories of concern expressed by beginning teachers:

1. Relationships with students
2. Relationships with parents

3. Relationships with colleagues
4. Relationships with supervisors
5. Workload/time management/fatigue
6. Knowledge of subject/curriculum
7. Evaluation and grading
8. Autonomy and control
9. Appearance and identity.

Additionally, even if beginning teachers have had good preparation in a preservice program, there are still areas of music-program administration that can be challenging to negotiate, e.g., budgets, transportation requests, parent meetings, etc. A mentor can be extremely helpful in this area (Conway, 2006).

Types of Mentors

When students complete the teacher training process, it is inappropriate to consider new teachers as finished products, to presume that they mostly need to refine existing skills, or to treat their learning needs as signs of deficiency in their preparation programs (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). Beginning teachers have legitimate learning needs that cannot be grasped in advance or outside the context of teaching, therefore the onus is on principals to develop induction programs that are well-defined and leave nothing to chance (Menchaca, 2003).

Formal mentorship varies throughout the country. Reports regarding induction at the national level identify 38 states that offer some kind of program targeted specifically toward novice teachers. According to a 2000 survey of 50 states, only 19 states mandated

that districts offer mentoring programs to all beginning teachers (Conway et al., 2002). Finding formal mentors who teach the same content and the same grade levels can be a challenge, especially in smaller districts; however, such pairings produce the best possible learning outcomes for both the beginning teacher and his or her students (Haack, 2006). While many administrators work to secure appropriate mentors for music teachers, Conway (2003) revealed one principal initially assigned the custodian as a formal mentor to a beginning music teacher. The custodian had played drums, so the principal deemed him an appropriate mentor for the new band director.

Formal mentorship plays a vital role in the successful induction of early career music educators, and mentorship programs designed and implemented by state music organizations may be the answer to providing appropriate content support (Conway, 2003). Additionally, it is not always realistic to expect a new teacher to take the initiative in finding resource people, thus placing the onus on administrators to bring experienced music teachers into regular contact with new music teachers through team teaching and formal mentor programs (Krueger, 2000).

Induction programs vary, but the best ones include four to five days of information and training before the school year begins; professional development that lasts two or three years or more; study groups in which new teachers form collegial friendships and become part of a learning community; strong administrative leadership and support; coaching and mentoring built into the overall induction program; emphasis on effective teaching and student achievement; and opportunities for teachers to observe top-notch experienced teachers (Black, 2004). Additionally, new teachers benefit from

sitting down with someone who can help them discover the underlying principles that drive the curriculum. With this knowledge, the new teachers become empowered to make decisions, to adjust existing materials and activities to fit their particular teaching situations, and to unleash their creative energies (McCann et al., 2005).

Although novice teachers need, and sometimes prefer, the structure of more formal induction programs (Klug & Salzman, 1991), informal mentorships initiated by the novice teacher can complement such programs in the successful induction of beginning teachers (Desimone et al., 2014; Hochberg et al., 2015; Tillman, 2000). Informal mentors are distinct from formal mentors because they are self-selected (Hochberg et al., 2015). In a study of 57 first-year mathematics teachers, Desimone et al. (2015) determined that, because formal mentors sometimes serve in evaluative capacities (both directly and indirectly), novice teachers often seek support for management and emotional issues from informal mentors who are not officially evaluating them.

Most school districts' new teacher induction programs are quite general in nature, so it is up to the individual music educator to particularize and enhance such offerings by finding an expert music teacher mentor (Haack & Smith, 2000). The very nature of informal mentorship affords early career music educators the opportunity to grow alongside veteran music educators whom they have personally sought for guidance and advice. Beginning music teachers often build their own network of support out of a desire to make good decisions, acknowledging their lack of experience to effectively do so (Krueger, 2001).

To achieve the transition from university to school settings, teachers quite often report seeking help and assistance from others, including informal mentors (Roulston et al., 2005). Most young teachers prefer to have mentors who teach similar classes at an identical level as themselves, and they value informal mentors with expertise, support, availability, and, above all else, empathy (Haack & Smith, 2000). Research indicates that informal experiences are often perceived as more valuable to early career teachers than formal ones (Conway, 2007). Because many entry-year music educators are often the sole teachers in their respective content area on their campuses, an off-campus informal mentor can enable positive reflection through dialogue that is set apart from daily school activity (Tillman, 2000).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study is based on research conducted by McIlhagga (2006) in which he posed the following research questions:

1. Determine the skills and abilities of mentoring that were perceived as important by novice music teachers in the state of Michigan
2. Determine how those skills and abilities affected the novice music teachers' rating of overall mentor effectiveness
3. What effect the amount of time spent in the mentoring relationship had on the novice music teachers' predicted future in music education.

I sought to address a similar line of questions pertaining to the mentoring practices of secondary choral directors in the state of Texas. As outlined in Chapter 1, this study sought to address the following:

1. Determine the profile of formal and informal mentors working with early career secondary choral directors in the state of Texas
2. Determine the differences in perceived importance and assistance provided in non-music related skills during formal and informal mentoring
3. Determine the differences in perceived importance and assistance provided in music related skills during formal and informal mentoring

The list of challenges facing early career choral music educators that was used in the survey was based on the research studies presented in the literature review. The list included: monitoring enrollment (recruitment and retention), managing large classes, isolation as the sole choral director on campus, preparing for public performances (often without sufficient notice), parent communication, establishing a culture of excellence among all stakeholders, creating a budget, fundraising, organizing a choir trip, knowledge of rules and guidelines surrounding state-level contests, and meeting the many demands of running a successful choral program. While this list of responsibilities is not comprehensive, it provides a clear picture of how daunting the initial years of directing a choir program can be and the need for a mentor.

Participants

The population for this study included active secondary choral directors in the state of Texas. Teachers who indicated 1-5 years of teaching experience were classified as novice educators and were directed to questions pertaining to their experiences as a mentee under formal and/or informal mentorship. Teachers who indicated six or more years of teaching experience were classified as veteran educators and were directed to questions pertaining to their experiences serving as a formal or informal mentor to an early career choral educator. These parameters were based on the majority of the research studies which define novice music educators as having taught for five years or less.

Upon receiving approval from the university's Institutional Review Board, emails containing a request for participation and a link to the survey were distributed to 1,940

choral music educators in the state of Texas via a post to the Texas Choir Directors Facebook Group. An additional 42 email communications were sent to choral directors teaching in UIL Region 23 (where I am a member), as well as various university and college choral professors and fine arts directors throughout the state.

Instrument

The researcher-designed survey (see Appendix C) used in this study was a partial replication of a survey utilized in McIlhagga's (2006) study of secondary instrumental and vocal directors in the state of Michigan. The Michigan Music Teacher Mentoring Survey (MMTMS) was a three-part researcher-designed survey that was based in part on the music education research of Smith (2004), who studied the mentoring and professional development of new music educators in Minnesota. After editing the MMTMS to meet the needs of this study, I used Google Forms to create the survey in an effort to make the instrument quickly accessible for participants throughout the state of Texas.

Survey Piloting and Data Monitoring

Because the survey essentially included two separate channels (mentor and mentee), once completed, I tested the survey as both a mentee and mentor before piloting the survey with five North Texas secondary choral directors. These directors' teaching experience ranged from 5 years to 20 years, and they had personal experience with mentoring. Their task was to ensure that both survey channels functioned properly and that all directions, questions, etc. were clear and led participants to the correct sections.

No revisions were suggested, although it was later discovered that one music-related skill was listed in the non-music related skills section of the veteran educator mentoring section. This was later corrected during data analysis. Using Google Forms, survey responses were connected to a Google Spreadsheet, and I was able to monitor responses using Google Drive.

Survey Section 1

The survey used in this study was divided into seven sections for mentees and into four sections for mentors. The initial section entitled “Participant Profile” gathered basic information in an effort to create a profile of both mentees and mentors throughout the state. This section collected information on the participant’s gender, current teaching position, first year teaching position, grade levels currently teaching, school district demographics of current teaching position, school district demographics of first year teaching position, as well as the region of Texas in which the participant currently teaches and taught during his or her entry year. The final question in Section I asked for years of teaching experience, including the current school year.

Mentee Survey Section 2a

Participants who indicated 1-5 years of experience were designated as mentees and were directed to a section entitled “Formal Mentor Profile” that asked participants to confirm and describe their experience with a formal mentor. Mentees who indicated having had a formal mentor were asked to provide a brief profile of their mentor including gender, approximate number of years of teaching experience, who assigned the

mentor, which years the mentee had a mentor, location of the mentor, and the music or non-music area that best described their formal mentor's area of expertise. Mentees who did not have a formal mentor were directed to Section 5 entitled "Informal Mentor Profile."

Mentee Survey Section 3a

After providing profile information of their formal mentor, participants were then directed to Section 3a entitled "Formal Mentor's Assistance/Helpfulness (non-music related skills)" and were presented with 10 non-music related teaching skills. Using a Likert-type scale from 1 – strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree, the participant was presented with a skill and asked the following questions: (1) My formal mentor assisted me with [insert skill]; and (2) [insert skill] was important to my teaching effectiveness.

Mentee Survey Section 4a

Following the non-music related skills section, mentee participants were directed to Section 4a entitled "Formal Mentor's Assistance/Helpfulness (music related skills)" and were presented with 16 music related teaching skills. Using a Likert-type scale from 1 – strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree, the participant was presented with a skill and asked the following questions: (1) My formal mentor assisted me with [insert skill]; and (2) [insert skill] was important to my teaching effectiveness. At the conclusion of this section, the mentee was also asked an open-ended response question:

“What assistance did you need (music or non-music) that you did not receive from formal mentoring and/or what advice would you give to those in a formal mentorship?”

Mentee Survey Section 5

After providing information regarding formal mentorship, mentees were then asked about informal mentorship. Those who were not informally mentored were prompted to submit their responses. Those who were informally mentored were then directed to Section 5 entitled “Informal Mentor Profile” and were asked to describe what prompted them to seek an informal mentor. Mentees were then asked to provide a brief profile of their informal mentor including gender, approximate number of years of teaching experience, which years the mentee had an informal mentor, location of the mentor, and the music or non-music area that best described their informal mentor’s area of expertise.

Mentee Survey Section 6

After providing profile information of their informal mentor, participants were then directed to Section 6 entitled “Informal Mentor’s Assistance/Helpfulness (non-music related skills)” and were presented with 10 non-music related teaching skills. Using a Likert-type scale from 1 – *strongly disagree* to 5 – *strongly agree*, the participant was presented with a skill and asked the following questions: (1) My informal mentor assisted me with [insert skill]; and (2) [insert skill] was important to my teaching effectiveness.

Mentee Survey Section 7

Following the non-music related skills section, mentee participants were directed

to Section 7 entitled “Informal Mentor’s Assistance/Helpfulness (music related skills)” and were presented with 16 music-related teaching skills. Using a Likert-type scale from 1 – *strongly disagree* to 5 – *strongly agree*, the participant was presented with a skill and asked the following questions: (1) My informal mentor assisted me with [insert skill]; and (2) [insert skill] was important to my teaching effectiveness. At the conclusion of this section, the mentee was also asked an open-ended response question: “What assistance did you need that you did not receive from informal mentoring and/or what advice would you give to those seeking an informal mentorship?”

Mentor Survey Section 2b

Participants who initially indicated 6+ years of teaching experience were designated as mentors and were directed to a section that asked participants to describe their experiences as a formal and/or informal mentor. Mentors were asked questions about the approximate number of mentees they had mentored, the number of years their mentee had been teaching during their mentorship, the most frequent location of their mentees, and which entities had assigned the veteran educator to mentor an early career choral director as well as their experience with informal mentorship. Additionally, mentors were asked which years of their teaching career they had served as mentors.

While early career educators were asked to separately describe the assistance they received from formal mentors and informal mentors, this study assumed that a veteran educator serving as a mentor—formally or informally—would provide the same assistance to a novice teacher and were not asked to provide separate responses as the

mentees were. It is also important to note that veteran educators who indicated never having served as mentors were asked to provide information regarding their experiences as mentees.

Mentor Survey Section 3b

After providing profile information of their mentee as well as of themselves as mentors, participants were then directed to Section 3b entitled “Mentor’s Assistance/Helpfulness (non-music related skills)” and were presented with 10 non-music related teaching skills. Using a Likert-type scale from 1 – *strongly disagree* to 5 – *strongly agree*, the participant was presented with a skill and asked the following questions: (1) I provided assistance with my mentee’s understanding of [insert skill]; and (2) [insert skill] was important to my mentee’s teaching effectiveness. At the conclusion of this section, the mentor was also asked an open ended response question: “What skills do you believe early career choral directors most need, and what advice would you give to others who are serving as a mentor of an early career choral director?”

Mentor Survey Section 4b

Following the non-music related skills section, mentor participants were directed to Section 4b entitled “Mentor’s Assistance/Helpfulness (music related skills)” and were presented with 16 music related teaching skills. Using a Likert-type scale from 1 – *strongly disagree* to 5 – *strongly agree*, the participant was presented with a skill and asked the following questions: (1) I provided assistance with my mentee’s understanding

of [insert skill]; and (2) [insert skill] was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness.

