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Thesis Committee Members: Dr. Theodore S. Rodgers,
       Ms. Bena Gul Peker
       Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

The aim of this study was to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of the
Colleague Mentoring Program (CMP) which is currently in its second year at the Eastern
Mediterranean University English Preparatory School in Northern Cyprus and to make the
suggestions for the development of the activities taking place within the program such as
group meetings, interviews and target settings initially intended as an inservice teacher
development. The researcher sought answers to the following questions: (a) To what
extent have the aims of the program been achieved? (b) What mentorship activities (group
meetings, interviews, target settings) are perceived as efficient in operation and most
productive for professional growth? (c) What mentorship activities (group meetings,
interviews, target settings) are perceived as insufficient in operation and least productive
for professional growth?

The instruments used in this study were questionnaires administered to 6 mentors
and 47 mentees and interviews held with 2 administrators and the current coordinator of
the CMP. In addition, the existing target-setting documents were analyzed for the purpose
of triangulation.
The findings of the study indicated that the aims of the CMP have been achieved to some extent. One of the major strengths of the CMP is that it provides opportunities for collaboration and cooperation among the colleagues at the institution. Another major strength is that the teachers become self-directing and some may even conduct surveys within the institution to make suggestions for the development of the areas which need considerations within the institution. The findings also indicated the strengths of the group meetings which were reported to provide opportunities for mentees to perform group initiated projects. A final finding of the study was about the personal interviews that were said to provide mentees with personal attention and they did not feel isolated in the big and continuously growing institution.

The major deficiencies of the CMP were reported to be related to the frequency of the group meetings, individual meetings and completion of the target settings initiated by the mentees. There are three individual meetings among mentors and mentees in a semester and mentees set two targets to achieve. Considering the results of the group meetings, the administrators and the coordinator prefer that mentees have meetings once a fortnight. However, mentors prefer to have the meetings once a week and for sixty minutes. Mentees prefer to have CM group meetings once a fortnight and for forty minutes as opposed to once a week and for fifty minutes. The administrators and the coordinator seem to agree on the frequency and length of the group meetings, whereas the mentees see it as a shortcoming. Concerning individual meetings the results show that the administrator and the coordinator think that the number of the interview in a semester should be fewer. Mentees would like to have interviews less than three times in a
semester, whereas mentors would like to have individual meetings more than three times in a semester. As regards target setting, the results of the mentees and mentors showed that less than half of the mentees and half of the mentors think that the targets set by mentees are achievable. However, according to the administrators and the coordinator the mentees managed to set their targets but the majority of the mentees did not complete their targets.

As become apparent from the data that ongoing mentee and mentor training is essential for mentees and mentors to develop certain group meeting skills such as active listening, note taking and using meeting time efficiently.

The result of this study indicated that the current