Procedure

I posted a direct link to the letter of recruitment (see Appendix B) for this study on the Texas Choir Directors Facebook Group on February 21 and February 26. I also sent 43 emails between February 21 and March 10 to UIL Region 23 as well as various acquaintances serving as university and college choral professors or district fine arts administrators. A TinyURL was included in the letter of recruitment, which directed participants to the Google Form survey. Once the survey was completed and electronically submitted, responses were collected on a Google Spreadsheet, which was later downloaded as an Excel file to facilitate statistical analysis.

Analysis of Data

For Research Question No. 1, I ran descriptives to find the demographics of the different groups, e.g., gender, district size, location of mentors, etc. The remaining two research questions were essentially asking the same question of different groups (mentors, mentees who were formally mentored, and mentees who were informally mentored) through the lenses of music related assistance and non-music related assistance. The same test was used with each group, and the purpose of the test was to determine the statistical significance between the assistance that was received or given and what was perceived as important. I used the Wilcoxon signed-rank test to compare the assistance provided to the perceived importance. This allowed me to take into account

all of the responses on the Likert-type scale (*strongly disagree* to *agree*) and then compare them. The output of the test told me which skills had statistically significant responses, that is to say, if there was a meaningful difference between assistance that was received or given and what the respondent thought was important.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The following chapter shows the results of the study in reference to the three research questions:

1. What is the profile of formal and informal mentors working with early career secondary choral directors in the state of Texas?
2. What are the differences in perceived importance and assistance provided in non-music related skills during formal and informal mentoring?
3. What are the differences in perceived importance and assistance provided in music related skills during formal and informal mentoring?

Research participants ($N = 58$) were active secondary choral directors in the state of Texas. Of the 1,940 members of the Texas Choir Directors Facebook Group, as well as the 42 emails sent to potential participants, 73 responses were recorded and submitted. Upon closer inspection, it was discovered that one participant accidentally submitted the same survey a total of 16 times. Deletion of 15 of the 16 responses resulted in a final total of 58 participants with a response rate of 3%. Twelve veteran educators with 6+ years of experience had never served as mentors but had been mentored earlier in their careers and provided information from a mentee's perspective.

Research Question No. 1

What is the profile of formal and informal mentors working with early career secondary choral directors in the state of Texas?

Among the 58 participants who completed the survey, 72% ($n = 42$) were female and 28% ($n = 16$) were male. When asked about their current teaching position, participants could select more than one response to best describe the nature of their work, e.g., middle school head director and high school assistant director. A total of 42% ($n = 28$) respondents identified as middle school head choral directors, followed by 22% ($n = 15$) identifying as high school head choral directors, 15% ($n = 10$) as middle school assistant choral directors, and 13% ($n = 9$) as high school assistant choral directors.

Due to the large land mass of Texas and its diverse population, for purposes of reporting, the state was divided in the following regions: North, South, East, West, Central, and Panhandle (see Table 1). The largest percentage (36%) of participants began their teaching career in the North Texas area followed by South Texas (20%), Central Texas (19%), and East and West Texas with 7% and 5%, respectively. No participants reported from the Panhandle area, and an additional 12% of respondents reported teaching in a state other than Texas during their first year. Similar trends were reported by participants regarding their current teaching assignment with an increase to 52% in North Texas, the South, East, and Central areas remaining constant, and West Texas showing a decline to 3%.

Table 1

State Geographic Regions of Participants' (n = 58) Teaching Assignments

By Year Comparison	North	South	East	West	Central	Panhandle	N/A
First Year Teaching	36%	21%	7%	5%	19%	0%	12%
Current Year Teaching	52%	19%	7%	3%	19%	0%	0%

Additionally, school districts throughout the state were identified as suburban, urban, or rural based on the size of the population and the socioeconomic status of its residents, and participants selected the demographic classification that best described their first school district and their current school district (see Table 2).

Table 2

School Type of Participants' (n = 58) Teaching Assignments

By Year Comparison	Suburban	Urban	Rural
First Year Teaching	52%	35%	14%
Current Year Teaching	57%	33%	10%

Although 58 secondary choral directors participated in this study, nine had no experience with mentoring and were exited from the survey after providing basic demographic information. The remaining results outlined in this chapter include data submitted by 20 mentors, 21 mentees who were informally mentored, and 18 mentees

who were formally mentored. It is important to note that 10 mentees were both formally and informally mentored and provided data in both areas.

Formal Mentorship Described by the Mentee

The mentees in this study ($N = 18$) indicated that 67% ($n = 12$) had one formal mentor while 17% ($n = 3$) indicated having two mentors, and an additional 17% ($n = 3$) had three formal mentors. Additionally, 67% ($n = 12$) were the same gender as their formal mentor. Regarding assignment of a formal mentor, 61% ($n = 11$) were assigned a formal mentor by their campuses, followed by 17% ($n = 3$) by a fine arts director, 11% ($n = 2$) by the school district, and 11% ($n = 2$) by the Texas Music Educators Association (see Table 3).

Table 3

Method of Assignment of Formal Mentors as Reported by Mentees ($n = 18$)

Campus	Fine Arts Director	School District	T.M.E.A.
61%	17%	11%	11%

During their very first year of teaching, 67% ($n = 12$) of mentees reported formal mentoring exclusively during their first year, 11% ($n = 2$) were mentored during their first and second years, with four respondents (22%) reporting various combinations of non- consecutive mentorship (see Table 4). In total, 15 of the 18 mentees in this study (83%) were formally mentored during their first year, 72% ($n = 13$) were formally mentored by an on-campus music educator, and the remaining 28% of mentees ($n = 5$) indicated a non-music educator as their assigned formal mentor (see Table 5). Three of those five respondents secured an informal mentor.

Table 4

Years During Which Mentees (n = 18) Report Receiving Formal Mentorship

Year 1	Years 1 & 2	Years 1 & 4	Year 2	Years 2 & 3	Year 3
67%	11%	6%	6%	6%	6%

Table 5

Formal Mentor's Content Area as Reported by Mentees (n = 18)

Music Educator	Fine Arts	Language Arts	Math	Other
72%	11%	6%	6%	6%

Note. Fine Arts = non-music

Informal Mentorship Described by the Mentee

Twenty-one respondents (55%) reported that they were currently being informally mentored or were informally mentored during their first five years. The majority of these mentees ($n = 15$; 71%) were the same gender as their informal mentors. Mentees reported their mentors having an average of 14.7 years of teaching experience at the time of their mentorship. Mentees indicated that most ($n = 12$; 27%) had informal mentors in their first year of teaching, followed by their fourth year ($n = 9$; 20%), and second/third year ($n = 8$; 18%). Over 95% of participants reported that their informal mentors were music

educators, and most informal mentors ($n = 12$; 57%) were located on the same campus as the mentee (see Table 6).

Table 6

Location of Informal Mentor as Reported by Mentees ($n = 21$)

Same Campus	Same District	Different District	Retired
57%	24%	10%	10%

Mentorship Described by the Mentor

The 20 respondents who served as mentors reported a range of 1 to 20 mentees with an average of four. Nineteen participants (95%) reported mentoring early career secondary choral directors during the mentee's first year of teaching, and 12 mentors (60%) also mentored directors during the mentee's second year of teaching. Fifteen mentors (75%) served as formal mentors. Nine of the formal mentors (60%) mentored early career choral directors on a different campus in the same school district, four (27%) mentored on their home campus, and the remaining two (13%) mentored a novice teacher on a different campus in a different school district (see Table 7). Eleven mentors (73%) were assigned by their campus and/or fine arts directors ($n = 9$; 60%; see Table 8).

Table 7

Location of Formal Mentor as Reported by Mentors (n = 15)

Same District	Same Campus	Different District
60%	27%	13%

Table 8

Third Party Assigners of Formal Mentors as Reported by Mentors (n = 15)

Campus	Fine Arts Director	District	T.M.E.A	Certification Program	Other
67%	11%	6%	6%	6%	6%

Note. Mentors were able to select all applicable categories.

While 15 of the 20 mentors served in a formal capacity, five veteran educators (25%) were never assigned to serve as formal mentors, instead serving as informal mentors. Three of the informal mentors (60%) mentored a novice educator on the same campus. Four of the informal mentors (80%) revealed the mentorship was initiated by both parties with only one mentor indicated the mentorship was initiated by the mentee. For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that a veteran choral music educator—whether serving formally or informally—would provide the same assistance to a mentee. Thus, the data presented under Research Question No. 2 includes all 20 mentor participants, both formal and informal.

Research Question No. 2

What are the differences in perceived importance and assistance provided in non-music related skills during formal and informal mentoring?

A Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to compare perceived importance of assistance with assistance provided to novice teachers from the perspective of the mentor. The test takes into account all responses on the Likert-type scale (from strongly disagree to agree) and compares the scores to detect statistical significance.

Non-Music Related Assistance from Mentor's Perspective

A comparison of mentors' perceptions of importance of assistance with non-music related skills and the assistance they provided to novice teachers revealed that "Classroom Management and Discipline" was the only category which was statistically identical (90%; see Table 9).

"Planning and Organization" was ranked by mentors as the most important non-music related skill (95%), but it ranked second in assistance provided at 75% with a statistical difference of $p = .03$. Additionally, 45% of mentors believed in the importance of "Computer Skills," but only 35% offered assistance with a statistical difference of $p = .03$. "Parent Collaboration" also saw a statistical difference of $p = .03$ with 70% of mentors perceiving it as important with only 60% offering assistance.

Table 9

A Comparison of Mentors' (n = 20) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided to Novice Teachers (Non-Music Related Skills)

Type of Assistance	Perceived Importance	Assistance Provided
Planning and Organization*	95%	75%
Classroom Management and Discipline	90%	90%
Politics and Procedures	80%	90%
Program Budget	70%	50%
Parent Collaboration*	70%	60%
Fundraising	60%	55%
Understanding and Using Research	50%	45%
Evaluation and Grading	45%	35%
Computer Skills (non-music)*	45%	35%
Special Learner Accommodations	25%	30%

Note. * = differences in the assistance provided and its perceived importance are statistically significant at the .05 level. Statistics represent percentages of respondents who selected *agree* and *strongly agree*.

Non-Music Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors from Mentee's Perspective

A comparison of mentees' perceptions of importance of assistance with non-music related skills and the assistance provided by their formal mentors did not reveal any categories that were statistically identical. The difference between the perceived importance of the non-music related skills with the assistance that was actually provided were statistically significant in 8 out of the 10 skills (see Table 10).

Table 10

A Comparison of Mentees' (n = 18) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors (Non-Music Related Skills)

Type of Assistance	Perceived Importance	Assistance Provided
Classroom Management and Discipline*	94%	39%
Planning and Organization*	94%	28%
Evaluation and Grading*	78%	33%
Politics and Procedures	78%	83%
Program Budget*	72%	39%
Parent Collaboration	72%	61%
Computer Skills (non-music)*	61%	0%
Special Learner Accommodations*	56%	22%
Fundraising*	56%	39%
Understanding and Using Research*	50%	28%

Note. * = differences in the assistance provided and its perceived importance are statistically significant at the .05 level. Statistics represent percentages of respondents who selected *agree* and *strongly agree*.

“Classroom Management and Discipline,” as well as “Planning and Organization,” tied for the most important skills at 94%; however, it was provided at a ranking of 39% and 28% with a statistical significance of $p = .01$ and $p = .00$, respectively. “Evaluation and Grading” ranked second in level of importance to mentees at 78%, but actual assistance in this area ranked fourth at 33% with a statistical significance of $p = .01$. “Program Budget” ranked third in level of importance at 72%,

and while it remained in third place in actual assistance provided, the percentage dropped to 39% with a statistical significance of $p = .02$. Computer skills ranked fourth in level of importance to mentees at 78%, but the percentage of assistance provided dropped to 0% with a statistical significance of $p = .01$. The areas of “Special Learner Accommodations” and “Fundraising” ranked fifth in level of importance at 56% with assistance provided at 22% and 39%, respectively, and both areas holding a statistical significance of $p = .01$. Mentees ranked “Understanding and Using Research” in sixth place at 50% with assistance provided at 28% and a statistical significance of $p = .01$.

Non-Music Assistance Provided by Informal Mentors from Mentee’s Perspective

A comparison of mentees’ perceptions of importance of assistance with non-music related skills and the assistance provided by their informal mentors did not reveal any categories that were statistically identical. The difference between the perceived importance of the non-music related skills with the assistance that was actually provided was statistically significant in seven out of the ten skills (see Table 11).

“Classroom Management and Discipline” ranked first in importance at 100%; however, the percentage of assistance provided ranked fourth at 52% with a statistical significance of $p = .01$. “Planning and Organization” ranked second in importance at 95% but fifth in assistance provided at 43% with a statistical significance of $p = .01$. “Evaluation and Grading” ranked third in importance at 81% and second in assistance provided at 67% with a statistical significance of $p = .04$. “Special Learner Accommodations” and “Program Budget” tied for sixth place at 67%, but assistance provided fell to 29% $p = .01$ and 38% $p = .03$, respectively. The skill of “Understanding

and Using Research” ranked seventh in level of importance at 62% and ranked sixth under assistance provided at 38%; $p = .01$. The final statistically significant skill of “Computer Skills (non-music)” was the least important skill to mentees at 38% with an assistance percentage also in last place at 19% $p = .02$.

Table 11

A Comparison of Mentees’ (n = 21) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided by Informal Mentors (Non-Music Related Skills)

Type of Assistance	Perceived Importance	Assistance Provided
Classroom Management and Discipline*	100%	52%
Planning and Organization*	95%	43%
Evaluation and Grading*	81%	67%
Politics and Procedures	76%	76%
Parent Collaboration	71%	62%
Special Learner Accommodations*	67%	29%
Program Budget*	67%	38%
Understanding and Using Research*	62%	38%
Fundraising	57%	62%
Computer Skills (non-music)*	38%	19%

Note. * = differences in the assistance provided and its perceived importance are statistically significant at the .05 level. Statistics represent percentages of respondents who selected *agree* and *strongly agree*.

Research Question No. 3

What are the differences in perceived importance and assistance provided in music related skills during formal and informal mentoring?

Music Related Assistance from Mentor's Perspective

A comparison of mentors' perceptions of importance of assistance with music-related skills and the assistance they provided to novice teachers revealed two statistically identical categories—"Rehearsal Technique" (100%) and "Advocacy" (70%) (see Table 12). "Music Literacy" was ranked by 90% of mentors as an important skill though only 80% offered assistance. Additionally, 80% of mentors ranked "General Music Knowledge" as important with a 50% rate of assistance, and "Piano Skills" were ranked at 40% importance with only 15% assistance—both categories with a statistical significance of $p = .02$. Preparation for "All-Region/All-State" was reported as an important skill by 70% of mentors with assistance provided by at a rate of 75% and a statistical significance of $p = .03$. Lastly, "Arranging and Composing" was an important skill to 30% of mentors with assistance provided by 10% and a statistical significance of $p = .03$.

Table 12

A Comparison of Mentors' (n = 20) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided to Novice Teachers (Music Related Skills)

Type of Assistance	Perceived Importance	Assistance Provided
Teaching Materials	100%	90%
Rehearsal Technique	100%	100%
Music Program Administration	95%	85%
Curriculum and Instruction	90%	80%
Music Literacy*	90%	80%
UIL Concert	85%	90%
UIL Sight Reading	85%	90%
General Music Knowledge*	80%	50%
Piano Accompanist	75%	70%
Advocacy	70%	70%
All-Region/All-State*	70%	75%
Conducting	65%	50%
Music Technology	45%	35%
Piano Skills*	40%	15%
Ethnic/Multicultural Music	35%	30%
Arranging/Composing*	30%	10%

Note. * = differences in the assistance provided and its perceived importance are statistically significant at the .05 level. Statistics represent percentages of respondents who selected *agree* and *strongly agree*.

Music Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors from Mentee's Perspective

A comparison of mentee's perceptions of importance of assistance with music related skills and the assistance provided by their formal mentors did not reveal any categories that were statistically identical; however, all of the differences between the perceived importance and assistance provided were statistically significant (see Table 13). "Teaching Materials" ranked first in level of importance at 100% and dropped to third with assistance provided at 39% and a statistical significance of $p = .01$. The following five areas tied for second place in perceived importance at 83% with a statistical significance of $p = .01$ (percentages of assistance provided indicated alongside each skill): "General Music Knowledge" (22%), "Rehearsal Technique" (39%), "Music Literacy" (28%), "UIL Concert" (50%), and "UIL Sight Reading" (33%). "All-Region/All-State" and "Music Program Administration" both ranked third in level of importance with 78%, percentages of assistance at 39% and 44%, respectively, and statistical significance of $p = .01$. "Conducting" and "Curriculum and Instruction" ranked fourth in level of importance at 72%, but "Conducting" dropped to sixth place in assistance provided at 17%; $p = .01$, and "Curriculum and Instruction" jumped to third place in assistance provided at 39%; $p = .01$. Ranking fifth in level of importance were "Music Technology" and "Advocacy" at 67% with assistance percentages at 6%; $p = .01$ and 28%; $p = .02$, respectively. "Piano Skills" ranked sixth in level of importance at 67% but dropped to last place in assistance provided with 0%; $p = .01$. The areas of "Piano Accompanist" and "Ethnic/Multicultural Music" tied for seventh place at 61% with assistance provided at 17%; $p = .01$ in both areas.

Table 13

A Comparison of Mentees' (n = 18) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors (Music Related Skills)

Type of Assistance	Perceived Importance	Assistance Provided
Teaching Materials*	100%	39%
General Music Knowledge*	83%	22%
Rehearsal Technique*	83%	39%
Music Literacy*	83%	28%
UIL Concert*	83%	50%
UIL Sight Reading*	83%	33%
Music Program Administration*	78%	44%
All-Region/All-State*	78%	39%
Conducting*	72%	17%
Curriculum and Instruction*	72%	39%
Music Technology*	67%	6%
Advocacy*	67%	28%
Piano Skills*	67%	0%
Piano Accompanist*	61%	17%
Ethnic/Multicultural Music*	61%	17%
Arranging/Composing*	33%	6%

Note. * = differences in the assistance provided and its perceived importance are statistically significant at the .05 level. Statistics represent percentages of respondents who selected *agree* and *strongly agree*.

“Arranging and Composing” was ranked last at 33% with assistance provided ranking second from last at 6%; $p = .01$.

Music Assistance Provided by Informal Mentors from the Mentee’s Perspective

A comparison of mentees’ perceptions of importance of assistance with music related skills and the assistance provided by their informal mentors did not reveal any categories that were statistically identical. The difference between the perceived importance of the music related skills with the assistance that was actually provided were statistically significant in 11 out of 16 skills (see Table 14). “Rehearsal Technique” ranked first in importance with 100% and second in assistance provided with 76%; $p = .01$. “Teaching Materials” ranked second in importance at 85% and third in assistance provided at 71% $p = .01$. The areas of “Curriculum and Instruction” and “Music Program Administration” tied for third in perceived importance, but “Curriculum and Instruction” dropped to fifth in assistance provided at 62% $p = .01$ while “Music Program Administration” remained ranked third though the percentage in assistance provided dropped to 71% $p = .01$. “Music Literacy” and “General Music Knowledge” both ranked fourth in level of importance with 86%, but dropped to sixth and eighth, respectively, in assistance provided at 57%; $p = .02$ and 38%; $p = .01$. The skill of “Conducting” ranked fifth in level of importance at 81% but dropped to tenth in assistance provided at 29% with a statistical significance of $p = .01$. “Ethnic and Multicultural Music” ranked seventh in level of importance at 62% and dropped to eighth in assistance provided at 38%; $p = .02$.

Table 14

A Comparison of Mentees' (n = 21) Perceptions of Importance of Assistance and Assistance Provided by Informal Mentors (Music Related Skills)

Type of Assistance	Perceived Importance	Assistance Provided
Rehearsal Technique*	100%	76%
Teaching Materials*	95%	71%
Curriculum and Instruction*	91%	62%
Music Program Administration*	91%	71%
General Music Knowledge*	86%	38%
Music Literacy*	86%	57%
UIL Concert	86%	81%
UIL Sight Reading	86%	81%
All-Region/All-State	86%	71%
Piano Accompanist	81%	48%
Conducting*	81%	29%
Advocacy	71%	67%
Ethnic/Multicultural Music*	62%	38%
Arranging/Composing*	52%	33%
Piano Skills*	52%	10%
Music Technology*	52%	24%

Note. * = differences in the assistance provided and its perceived importance are statistically significant at the .05 level. Statistics represent percentages of respondents who selected *agree* and *strongly agree*.

The areas of “Arranging/Composing,” “Music Technology,” and “Piano Skills” all ranked eighth in level of importance at 52%, but ranked ninth, eleventh, and twelfth, respectively, in assistance provided at percentages of 33%; $p = .01$, 24%; $p = .01$, and 10%; $p = .01$.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Using McIlhagga's (2006) research as a foundation, this study employed a quantitative approach to better understand the music and non-music teaching skills of novice secondary choral directors in the state of Texas and to determine the impact of both formal and informal mentoring provided by veteran educators. An online survey was designed and shared with secondary choral directors (grades 6-12) throughout the state of Texas and allowed novice and veteran choral educators alike to share their perceived importance of 16 music related skills and 10 non-music related skills, as well as assistance provided in these 26 areas. The data collected from 58 secondary choral directors was analyzed to determine relationships between perceived importance and assistance provided as reported by mentors and mentees alike. Because this study focused on the mentoring practices of secondary choral directors in the state of Texas, this limited the greater pool of secondary choral directors throughout the country, in addition to those in and out of the state who teach choir in an elementary setting. This chapter will take the results presented in Chapter 4 and further explore the relationships between formal mentoring and informal mentoring, implications for assistance novice choral educators need, as well as suggestions for further research.

Research Question No. 1

Of the mentors who participated in this study ($n = 20$), 70% ($n = 14$) were women and 30% ($n = 6$) were men, which aligns with 2017 Texas Education Agency (TEA) data that reported 76% of the Texas teaching population as female and 24% as male during the 2015-16 school year (TEA, 2017a). Additionally, 60% ($n = 12$) of the mentors were middle school head directors, and 65% ($n = 13$) taught in suburban school districts. Mentors' years of teaching experience ranged from 8-32 years with an average of 14.5 years of experience, which is slightly higher than a 2017 TEA report of math and science teachers, which indicated an average of 10.11 years for math teachers and 9.94 for science teachers during the 2015-16 school year (TEA, 2017b). The number of novice educators they mentored ranged from 1-20 with an average of 4.3. Mentors began mentoring as early as their third year of teaching and as late as their twentieth year of teaching, with a mode of 10 years. Mentors who served informally ($n = 11$) reported a mutual initiation of the mentorship between mentee and mentor 55% of the time. Of the mentors in this study, 40% ($n = 8$) were from North Texas, with the remaining 60% ($n = 12$) residing elsewhere throughout the state. Lastly, an overwhelming majority, 95% ($n = 19$) mentored a novice choral educator in his or her first year of teaching. Using this data to create a profile of choral music education mentors in the state of Texas, the typical mentor is a female head director of a suburban middle school program, resides outside of North Texas with 14.5 years of teaching experience, first began mentoring in her tenth year, and has had one first-year mentee each year since.

Among the mentees who participated in this study ($n = 38$), 74% ($n = 28$) were women, and the remaining 26% ($n = 10$) were men, which again aligns with (TEA, 2017a) state data. Additionally, 55% ($n = 21$) began teaching in the middle school setting, and 63% ($n = 24$) were teaching at the middle school level following their first year. Mentees reported 47% ($n = 18$) began teaching in suburban districts, with 53% reporting employment in suburban districts after their first year ($n = 20$). Mentees taught an average of six years and reported formal mentors with an average of 13 years of experience and informal mentors with an average of 14. Using this data to create a profile of choral music education mentees in the state of Texas, the mentee is a female middle school director with six years of teaching experience in a suburban school district with a mentor with 13.5 years of teaching experience as a music educator.

Research Question No. 2

When the 10 non-music related skills were ranked and labeled in order of perceived importance, according to the mentor, and then according to the mentee in an informal mentorship, 6 out of 10 skills (60%) were ranked within the same quartile (two ties resulted in a total of 8 rankings). The perceived importance of the following six skills ranked within the same quartile between mentors and mentees in an informal mentorship:

- Classroom Management and Discipline – first quartile
- Planning and Organization – first quartile
- Parent Collaboration – second quartile
- Politics and Procedures – second quartile
- Understanding and Using Research – third quartile

- Computer Skills (non-music) – fourth quartile

The same process was then applied to formal mentorship. The 10 non-music related skills were ranked and labeled in order of perceived importance according to the mentor and then according to the mentee in a formal mentorship, and 6 out of 10 skills (60%) were once again ranked within the same quartile (two ties resulted in a total of 8 rankings). The perceived importance of the following six skills ranked in the same quartile between mentors and mentees in a formal mentorship:

- Classroom Management and Discipline – first quartile
- Planning and Organization – first quartile
- Parent Collaboration – second quartile
- Politics and Procedures – second quartile
- Program and Budget – second quartile
- Special Learning Accommodations – fourth quartile

When comparing the perceived importance of non-music related skills between formal mentorships and informal mentorships, it is important to note that mentees in this study reported finding the same number (60%) of non-music related skills important, whether they were in a formal or informal mentorship. Furthermore, when comparing the actual skills that were perceived as being most important between formal and informal mentorships, the following four skills were in the top half of both types of mentorship pairings:

- Classroom Management and Discipline – first quartile

- Planning and Organization – first quartile
- Parent Collaboration – second quartile
- Politics and Procedures – second quartile

These areas align with previous studies, which indicate classroom management, student discipline, organization, and parent-teacher communication as areas of great concern for novice educators (Conway, 2006; McCann et al., 2005; Wood, 2005).

Mentors and mentees in informal mentorships equally ranked “Understanding and Using Research” in the third quartile and “Computer Skills (non-music)” in the fourth quartile; however, mentors and mentees in formal mentorships were misaligned in the aforementioned skills and, instead, equally ranked “Program and Budget” in the second quartile and “Special Learner Accommodations” in the fourth quartile. As reported in the previous section, 56% of novice choral educators in this study had a formal mentor who taught the same choral grade levels, and 62% of mentees had an informal mentor who taught the same choral grade levels. This study aligns with previous research that argues for same grade level and content area mentorship pairings (Conway et al., 2002; Conway, 2003; Roulston et al., 2005); however, even when such pairings exist, mentees and mentors do not always place the same level of importance on the same skills.

While it is important that mentees and mentors in both formal and informal mentorships perceive the same skills as important to their teaching effectiveness, it is equally important to discuss the skills that mentors and mentees did not assign the same levels of perceived importance. In informal mentorships, mentees and mentors ranked “Program and Budget” in the third and second quartiles, respectively, but only by a

difference of 3.3 percentage points. “Fundraising” was ranked by mentees in the fourth quartile (57%) and in the third quartile by mentors (60%) with a difference of only three percentage points. Similarly, in formal mentorships, mentees and mentors ranked “Fundraising” in the fourth and third quartiles, respectively, with a difference of four percentage points. Additionally, “Understanding and Using Research” and “Computer Skills (non-music)” were assigned conflicting levels of perceived importance. Essentially, mentors and mentees in both informal and formal mentorships ranked the top and bottom skills most equally while the skills that fell in the middle were slightly varied.

The two skills that differed most greatly in perceived importance between mentors and mentees in both formal and informal mentorships were “Evaluation and Grading” and “Special Learning Accommodations.” Mentors ranked “Evaluation and Grading” second from the bottom, at 45% perceived importance, while mentees in both formal and informal mentorships ranked it in the second quartile at 81% and 78%, respectively. Mentees found “Evaluation and Grading” 33 percentage points more important than their formal mentors and 36 percentage points more important than their informal mentors. When investigating the implementation of assessment rubrics in the music classroom, DeLuca and Bolden (2014) supported the mentees’ viewpoint on both the importance and challenge of assessing student performers. If Texas mentors want to help their mentees in ways that are meaningful and relevant to the mentee’s teaching effectiveness, perhaps more attention should be placed on guiding novice teachers toward best practices in evaluating and grading student learning outcomes in the choral setting. Thoughtful, well-designed rubrics are one way to incorporate better assessment practices.

Similarly, mentors ranked “Special Learning Accommodations” at the bottom of all non-music skills. Although mentees in both formal and informal mentorships did not place a great deal of importance on this particular skill, mentees in formal mentorships reported a 56% perceived importance, and mentees in informal mentorships ranked it in the third quartile at 67%. Although mentees in formal mentorships ranked this skill in the fourth quartile along with mentors, the fact that mentees found “Special Learning Accommodations” 31 percentage points more important than their mentors is noteworthy, regardless of the final ranking as compared to other skills. Choral conductor/teachers face considerable challenges as they move toward inclusion of special learners; however, all learners deserve equal access, and all teachers should work toward this goal (Salvador, 2013). Out of the 5,359,127 students enrolled in Texas schools during the 2016-17 school year, 477,281 (9%) received special education services of some kind (TEA, 2017c). If we include accommodations that are mandated for bilingual or English a second language (ESL) learners (1,005,765), as well as English language learners (ELL; 1,010,756), the percentage of students with special learning needs jumps to a staggering 47% of the student population. With this number of learners with specific needs in Texas schools, it is imperative that teachers strive to meet the needs of these students as outlined in the student’s individualized education plan, or language accommodations with regard to bilingual, ESL, and ELL learners. While the perceived importance of “Special Learning Accommodations” ranked in the bottom half of non-music skills by mentees and mentors, mentees still found this skill more important than their mentors. Veteran choral educators

need to guide novice choral educators toward research-based practices that help special learners in the choral setting find academic success.

While it has been established that mentors and mentees in both formal and informal relationships perceive the same number of non-music related skills as important (60%), the same cannot be said of actual assistance provided. Veteran educators reported assistance provided at 57%, while mentees reported assistance provided by informal mentors at 49% and formal mentors at 37%, a difference of eight and nineteen percentage points, respectively. Mentors overestimated the amount of assistance they provided when compared with what mentees reported experiencing.

When the 10 non-music related skills were ranked and labeled in order of assistance given on both sides of an informal mentorship, 70% were ranked within the same quartile (two ties resulted in a total of eight rankings), meaning the assistance mentors said they gave aligned with the assistance mentees said they received in 7 out of 10 areas. The assistance given in the following seven non-music related skills ranked within the same quartile as reported by mentors and mentees in an informal mentorship:

- Politics and Procedures – first quartile
- Fundraising – second quartile
- Parent Collaboration – second quartile
- Program and Budget – third quartile
- Understanding and Using Research – third quartile
- Computer Skills (non-music) – fourth quartile

- Special Learning Accommodations – fourth quartile

The same process was then applied to formal mentorship. The 10 non-music related skills were ranked and labeled in order of assistance given as reported by the mentor and then according to the mentee in a formal mentorship. Only 40% were ranked within the same quartile (two ties resulted in a total of eight rankings), meaning the assistance mentors said they gave did not match what mentees reported having received in 6 out of 10 areas. The assistance given in the following four non-music related skills ranked within the same quartile between mentors and mentees in a formal mentorship:

- Politics and Procedures – first quartile
- Fundraising – second quartile
- Understanding and Using Research – third quartile
- Computer Skills (non-music) – fourth quartile

The four non-music related skills listed above were ranked similarly in both formal and informal mentorships indicating some consistency in the areas of assistance provided to novice choral educators. The skill of “Politics and Procedures” ranked in the second quartile in perceived importance in both formal and informal mentorships; however, it was ranked as the skill given the most assistance out of all non-music related skills. While existing research does support the notion that this is an area where novice educators may need guidance (Blair, 2008; Callahan, 2016; Conway, 2015), the perceived importance to mentees in this study and time mentors spent assisting in this area are misaligned.

Of particular interest is the comparison between the novice's perceived importance of certain non-music related skills with the assistance they reported receiving. In formal mentorships, 8 out of 10 categories (80%) were misaligned between the mentee's perceived importance and assistance given, meaning that mentees were given more help in areas that were less important to them and less help in areas that were more important to them. In informal mentorships, the same misalignment was discovered in 6 out of 10 categories (60%). While slightly better, this incongruity between the mentees' needs and assistance provided by mentors is cause for concern. The following are instances where mentees in an informal mentorship received more help in areas that were less important to them:

- "Politics and Procedures" ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the first quartile of assistance given.
- "Evaluation and Grading" ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the first quartile of assistance given.
- "Fundraising" ranked in the fourth quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.

Mentors ranked "Evaluation and Grading" in the fourth quartile of perceived importance and assistance given, meaning they did not find this skill important and did not feel they assisted in this area, but the skill ranks in the first quartile of assistance given as reported by mentees. Again, as a quantitative study, respondents were not given an opportunity to expound on the type of assistance they were given, but this sizeable

divergence in the area of “Evaluation and Grading” indicates a disconnection between mentors and mentees in this area.

Additionally, the following are instances where mentees in an informal mentorship received less assistance in areas that were more important to them:

- “Classroom Management and Discipline” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.
- “Planning and Organization” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.
- “Special Learning Accommodations” ranked in the third quartile of perceived importance but the fourth quartile of assistance given.

The misalignment of the ranking of “Planning and Organization” between mentors and mentees in formal mentorships would be easier to explain if data regarding examples of how mentors believed they helped and what mentees perceived as a lack of assistance were available for comparison. This variance of perceived assistance means that 57% of the time, mentees felt left to themselves to determine how to plan and organize for their classroom even though they reported this skill as a top quartile issue in their teaching effectiveness. Planning and organization are key to teacher success, and as teachers transition from pre-service to full-time teaching, assistance in this area is key (Callahan, 2016; Roulston et al., 2005).

This same comparative process was applied to formal mentorship. The following are five instances when mentees in a formal mentorship received more help in areas that were less important to them:

- “Politics and Procedures” ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the first quartile of assistance given.
- “Parent Collaboration” ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the first quartile of assistance given.
- “Fundraising” ranked in the fourth quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.
- “Special Learning Accommodations” ranked in the fourth quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.
- “Understanding and Using Research” ranked in the fourth quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.

Mentees actually reported receiving more assistance in fundraising (39%) than in special learning accommodations (22%). Perhaps mentors feel more qualified to provide advice regarding fundraising, as compared to meeting special learning accommodations, due to deficits in their training. However, an educators’ primary goal and responsibility is to meet the needs of all learners. Salvador (2013) concurred, adding that it is imperative to address special needs populations in a choral setting.

The following are three instances where mentees in a formal mentorship received less help in areas that were more important to them:

- “Classroom Management and Discipline” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.

- “Planning and Organization” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.
- “Computer Skills (non-music)” ranked in the third quartile of perceived importance but the fourth quartile of assistance given.

“Classroom Management and Discipline” is crucial to the success of any teacher, and takes time to hone, even with the helpful guidance of a mentor. Music educators often teach larger than average classes, and strong classroom management is essential to their success (Baur, 2001; Reese, 2007). The mentees in this study ranked this skill in the top quartile at 94% perceived importance and reported assistance provided by their formal mentor only 39% of the time. To restate this concern, novice choral educators were left alone 61% of the time to figure out how to manage their classes and handle discipline issues. Student discipline problems are often cited as a reason that educators—music and non-music, alike—leave the profession (Scheib, 2004). Furthermore, “Planning and Organization” tied with “Classroom Management and Discipline” at 94% perceived importance, but mentees received even less assistance in this area, reporting assistance only 28% of the time. By contrast, mentors reported assisting with planning and organization 75% of the time, which is a discrepancy of 47 percentage points. This is a serious misalignment that needs to be addressed, yet, without knowing exactly how mentors believed they were providing assistance in this area, it is difficult to provide suggestions for correction. Many novice educators do report the “sink or swim” mentality as a reason for early failure that often leads to attrition (Colley, 2002), so it is troubling to

see areas in which novice educators are spending a great deal of time problem-solving on their own.

Overall, this study determined that in the area of perceived importance, mentees and mentors—whether formal or informal—perceive the same number of non-music related skills (60%) as important. When it came to reporting assistance, mentees in informal mentorships ranked approximately 70% of skills in the same quartile as their mentors, while mentees in formal mentorships ranked only 40% of non-music skills in the same quartile. Lastly, when comparing mentees’ perceived importance with the assistance they report receiving, the data still leans toward informal mentoring. The mentees’ perceived importance and the assistance they received were aligned approximately 60% of the time, meaning they received assistance in areas they believed were important to their teaching in 6 out of 10 areas. Comparatively, mentees in formal mentorships found their perceived importance aligned with assistance given only 20% of the time. Although neither mentoring style is perfect, it would appear that when it comes to non-music related functions, informal mentoring has a greater impact on novice choral educators in the three areas measured by this study.

Research Question No. 3

When the 16 music-related skills were ranked and labeled in order of perceived importance, according to the mentor and mentee in an informal mentorship, 10 out of 16 skills (63%) were ranked within the same quartile. The perceived importance of the following 10 music related skills ranked within the same quartile between mentors and mentees in an informal mentorship:

- Teaching Materials – first quartile
- Rehearsal Technique – first quartile
- UIL Sight Reading – second quartile
- UIL Concert – second quartile
- General Music Knowledge – second quartile
- Conducting – third quartile
- Advocacy – third quartile
- Piano Skills – fourth quartile
- Ethnic/Multicultural Music- fourth quartile
- Arranging/Composing – fourth quartile

The same process was then applied to formal mentorship. The 16 music-related skills were ranked and labeled in order of perceived importance, according to the mentor and mentee, with the results indicating that only 7 out of 16 skills (44%) were ranked within the same quartile. The perceived importance of the following seven music-related skills ranked in the same quartile between mentors and mentees in a formal mentorship:

- Teaching Materials – first quartile
- Rehearsal Technique – first quartile
- Music Literacy – first quartile
- Advocacy – third quartile
- Music Technology – third quartile
- Ethnic/Multicultural Music – fourth quartile

- Arranging/Composing – fourth quartile

When comparing the perceived importance rankings of music-related skills between formal mentorships and informal mentorships, the data suggested that mentees' more closely aligned with informal mentors (63%) than formal (44%), with a difference of 19 percentage points between the two groups. To restate this point, mentees and their formal mentors disagreed on the importance of more than half of the music-related issues presented in this study (56%). When comparing the skills that were perceived most important between formal and informal mentorships, four skills (25%) were ranked similarly, but only one ranked in the top half. This supports the idea that in the area of music related skills, there is a contrast in what issues are perceived as important between formal and informal mentorships. The four similarly ranked skills are as follows:

- Rehearsal Technique – first quartile
- Advocacy – third quartile
- Ethnic/Multicultural Music- fourth quartile
- Arranging/Composing – fourth quartile

As previously stated, this study assumed that veteran educators serving as mentors would not alter their perceptions or assistance as a result of serving in a formal versus informal capacity, so mentor data was not isolated into formal and informal categories. Out of the top eight music-related skills mentees perceived as important, only one skill (rehearsal technique) ranked in the top half of important skills between mentees and their mentors even though mentor data remained constant across both lists. This further

supports the notion that mentees enter into mentorships with a different set of priorities depending on whether the mentorship is formal or informal.

While it is important that mentees and mentors in both formal and informal mentorships perceive the same skills as important to their teaching effectiveness, it is equally important to discuss the skills that mentors and mentees did not assign the same levels of perceived importance. In formal mentorships, mentors ranked “Music Program Administration” and “Curriculum and Instruction” in the first quartile, while mentees ranked them in the second quartile by a difference of approximately 17 percentage points in both areas. Mentors ranked “Piano Accompanist” in the second quartile, and mentees ranked the same skill in the fourth quartile with a difference of 14 percentage points. Furthermore, mentors ranked “UIL Sight Reading,” “UIL Concert,” and “General Music Knowledge” in the second quartile, while mentees ranked the same three categories in the first quartile by a difference of 2-3 percentage points. “All-Region/All-State” and “Conducting” ranked in the third quartile with mentors but the second quartile with mentees by approximately seven percentage points in both areas. Lastly, “Piano Skills” ranked in the fourth quartile amongst mentors and the third quartile by mentees with a difference of approximately 27 percentage points. Out of the 16 music-related skills, the perceived importance was misaligned in nine areas (57%) between mentors and mentees in formal mentorships.

Four areas emerged with significant differences in the perceived importance between mentor and mentee. “Music Program Administration” and “Curriculum and Instruction” were ranked as 95% and 90% important, respectively, by mentors and

dropped to 78% and 72% when ranked by mentees. Although curriculum and instruction may seem like a fairly straightforward skill for teachers, in my own experiences with mentoring novice educators, many were so overwhelmed with what feels like daily survival that taking a curriculum guide (if one even exists in their district for secondary choir) and breaking it down into manageable, bite-sized learning objectives seemed insurmountable. Furthermore, in the existing body of research, following a curriculum and writing lesson plans that fit into the mold of non-music teachers is often a struggle for novice music educators, and many often find themselves at odds with administrators who are unfamiliar with the literacy and performance demands of music educators (Blair, 2008; Conway, 2015). Similarly, the many moving pieces of administering a secondary choral program can also be overwhelming to novice educators who are still trying to get a firm grasp on day-to-day teaching and often struggle to find time to keep up with parent emails, ordering t-shirts, scheduling trips, etc. Another misaligned skill is that of working with a piano accompanist. Mentors ranked the perceived importance in the second quartile at 75%, while mentees ranked it in the bottom quartile at 61%. This discrepancy could exist for a few reasons. Working with a piano accompanist may not rank as a top level issue with some novice teachers because they may not have the funds to hire an accompanist or perhaps they accompany their choirs themselves. Similarly, the last music-related skill with the largest disparity between mentors and mentees in a formal mentorship was piano skills. Mentors ranked this skill in the fourth quartile at 40% perceived importance, while mentees ranked it in the third quartile at 67%, a difference of 27 percentage points. Since mentors ranked the piano accompanist higher in importance

than the director's own piano skills, it is possible that they find the latter less important because they are not the person playing the piano. For those same reasons, mentees may perceive their own piano skills as a more important skill because of the need to play themselves. Again, without open-ended responses, these are all conjectures drawn from the data.

When reviewing the disparities between mentors and mentees in informal mentorships, there were fewer areas of conflict pertaining to perceived importance of music related skills. In informal mentorships, mentees ranked "Music Program Administration," "Curriculum and Instruction," and "Music Literacy" in the second quartile, while mentors ranked the same three skills in the first quartile of perceived importance, with a difference of only four percentage points. Additionally, mentees ranked "All-Region/All-State" in the second quartile at 86% and "Piano Accompanist" in the third quartile at 81%. Mentors ranked the same two categories in the third and second quartiles, respectively, at 70% and 75%. Lastly, mentees ranked "Music Technology" in the fourth quartile, while mentors ranked it in the third quartile.

The greatest misaligned issue between mentors and mentees was the area of "All-Region/All-State" with a difference of 16 percentage points. Texas does place a great deal of emphasis on preparing students for the competitive elements of music, which includes all-region/all-state for secondary musicians. In my own experiences, many young choral educators fueled by competitiveness use all-region/all-state results as a vehicle to measure success of their choral program and of their own teaching. Many administrators often speak in "winning and losing" terminology, so the all-region/all-state

process allows choral educators to be relatable, and for many young teachers, this process seems like a straightforward path to measureable success. Existing research indicates that competition in music education provides a sense of achievement for students and helps maintain quality performances and high standards (Stamer, 2004); however, it is important to ensure that novice choral educators are receiving a balanced approach to mentoring between competitive and non-competitive aspects of music teaching.

Overall, mentors and mentees in informal mentorships shared similar perceived importance in 10 out of 16 music related skills (63%) while mentors and mentees in formal mentorships shared similar perceived importance in 7 out of 16 music related skills (44%). This supports the notion that when it comes to music-related instructional support, mentors and mentees in informal mentorships are more closely aligned in their own perceptions with areas that are also most important to a novice educator's teaching effectiveness.

While perceived importance of the same music-related skills is an important part of a successful mentorship, it is equally important that the assistance provided aligns with perceived importance. On average, educators in this study reported providing assistance in music related skills 64% of the time, mentees in informal mentorships reported assistance 54% of the time, and mentees in formal mentorships reported assistance only 26% of the time. Similar to non-music related skills, mentors overestimated the amount of assistance they provided with music related skills when compared with what mentees report experiencing.

When the 16 music related skills were ranked and labeled in order of assistance given on both sides of an informal mentorship, 56% were ranked within the same quartile, meaning the assistance mentors said they gave aligned with the assistance mentees said they received in 9 out of 16 areas. The assistance given in the following nine non-music related skills ranked within the same quartile as reported by mentors and mentees in an informal mentorship:

- Rehearsal Technique – first quartile
- Teaching Materials – first quartile
- UIL Concert – first quartile
- UIL Sight Reading – first quartile
- Curriculum and Instruction – second quartile
- General Music Knowledge – third quartile
- Piano Accompanist – third quartile
- Piano Skills – fourth quartile

The same process was then applied to formal mentorship. The 16 music-related skills were ranked and labeled in order of assistance given as reported by the mentor and mentee in a formal mentorship. Fifty percent of the music-related skills were ranked within the same quartile, meaning the assistance mentors said they gave failed to match what mentees reported having received in 8 out of 16 areas. The assistance given in the following eight music related skills ranked within the same quartile between mentors and mentees in a formal mentorship:

- UIL Concert – first quartile
- Curriculum and Instruction – second quartile
- Music Literacy – second quartile
- General Music Knowledge – third quartile
- Conducting – third quartile
- Piano Accompanist – third quartile
- Arranging/Composing – fourth quartile
- Piano Skills – fourth quartile

Only two of the same music skills ranked in the top half of assistance given in both informal and formal mentorships, which supports the idea that mentees receive assistance in different areas depending on the type of mentorship. As reported by mentees, “UIL Concert” ranked first in formal mentorships and a close second in informal mentorships, which confirms the idea that Texas choral directors focus a great deal of time and energy preparing for UIL Concert. Additionally, “Curriculum & Instruction” ranked in the second quartile of assistance given with both mentors and mentees, which was the second of only two skills that were similarly ranked between both styles of mentoring.

The remaining six music related skills ranked in the top half of assistance given differed between formal and informal mentorships, again supporting the notion that mentees not only perceive skills differently depending on the style of mentorship in which they engage but also receive different type of assistance.

Of particular importance in evaluating effective mentoring is the comparison of the novice's perceived importance of certain music-related skills with the assistance they report receiving from veteran educators. That is to say, did assistance provided align with the mentee's perceived importance of said skill? In formal mentorships, 12 out of 16 categories (75%) were misaligned between the mentee's perceived importance and assistance given, meaning that mentees were given more help in areas that were less important to them and less help in areas that were more important to them. In informal mentorships, the same misalignment was discovered in 9 out of 16 categories (56%). While slightly better, this incongruity between the mentees' needs and assistance provided by mentors is cause for concern. The following are instances where mentees in an informal mentorship received more help in areas that were less important to them:

- "UIL Concert" ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the first quartile of assistance given.
- "Music Program and Administration" ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the first quartile of assistance given.
- "UIL Sight Reading" ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the first quartile of assistance given.
- "All-Region/All-State" ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the first quartile of assistance given.
- "Advocacy" ranked in the third quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.

- “Ethnic/Multicultural Music” ranked in the fourth quartile of perceived importance by the third quartile of assistance given.
- “Arranging/Composing” ranked in the fourth quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.

Mentors and mentees in informal mentorships ranked “UIL Concert” and “UIL Sight Reading” in the second quartile of perceived importance behind five other music related skills; however, both UIL components ranked first in assistance given by both mentors and mentees. According to mentees, these were the top two areas of assistance provided. It is no secret that in the state of Texas, UIL Concert and Sight Reading contest is an important measure of success for students and directors alike; however, it can also overwhelm all involved when focus shifts from assessing musical competence to pure competition. In an article outlining the pros and cons of music competition (Buyer, 2005), one of the most alarming trends is students becoming conditioned to respond only to motivation associated with competition. Another competitive area of music related skills that was misaligned was “All-Region/All-State.” Although mentors and mentees ranked it in the third and second quartiles, respectively, in perceived importance, mentees ranked it first in assistance provided. Again, there is often a great deal of outside pressure on choral directors to perform in the competition arena, but it is important to make sure that mentees receive help in areas that matter to them and that offer a balanced approach to teaching. Mentees ranked four other skills ahead of UIL and All-Region/All-State, yet the top areas of assistance provided were in the latter categories. In order to provide effective mentoring, the mentor either needs to help the mentee reprioritize issues that may seem

misaligned or the mentor needs to make sure assistance is provided in areas that matter to the mentee. Either way, effective communication between mentor and mentee is key (Callahan, 2016; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011).

Additionally, the following are instances where mentees in an informal mentorship received less help in areas that were more important to them:

- “Conducting” ranked in the third quartile of perceived importance but the fourth quartile of assistance given.
- “General Music Knowledge” ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.

Novice directors rated conducting at 81% importance to their success as a choral music educator; however, the rate of assistance was 29%, a difference of 52 percentage points. Although conducting did rank in the third quartile of perceived importance with mentees, the skills ranked above it at 86% were in a five-way tie. In a study of undergraduate music education majors enrolled in conducting (Silvey & Major, 2014), participants expressed an uncertainty in their leadership as musicians and only began to gain awareness of the complexities of conducting after standing before an ensemble. Effective non-verbal communication is an important piece of making music with and for our students, and if mentees only perceive less than 20% of all other music related skills to be more important than conducting, informal mentors perhaps need to offer assistance in this area to better meet the needs of their mentees and ultimately their students.

Additionally, “General Music Knowledge” was rated at 86% in perceived importance and 38% in assistance given, a difference of 48 percentage points. This area held a five-way

tie with UIL Concert, UIL Sight Reading, All-Region/All-State, and Music Literacy, but was the only area that dropped between perceived importance and assistance given.

“Music Literacy” remained in the second quartile of assistance given, and the remaining three categories moved up to the first quartile, as reported by novice educators. What is even more startling is that veteran educators rated the perceived importance of general music knowledge at 80% and self-reported assistance provided at 50%, a different of 30 percentage points. If this is an area that both mentors and mentees perceive as important, it is interesting that not much assistance is provided. If we look through a half-glass-full lens, it is possible that while novice educators perceive this skill as important, perhaps they neither asked nor received assistance in this area because they already had a firm grasp from their undergraduate music courses.

The same process was applied to formal mentorships, which revealed 12 out of 16 categories (75%) misaligned between the mentee’s perceived importance of a specific skill and the amount of assistance they reported. The following are instances where mentees in a formal mentorship received more help in areas that were less important to them:

- “Music Program and Administration” ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but in the first quartile of assistance given.
- “Advocacy” ranked in the third quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.
- “Piano Accompanist” ranked in the fourth quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.

- “Ethnic/Multicultural Music” ranked in the fourth quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.

It is important to note that overall perceived importance averaged to 73% as reported by the mentees, while they reported actual assistance provided at 26%. When comparing actual percentages between mentee’s perceived importance and assistance they reported, it appears that mentees received less help in areas that were more important to them in all categories, which is why this study ranked the percentages accordingly and compared rankings, not raw data. For instance, “Music Program Administration” was rated 78% (second quartile) in perceived importance, but assistance provided was rated at 44% (which ranked in the first quartile of this string of low data). This particular skill fell behind six other skills in perceived importance but came in second, just after UIL Concert in actual assistance provided. The actual daily operations of running a secondary choral program are important, and this is an area where mentors could have worked with their mentees to help them understand and reprioritize its importance, so that mentee’s perceived importance and assistance provided were more closely aligned.

Additionally, the following are instances where mentees in a formal mentorship received less help in areas that were more important to them:

- “Teaching Materials” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.
- “Rehearsal Technique” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.

- “UIL Sight Reading” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.
- “Music Literacy” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the second quartile of assistance given.
- “General Music Knowledge” ranked in the first quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.
- “Conducting” ranked in the second quartile of perceived importance but the third quartile of assistance given.
- “Music Technology” ranked in the third quartile of perceived importance but the fourth quartile of assistance given.
- “Piano Skills” ranked in the third quartile of perceived importance and the fourth quartile of assistance given.

The area of “Teaching Materials” was rated 100% important to novice educators; however, the assistance reported in this area was 39%. In my own undergraduate experience, we often taught with outdated or out-of-adoption textbooks, and technology integration was nearly non-existent. When I began teaching, I had a lot to learn about curriculum, textbooks, and teaching materials, and this research suggests that all of the participants in this study also perceived these materials as crucial to their teaching success. The fact that they were left alone nearly 60% of the time to figure out the best teaching materials is cause for concern. Even more so is the fact that mentors reported assistance at 90%, compared to the mentee’s 39%, a difference of 51 percentage points.

The overwhelming help that mentors report in this area is not being perceived as such by mentees, and the existing research calls for mentors to be intentional about the assistance they provide to novice educators (Haack, 2000). Another large discrepancy exists in the area of “General Music Knowledge.” Mentees rated this at 83% perceived importance and reported assistance only 22% of the time, a difference of 61 percentage points. This staggering difference is also concerning. Had the survey included a question that allowed mentees to rate perceived importance, assistance provided, and need for assistance, we would be able to more clearly determine if the drop in assistance was due to the mentee already being strong in this area, as opposed to the area being overlooked. Without that data, all we know is that mentees do think the skill is important, but they did not receive much help in the area. Another area of concern was “Music Literacy.” Mentees ranked this skill as 83% important but reported assistance at 28%, a difference of 55 percentage points. Teaching young musicians to read music is one of the most important skills we build in our students. The fact that novice educators were left to figure out this skill on their own nearly 45% of the time is concerning, especially when it ranked in the first quartile of importance before falling to the second quartile in assistance given (after seven other skills). The landscape of educational assessment is changing, and choral music educators need to remain on the cutting edge, not fall behind, when it comes to teaching and assessing music literacy in young singers (Henry, 2014). Also noteworthy is the fact that “General Music Knowledge” dropped from the first quartile of perceived importance to the third quartile of assistance provided. One final area with a large misalignment was the area of conducting. Mentees in formal mentorships ranked it as a

skill that was 72% important to their success as an educator but reported only receiving assistance 17% of the time, a difference of 55 percentage points. If we take the glass-half-full approach, the discrepancy can be credited to the mentee having a clear understanding of his conducting skills. If we take a glass-half-empty approach, this is yet another area where mentors failed to meet the needs of their mentees. As previously stated, many novice music educators feel inadequate in their undergraduate conducting preparation, so this is an area that needs further guidance post-college (Silvey & Major, 2014).

Overall, when it comes to perceived importance, mentees in informal mentorships aligned with their mentors on approximately 63% of the music related skills compared with their counterparts in formal mentorships, who only aligned with their mentors on 44% of music related skills. When it came to reporting assistance, mentees in informal mentorships ranked approximately 56% of skills in the same quartile reported by their mentors while mentees in formal mentorships ranked only 50% of the skills in the same quartile. Lastly, when comparing mentees' perceived importance with the assistance they report receiving, the data still leans toward informal mentoring. The mentees' perceived importance and the assistance they received were aligned approximately 44% of the time, meaning they received assistance in areas they believed were important to their teaching. Comparatively, mentees in formal mentorships found their perceived importance align with assistance given only 15% of the time. While there is certainly work to be done in both styles of mentoring, it would appear that informal mentoring of music related skills presents a stronger case in the three areas measured by this study.

Recommendations for Further Study

One limitation of this study was its small sample size. The survey was conducted during the final preparation window for UIL Concert and Sight Reading, and directors may have been too overwhelmed to respond to the survey at that time. Furthermore, the length of the survey may have resulted in survey fatigue, leading to fewer respondents completing the survey. For future studies, I would suggest a separate survey for mentors and a separate survey for mentees. This would also streamline the process of reviewing data and analyzing statistics from the researcher's perspective. Future researchers should also include a survey component that allows respondents to indicate intent to remain in the profession. This study does not tie retention to mentoring, which would present an even stronger case for mentoring novice educators.

This study revealed that, overall, informal mentoring has a greater impact on novice choral educators than formal mentoring. This study was designed under the assumption that from a veteran educator's perspective, the type of assistance offered would not differ between formal or informal mentorship. With this piece of the data remaining constant, this study revealed that it is mentees who bring a different set of expectations to the table, depending on whether the mentorship is formal or informal. Future studies might include a qualitative piece in order to gather more detailed information from mentees about how and why they engage in informal mentoring and find it more impactful. Furthermore, where and what is the disconnection in formal mentoring that leads mentees to perceive the experience so differently? Additional studies utilizing this framework or a similar framework could also outline the mentoring

needs of early career elementary music specialists, early career band educators, and early career orchestra educators and perhaps even extend the study to all other content areas beneath the umbrella of visual and performing arts. Mentoring is a crucial component to the success of novice educators, and making sure that it is intentional and effective will help future choral educators, their students, and the future of choral music in the state of Texas and beyond.

REFERENCES

- Alliance for Excellent Education. (2014). *On the path to equity: Improving the effectiveness of beginning teachers*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved from <http://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/PathToEquity.pdf>
- Andrew, M., & Schwab, R. L. (1995). Has reform in teacher education influenced teacher performance? An outcome assessment of graduates of eleven teacher education programs. *Action in Teacher Education*, 17, 43-53.
- Arnold, C. L., Choy, S. P., & Bobbitt, S. A. (1993). *Modeling teacher supply and demand, with commentary*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Baker, V. (2007). Relationship between job satisfaction and the perception of administrative support among early career secondary choral music educators. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 17(1), 77-90.
- Baur, W. (2001). Classroom management for ensembles. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(6), 27-32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3399689>
- Bickmore S. T., & Bickmore, D. L. (2010). Revealing the principal's role in the induction process: Novice teachers telling their stories. *Journal of School Leadership*, 20(4), 445-469.

- Black, S. (2004). Helping teachers helps keep them around. *Education Digest*, 70(4), 46-51.
- Breaux, A. L., & Wong, H. K. (2003). *New teacher induction: How to train, support, and retain new teachers*. Mountain View, CA: Wong Publications.
- Blair, D. V. (2008). Mentoring novice teachers: Developing a community of practice. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 30(2), 99-117.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X08097502>
- Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, break all the rules: What the world's greatest managers do differently*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Buyer, P. (2005). Teaching the values of competition. *Teaching Music*, 13(1), 28-31.
Retrieved from:
<http://www.paulbuyer.com/article/PBuyer-2005-ValuesofCompetition.pdf>
- Callahan, J. (2016). Encouraging retention of new teachers through mentoring strategies. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 83(1), 6-11.
- Colley, A. C. (2002). What can principals do about new teacher attrition? *Principal*, 81(4), 22-24.
- Conway, C. (2007). Setting an agenda for professional development policy, practice, and research in music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 17(1), 56-61.
[doi:10.1177/10570837070170010109](https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837070170010109)
- Conway, C. (2015). Beginning music teacher mentor practices: Reflections on the past and suggestions for the future. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 24(2), 88-102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083713512837>

- Conway, C. M. (2003). An examination of district-sponsored beginning music teacher mentor practices. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(1), 6.
doi:10.2307/3345645
- Conway, C. M. (2006). Navigating through induction: How a mentor can help. *Music Educators Journal*, 92(5), 56-60. doi:10.2307/3878504
- Conway, C. M., & Christensen, S. (2006). Professional development and the beginning music teacher. *Contributions to Music Education*, 33(1), 9-25.
- Conway, C. M., Krueger, P., Robinson, M., Haack, P., & Smith, M. V. (2002). Beginning music teacher induction and mentor policies: A cross-state perspective. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 104(2), 9. doi:10.1080/10632910209605998
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 6-13.
- DeLuca, C., & Bolden, B. (2014). Music performance assessment. *Music Educators Journal*, 101(1), 70-76. doi:10.1177/0027432114540336
- DeLorenzo, L. C. (1992). The perceived problems of beginning music teachers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 113, 9-25.
- Desimone, L. M., Hochberg, E. D., Porter, A. C., Polikoff, M. S., Schwartz, R., & Johnson, L. J. (2014). Formal and informal mentoring: Complementary, compensatory, or consistent? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(2), 88-110.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113511643>
- Dillon, N. (2009). Pay attention to retention. *American School Board Journal*, 196(9), 26-29.

- Edgar, S. (2012). Communication of expectations between principals and entry-year instrumental music teachers: Implications for music teacher assessment. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 113(4), 136-146. doi:10.1080/10632913.2012.719426
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2003). What new teachers need to learn. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 25-29.
- Gallant, A., & Riley, P. (2014). Early career teacher attrition: New thoughts on an intractable problem. *Teacher Development*, 18(4), 562-580.
doi:10.1080/13664530.2014.945129
- Haack, P. A. (2006). Mentoring and professional development programs: Possibilities and pitfalls. *Music Educators Journal*, 92(4), 60-64. doi:10.2307/3401114
- Haack, P., & Smith, M. V. (2000). Mentoring new music teachers. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(3), 23. doi:10.2307/3399659
- Haberman, M. (2005). Raising teacher salaries: The funds are there. *Education*, 125(4), 327-342.
- Hancock, C. B. (2000). National estimates of retention, migration, and attrition: A multiyear comparison of music and non-music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 57(2), 92-107. doi:10.1177/0022429409337299
- Harrell, P., Leavell, A., van Tassel, F., & McKee, K. (2004). No teacher left behind: Results of a five-year study of teacher attrition. *Action in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 47-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2004.10463323>

- Henry, M. (2014). Vocal sight-reading assessment: Technological advances, student perceptions, and instructional implications. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 33(2), 58-64. doi:10.1177/8755123314547908
- Hill, W. L., Jr. (2003). The teacher shortage and policy. *Music Educators Journal*, 89(4), 6-7. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3399893>
- Hochberg, E. D., Desimone, L. M., Porter, A. C., Polikoff, M. S., Shwartz, R., & Johnson, L. J. (2015). A hybrid approach benefits beginning teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(8), 70-72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721715583968>
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2002). Holes in the teacher supply bucket. *School Administrator*, 59, 42. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/128
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323>
- Johanson, D. E. (2008). A study of the comparative perceptions of non-tenured and tenured music teachers and music supervisors regarding the needs and concerns of the teacher in music performance education. *Research & Issues in Music Education*, 6(3). Retrieved from <http://ir.stthomas.edu/rime/vol6/iss1/5>
- Kahrs, B., & Wells, S. (2012). Authentic mentoring: What matters most in the growth and development of beginning teachers. *National Forum of Educational Administration & Supervision Journal*, 29(3), 40-50.

- Killian, J. N., & Baker, V. D. (2006). The effect of personal and situational factors in the attrition and retention of Texas music educators. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 16(1), 41-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837060160010106>
- Kimpton, J. (2005). What to do about music teacher education: Our profession at a crossroads. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 14(2), 8-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837050140020103>
- Klug, B. J., & Salzman, S. A. (1991). Formal induction vs. informal mentoring: Comparative effects and outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(3), 241-251.
- Krueger, P. J. (1999). New music teachers speak out on mentoring. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 8(2), 7-13. doi:10.1177/105708379900800203
- Krueger, P. J. (2000). Beginning music teachers: Will they leave the profession? *Applications of Research in Music Education*, 19(1), 22-26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875512330001900105>
- Krueger, P. J. (2001). Reflections of beginning music teachers. *Music Educators Journal*, 88(3), 51. doi:10.2307/3399759
- Luther, V., & Richman, L. J. (2009). Teacher attrition: Listening to teachers to find a solution. *Academic Leadership*, 7(4), 22-26.
- Madsen, C. K., & Hancock, C. B. (2002). Support for music education: A case study of issues concerning teacher retention and attrition. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50(1), 6-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632910209600035>

- McCann, T. M., Johannessen, L. R., & Ricca, B. (2005). Responding to new teachers' concerns. *Education Leadership*, 62(8), 30-34.
- McIlhagga, S. D. (2006). Factors that affect perceived mentor effectiveness and teacher retention among beginning secondary music educators in the state of Michigan. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67, 2411A.
- Mee, M., & Haverback, H. R. (2014). Commitment, preparation, and early career frustrations: Examining future attrition of middle school teachers. *American Secondary Education*, 42(3), 39-51.
- Menchaca, V. D. (2003). A wake-up call for principals: Are your novice teachers leaving? *Catalyst for Change*, 33(1), 25-27.
- Minarik, M. M., Thornton, B., & Perreault, G. (2003). Systems thinking can improve teacher retention. *Clearing House*, 76(5), 230-234.
doi:10.1080/00098650309602010.
- Montague, M. G. (2001). Processes and situatedness: A collective case study of selected mentored music teachers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 2639A.
- Moore, A. (2016). Stepping up support for new teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 73(8), 60-64.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *Public school teacher attrition and mobility in the first five years: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007-08 beginning teacher longitudinal study*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015337.pdf>

- Reese, J. (2007). The four cs of successful classroom management: The music educator's job is easier if the classroom offers a positive and challenging environment. *Music Educators Journal*, 94(1), 24-29.
- Robertson, M., Hancock, D., & Allen, L. A., (2006). Why novice teachers leave. *Principal Leadership: Middle Level Edition*, 6(8), 33-36.
- Rowley, J. B. (1999). The good mentor. *Educational Leadership*, 56(8), 20-22.
- Roulston, K., Legette, R., & Womack, S. (2005). Beginning music teachers' perceptions of the transition from university to teaching in schools. *Music Education Research*, 7(1), 59-82. doi:10.1080/14613800500042141
- Salvador, K. (2013). Inclusion of people with special needs in choral settings: A review of applicable research and professional literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 31(2), 37-44. doi:10.1177/8755123312473760
- Scheib, J. W. (2004). Why band directors leave: From the mouths of maestros. *Music Educators Journal*, 91(1), 53-57. doi:10.2307/3400106
- Shann, M. (1998). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *Journal of Education Research*, 92(2), 67-73.
doi:10.1080/00220679809597578
- Silvey, B. A. & Major, M. L. (2014). Undergraduate music education majors' perceptions of their development as conductors: insights from a basic conducting course. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 36(1), 75-89.
doi:10.1177/1321103X14523532

- Singh, K., & Billingsley, B. (1996). Intent to stay in teaching. *Remedial and Special Education, 17*, 37-48. doi:10.1177/074193259601700105
- Smith, M. V. (1994). The mentoring and professional development of new music educators: A descriptive study of a pilot program. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55*, 2759.
- Stamer, R. A. (2004). Choral student perceptions of the music contest experience. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 22*(2), 5-12. doi. 10.1177/87551233040220020102
- Texas Education Agency. (2017a). *Employed teacher demographics 2012-2016*. Austin, TX: M. C. Ramsay. Retrieved from: https://tea.texas.gov/Reports_and_Data/Educator_Data/Educator_Reports_and_Data/
- Texas Education Agency. (2017b). *Experience of math and science teachers 2012 2016*. Austin, TX: M. C. Ramsay. Retrieved from: https://tea.texas.gov/Reports_and_Data/Educator_Data/Educator_Reports_and_Data/
- Texas Education Agency. (2017c). *Enrollment in Texas Public Schools 2016-17*. Austin, TX: Retrieved from: https://tea.texas.gov/acctres/enroll_index.html
- Tillman, B. A. (2000). Quiet leadership: Informal mentoring of beginning teachers. *Momentum, 31*(1), 24-26.
- Watkins, P. (2005). The principal's role in attracting, retaining, and developing new teachers: Three strategies for collaboration and support. *Clearing House, 79*(2), 83-87. doi:10.3200/TCHS.79.2.83-87
- Weasmer, J., & Woods, A. M. (2000). Preventing baptism by fire: Fostering growth in

- new teachers. *Clearing House*, 73(3), 171-173. doi:10.1080/00098650009600941
- Wilcox, E. (2000). Recruiting for the profession. *Teaching Music*, 8(2), 25-31.
- Wilkinson, G. A. (1994). Support for individualizing teacher induction. *Action in Teacher Education*, 16(2), 57-62.
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2000). *Supply and demand of educational personnel for Wisconsin public schools: An examination of data trends*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved from <https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/tepd/pdfs/supdem2000.pdf>
- Wood, A. L. (2005). The importance of principals: Site administrators' roles in novice teacher induction. *American Secondary Education*, 33(2), 39-62.
- Yourn, B. R. (2000). Learning to teach: Perspectives from beginning music teachers. *Music Education Research*, 2(2), 181-192.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14613800050165631>
- Yost, D. S. (2006). Reflection and self-efficacy: Enhancing the retention of qualified teachers from a teacher education perspective. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(4), 59-76.

APPENDIX A

IRB Letter of Approval



Institutional Review Board
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
P.O. Box 425619, Denton, TX 76204-5619
940-898-3378
email: IRB@twu.edu
<http://www.twu.edu/irb.html>

DATE: February 16, 2017

TO: Mr. Marcus Jauregui
Music & Drama

FROM: Institutional Review Board (IRB) - Denton

Re: *Exemption for Perceptions of Early Career Choral Music Educators and Mentors toward Effective Mentoring Practices (Protocol #: 19438)*

The above referenced study has been reviewed by the TWU IRB (operating under FWA00000178) and was determined to be exempt from further review.

If applicable, agency approval letters must be submitted to the IRB upon receipt PRIOR to any data collection at that agency. Because a signed consent form is not required for exempt studies, the filing of signatures of participants with the TWU IRB is not necessary.

Although your protocol has been exempted from further IRB review and your protocol file has been closed, any modifications to this study must be submitted for review to the IRB using the Modification Request Form. Additionally, the IRB must be notified immediately of any adverse events or unanticipated problems. All forms are located on the IRB website. If you have any questions, please contact the TWU IRB.

cc. Dr. Pamela Youngblood, Music & Drama
Dr. Vicki Baker, Music & Drama
Graduate School

APPENDIX B

Letter of Recruitment

Letter of Recruitment

My name is Marcus Jauregui, and I am currently a graduate student in music education at Texas Woman's University. Under the supervision of my professor, Vicki Baker, PhD, I am in the process of collecting data for my thesis entitled "Perceptions of Early Career Choral Music Educators and Mentors toward Effective Mentoring Practices."

The purpose of this study is to assess both formal and informal mentoring practices among Texas secondary choral directors to discern whether mentors and mentees place the same value on assistance with various musical and non-musical tasks. Mentors will be categorized as formal (assigned by an outside entity) and informal (selected by the mentee).

If you are a secondary choral music educator in Texas, please complete the survey at the link below:

www.tinyurl.com/zcjb7vg

Completion of the survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes.

By completing this survey, you are indicating consent to participation in the study. While there is a potential risk of loss of confidentiality in all email, downloading, and internet transactions, the data will remain confidential as far as possible in compliance with state and federal law. An additional risk is the loss of time. Since the survey is online, you can take the survey whenever it is convenient. You may stop at any time, take breaks, and come back to the survey.

Participation in this study is voluntary and you may stop at any time. If you are interested in the results of this survey, you can contact me at mjauregui@twu.edu.

Thank you for your participation in my research.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jauregui
M.A. in Music Education Candidate
Texas Woman's University
Department of Music and Drama
mjauregui@twu.edu

This research study has been reviewed and approved by Texas Woman's University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

APPENDIX C

Mentorship of Early Career Choral Directors Survey

Mentorship of Early Career Secondary Choral Directors Survey

Thank you for participating in this anonymous survey. The return of your completed questionnaire constitutes your informed consent to act as a participant in this research.

* Required

1. Are you currently employed as a secondary choral director in the state of Texas? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes Skip to question 2.
- ☐ No Stop filling out this form.

Participant Profile

2. Gender *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

3. Current Teaching Position *

Select all that apply -

Check all that apply.

- ☐ High School - Head Choral Director
- ☐ High School - Assistant Choral Director
- ☐ Middle School - Head Choral Director
- ☐ Middle School - Assistant Choral Director
- ☐ Other: _____

4. First Year Teaching Position *

Select all that apply -

Check all that apply.

- ☐ High School - Head Choral Director
- ☐ High School - Assistant Choral Director
- ☐ Middle School - Head Choral Director
- ☐ Middle School - Assistant Choral Director
- ☐ Elementary Music
- ☐ Other: _____

5. Grade level(s) you currently teach *

Select all that apply -
Check all that apply.

- ☐ 6th
- ☐ 7th
- ☐ 8th
- ☐ 9th
- ☐ 10th
- ☐ 11th
- ☐ 12th

6. Best describe the demographic profile of your current district: *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Urban
- ☐ Suburban
- ☐ Rural

7. Best describe the demographic profile of your school district during your first year teaching: *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Still in the same district
- ☐ Urban
- ☐ Suburban
- ☐ Rural

8. Select the region of Texas in which you currently teach: *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ North Texas
- ☐ South Texas
- ☐ East Texas
- ☐ West Texas
- ☐ Central Texas
- ☐ Panhandle

9. Select the region of Texas in which you taught during your first year. *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Did not teach in Texas
- ☐ North Texas
- ☐ South Texas
- ☐ East Texas
- ☐ West Texas
- ☐ Central Texas
- ☐ Panhandle

10. Number of years you have taught (including the current school year) *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ 1 Skip to question 11.
- ☐ 2 Skip to question 11.
- ☐ 3 Skip to question 11.
- ☐ 4 Skip to question 11.
- ☐ 5 Skip to question 11.
- ☐ Other: _____ Skip to question 108.

Formal Mentorship

A formal mentor is assigned by a third party (campus administrator, school district, etc.)

11. During your first five years of teaching, were you assigned a formal mentor? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No Skip to question 20.

Formal Mentor Profile

12. How many formal mentors have you had? *

13. My formal mentor and I were of the same gender. *

If you had more than one formal mentor, please select one primary formal mentor and answer the following questions with him or her in mind.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no

14. Approximate number of years of teaching experience your formal mentor had at the time of your mentorship

15. Who assigned your formal mentor? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Campus
- ☐ School District
- ☐ Fine Arts Director
- ☐ Texas Music Educators Association
- ☐ Certification Program
- ☐ Other: _____

16. During which years of your teaching career have you had a formal mentor? *

Check all that apply.

- ☐ 1st year
- ☐ 2nd year
- ☐ 3rd year
- ☐ 4th year
- ☐ 5th year

17. Where was your formal mentor located? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ On your campus
- ☐ On a different campus in your ISD
- ☐ In your ISD administrative offices
- ☐ On a different campus in a different ISD
- ☐ Retired
- ☐ Other: _____

18. Was your formal mentor a music educator? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes Skip to question 28.
- ☐ No Skip to question 26.

Mentee Profile

19. Approximately how many mentees have you had? *

20. My mentee(s) and I were of the same gender. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
never	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	always

21. I have most often mentored early career secondary choral directors during their... *

select all that apply

Check all that apply.

- ☐ 1st year of teaching
- ☐ 2nd year of teaching
- ☐ 3rd year of teaching
- ☐ 4th year of teaching
- ☐ 5th year of teaching

22. I have been assigned to serve as a formal mentor by the following entities: *

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Campus
- ☐ School District
- ☐ Fine Arts Director
- ☐ Texas Music Educators Association
- ☐ Certification Program
- ☐ I have never been assigned as a formal mentor
- ☐ Other: _____

23. During which years of your teaching career have you served as a mentor? *

24. My mentee(s) are most often located *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ On my campus
- ☐ On a different campus in my ISD
- ☐ On a different campus in a different ISD

Informal Mentorship

An informal mentor is any educator or administrator who has not been assigned by a third party to assist a beginning teacher.

25. In your experience as an Informal mentor, who has most often initiated the mentorship? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ yourself
- ☐ the mentee
- ☐ both
- ☐ I have never served in an Informal mentorship

Skip to question 50.

Formal Mentor (Non-Music)

26. What was your formal mentor's job assignment? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ School Administrator
- ☐ District Administrator
- ☐ Non-music Educator (Active)
- ☐ Non-music Educator (Retired)
- ☐ Other: _____

27. Please indicate the non-music content area that best describes your formal mentor's area of expertise. *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Math
- ☐ Science
- ☐ Social Studies
- ☐ Language Arts
- ☐ Fine Arts
- ☐ Career and Technology Education
- ☐ Other

Skip to question 30.

Formal Mentor (Music)

26. What was your formal mentor's area of specialization? *

Select all that apply -
Check all that apply.

- ☐ Middle School Choral Director
☐ High School Choral Director
☐ Band Director
☐ Orchestra Director
☐ Fine Arts Director
☐ Elementary Music Specialist
☐ Other: _____

Skip to question 30.

Informal Mentor

An informal mentor is any educator or administrator you select to provide you with guidance.

29. Are you currently being informally mentored or were you informally mentored during your first 5 years? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
☐ No Stop filling out this form.

Informal Mentor Profile

If you had more than one informal mentor, please select one primary informal mentor and answer the following questions with him or her in mind.

30. What prompted you to seek an informal mentor? *

31. My informal mentor and I were of the same gender. *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ yes
☐ no

32. Approximate number of years your informal mentor taught at the time of your mentorship *

33. Where was your Informal mentor located? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ On your campus
- ☐ On a different campus in same ISD
- ☐ In administrative offices in same ISD
- ☐ On a campus in a different ISD
- ☐ Retired
- ☐ Other: _____

34. During which years of your teaching career did you have an informal mentor? *

Select all that apply.
Check all that apply.

- ☐ 1st year
- ☐ 2nd year
- ☐ 3rd year
- ☐ 4th year
- ☐ 5th year

35. Was your Informal mentor a music educator? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes Skip to question 36.
- ☐ No Skip to question 37.

Informal Mentor (Music)

36. What was your Informal mentor's area of specialization? *

Check all that apply.

- ☐ High School Choral Director
- ☐ Middle School Choral Director
- ☐ Band Director
- ☐ Orchestra Director
- ☐ Fine Arts Director
- ☐ Elementary Music Specialist
- ☐ University Music Faculty
- ☐ Other: _____

Skip to question 82.

Informal Mentor (Non-Music)

37. What was your informal mentor's job assignment? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ School Administrator
☐ District Administrator
☐ Non-music Educator (Active)
☐ Non-music Educator (Retired)
☐ Other: _____

38. Please indicate the non-music content area that best describes your informal mentor's area of expertise *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Math
☐ Science
☐ Social Studies
☐ Language Arts
☐ Fine Arts
☐ Career and Technology Education
☐ Other

Skip to question 82.

Formal Mentor's Assistance/Helpfulness (non-music related skills)

For each of the following twelve (12) general (non-music) teaching skills, use the scale below each statement to indicate your level of agreement/disagreement and your level of concern for each.

Classroom Management and Discipline

39. My formal mentor assisted me with my classroom management and discipline. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

40. Classroom management and discipline were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Planning and Organization

41. **My formal mentor assisted me with my daily class planning and organization.** *
- Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

42. **Daily class planning and organization were Important to my teaching effectiveness.** *
- Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Evaluation and Grading

43. **My formal mentor assisted me with student evaluation and grading.** *
- Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

44. **Student evaluation and grading were Important to my teaching effectiveness.** *
- Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Special Learner Accommodations

45. **My formal mentor assisted me with special learner accommodations.** *
- Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

46. **Special learner accommodations were Important to my teaching effectiveness.** *
- Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Understanding and Using Research

47. My formal mentor assisted me with understanding and using research-based practices. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

48. Understanding and using research-based practices was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Computer Skills (non-music)

49. My formal mentor assisted me with computer skills (non-music). *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

50. Computer skills were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Politics and Procedures

51. My formal mentor assisted me with my knowledge of administrative and political structures and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

52. Knowledge of administrative and political structures and procedures was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Fundraising

53. My formal mentor assisted me with my knowledge of fundraising best practices.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

54. Knowledge of fundraising best practices was important to my teaching effectiveness.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Program Budget

55. My formal mentor assisted me with maintaining and utilizing my departmental budget.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

56. Maintaining and utilizing my departmental budget was important to my teaching effectiveness.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Parent Collaboration

57. My formal mentor assisted me with knowledge of collaborating with parent organizations.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Fundraising

53. My formal mentor assisted me with my knowledge of fundraising best practices.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

54. Knowledge of fundraising best practices was important to my teaching effectiveness.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Program Budget

55. My formal mentor assisted me with maintaining and utilizing my departmental budget.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

56. Maintaining and utilizing my departmental budget was important to my teaching effectiveness.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Parent Collaboration

57. My formal mentor assisted me with knowledge of collaborating with parent organizations.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

63. I provided assistance with my mentee's student evaluation and grading. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

64. Student evaluation and grading were important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Special Learner Accommodations

65. I provided assistance with my mentee's special learner accommodations. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

66. Special learner accommodations were important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Understanding and Using Research

67. I provided assistance with my mentee's understanding and use of research-based practices. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

68. Understanding and using research-based practices were important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Computer Skills (non-music)

69. I provided assistance with my mentee's computer skills (non-music). *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

70. Computer skills (non-music) were important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Politics and Procedures

71. I provided assistance with my mentee's knowledge of administrative and political structures and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

72. Knowledge of administrative and political structures and procedures was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Fundraising

73. I provided assistance with my mentee's knowledge of fundraising best practices. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

74. Knowledge of fundraising best practices was Important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Program Budget

75. I assisted my mentee with maintaining and utilizing his/her departmental budget. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

76. Knowledge of maintaining and utilizing his/her departmental budget was Important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Parent Collaboration

77. I assisted my mentee with knowledge of collaborating with parent organizations. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

78. Knowledge of collaborating with parent organizations was Important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

All-Region/All-State

79. I assisted my mentee with understanding all-region/all-state rules and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

80. Understanding all-region/all-state rules and procedures was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Open Ended Response

81. What skills do you believe early career choral directors most need, and what advice would you give to others who are serving as a mentor of an early career choral director?

Skip to question 135.

Informal Mentor's Assistance/Helpfulness (non-music related skills)

For each of the following twelve (12) general (non-music) teaching skills, use the scale below each statement to indicate your level of agreement/disagreement and your level of concern for each.

Classroom Management and Discipline

82. My informal mentor assisted me with my classroom management and discipline. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

83. Classroom management and discipline were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Planning and Organization

84. My informal mentor assisted me with my daily class planning and organization. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

85. Daily class planning and organization were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Evaluation and Grading

86. My informal mentor assisted me with student evaluation and grading. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

87. Student evaluation and grading were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Special Learner Accommodations

88. My informal mentor assisted me with special learner accommodations. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

89. Special learner accommodations were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Understanding and Using Research

90. My Informal mentor assisted me with understanding and using research-based practices. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

91. Understanding and using research-based practices were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Computer Skills (non-music)

92. My Informal mentor assisted me with computer skills (non-music). *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

93. Computer skills (non-music) were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Politics and Procedures

94. My Informal mentor assisted me with my knowledge of administrative and political structures and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

95. Administrative and political structures and procedures were Important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Fundraising

96. My Informal mentor assisted me with my knowledge of fundraising best practices. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

97. Knowledge of fundraising best practices was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Program Budget

98. My Informal mentor assisted me with maintaining and utilizing my departmental budget. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

99. Maintaining and utilizing my departmental budget was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Parent Collaboration

100. My informal mentor assisted me with knowledge of collaborating with parent organizations. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

101. Knowledge of collaborating with parent organizations was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Skip to question 105.

Formal Mentor's Assistance/Helpfulness (music related skills)

For each of the following sixteen (16) skills specific to music teaching, use the scale below each statement to indicate your level of agreement/disagreement and your level of concern for each.

General Music Knowledge

102. My formal mentor assisted me with my general knowledge of music fundamentals, history, and literature. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

103. General knowledge of music fundamentals, history, and literature was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Teaching Materials

104. My formal mentor assisted me with recommendations of teaching materials, e.g., warm-ups, sight reading, choral music literature. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

105. Teaching materials, e.g., warm-ups, sight reading, and choral music literature were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Conducting

106. My formal mentor assisted me with my conducting skills. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

107. Conducting skills were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Piano Accompanist

108. My formal mentor assisted me with knowledge of communicating and collaborating with my piano accompanist. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

109. Knowledge of communicating and collaborating with my piano accompanist was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Arranging/Composing

110. My formal mentor assisted me with my arranging/composing skills. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

111. Arranging/composing skills were important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Piano Skills

112. My formal mentor assisted me with my piano skills. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

113. Piano skills were important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Rehearsal Technique

114. My formal mentor assisted me with my rehearsal technique. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

115. Rehearsal technique was important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Ethnic/Multi-cultural Music

116. My formal mentor assisted me with ethnic/multi-cultural music education. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

117. Ethnic/multi-cultural music education was important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Curriculum and Instruction

118. My formal mentor assisted me with my instructional design and curriculum development. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

119. Instructional design and curriculum development were important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Technology

120. My formal mentor assisted me with educational and musical technology. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

121. Educational and musical technology was important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Literacy

122. My formal mentor assisted me with understanding the mechanics of teaching music literacy to students. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

123. Understanding the mechanics of teaching music literacy to students was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Program Administration

124. My formal mentor assisted me with the administration of my choral program. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

125. The administration of my choral program was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Advocacy

126. My formal mentor assisted me with advocating for choral music education. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

127. Advocating for choral music education was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

UIL Concert

128. My formal mentor assisted me with understanding UIL concert rules and procedures. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

129. Understanding UIL concert rules and procedures was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

UIL Sight Reading

130. My formal mentor assisted me with understanding UIL sight reading rules and procedures. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

131. Understanding UIL sight reading rules and procedures was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

All-Region/All-State

132. My formal mentor assisted me with understanding all-region/all-state rules and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

133. Understanding all-region/all-state rules and procedures was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Open Ended Response

134. What assistance did you need (music or non-music) that you did not receive from formal mentoring and/or what advice would you give to those in a formal mentorship?

Skip to question 29.

Mentor's Assistance/Helpfulness (music related skills)

For each of the following sixteen (16) skills specific to music teaching, use the scale below each statement to indicate your level of agreement/disagreement and your level of concern for each.

General Music Knowledge

135. I provided assistance with my mentee's general knowledge of music fundamentals, history, and literature. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

136. General knowledge of music fundamentals, history, and literature was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Teaching Materials

137. I provided assistance with my mentee's knowledge of teaching materials, e.g., warm-ups, sight reading, and choral music literature. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

138. Knowledge of teaching materials, e.g., warm-ups, sight reading, and choral music literature was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Piano Accompanist

139. I assisted my mentee with knowledge of communicating and collaborating with his/her piano accompanist. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

140. Knowledge of communicating and collaborating with his/her piano accompanist was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Conducting

141. I provided assistance with my mentee's conducting skills. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

142. Conducting skills were Important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Arranging/Composing

143. I provided assistance with my mentee's arranging/composing skills. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

144. Arranging/composing skills were Important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Piano Skills

145. I provided assistance with my mentee's piano skills. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

146. Piano skills were Important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Rehearsal Technique

147. I provided assistance with my mentee's rehearsal technique. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

148. Rehearsal technique was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Ethnic/Multi-cultural Music

149. I provided assistance with my mentee's use of ethnic/multi-cultural music education. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

150. Ethnic/multi-cultural music education was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Curriculum and Instruction

151. I provided assistance with my mentee's instructional design and curriculum development. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

152. Instructional design and curriculum development were important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Technology

153. I provided assistance with my mentee's use of music technology. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

154. Music technology was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Literacy

155. I provided assistance with my mentee's understanding of the mechanics of teaching music literacy to students. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

156. Understanding the mechanics of teaching music literacy to students was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Program Administration

157. I provided assistance with my mentee's administration of his or her choral program. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

158. The administration of a choral program was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *
- Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Advocacy

159. I provided assistance with my mentee's understanding of advocating for choral music education. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

160. Advocating for choral music education was Important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

UIL Concert

161. I provided assistance with my mentee's understanding of UIL concert rules and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

162. Understanding UIL concert rules and procedures was Important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

UIL Sight Reading

163. I provided assistance with my mentee's understanding of UIL sight reading rules and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

164. Understanding UIL sight reading rules and procedures was important to my mentee's teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Stop filling out this form.

Informal Mentor's Assistance/Helpfulness (music related skills)

For each of the following sixteen (16) skills specific to music teaching, use the scale below each statement to indicate your level of agreement/disagreement and your level of concern for each.

General Music Knowledge

165. My informal mentor assisted me with my general knowledge of music fundamentals, history, and literature. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

166. General knowledge of music fundamentals, history, and literature was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Teaching Materials

167. My informal mentor assisted me with my knowledge of teaching materials, e.g., warm-ups, sight reading, and choral music literature. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

168. Knowledge of teaching materials, e.g., warm-ups, sight reading, and choral music literature was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Piano Accompanist

169. My informal mentor assisted me with how to communicate and collaborate with my piano accompanist. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

170. Communicating and collaborating with my piano accompanist was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Conducting

171. My informal mentor assisted me with my conducting skills. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

172. Conducting skills were important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Arranging/Composing

173. My informal mentor assisted me with my arranging/composing skills. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

174. **Composing/arranging skills were Important to my teaching effectiveness.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Piano Skills

175. **My Informal mentor assisted me with my piano skills.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

176. **Piano skills were Important to my teaching effectiveness.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Rehearsal Technique

177. **My Informal mentor assisted me with my rehearsal technique.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

178. **Rehearsal technique was Important to my teaching effectiveness.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Ethnic/Multi-cultural Music

179. **My Informal mentor assisted me with ethnic/multi-cultural music education.** *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

180. Ethnic/multi-cultural music education was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Curriculum and Instruction

181. My Informal mentor assisted me with my instructional design and curriculum development. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

182. Instructional design and curriculum development were Important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Technology

183. My Informal mentor assisted me with educational and musical technology. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

184. Educational and musical technology was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Literacy

185. My informal mentor assisted me with understanding the mechanics of teaching music literacy to students. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

186. Understanding the mechanics of teaching music literacy to students was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Music Program Administration

187. My informal mentor assisted me with the administration of my choral program. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

188. The administration of my choral program was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Advocacy

189. My informal mentor assisted me with advocating for choral music education. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

190. Advocating for choral music education was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

UIL Concert

191. My Informal mentor assisted me with understanding UIL concert rules and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

192. Understanding UIL concert rules and procedures was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

UIL Sight Reading

193. My Informal mentor assisted me with understanding UIL sight reading rules and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

194. Understanding UIL sight reading rules and procedures was Important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

All-Region/All-State

195. My Informal mentor assisted me with understanding all-region/all-state rules and procedures. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

196. Understanding all-region/all-state rules and procedures was important to my teaching effectiveness. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly Agree

Open Ended Response

197. What assistance did you need that you did not receive from Informal mentoring and/or what advice would you give to those seeking an Informal mentorship?

Stop filling out this form.

Served as a Mentor

198. Have you ever served as a mentor to an early career secondary choral director? *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes Skip to question 19.
- ☐ No Skip to question 11.

Untitled Section

Powered by
 Google Forms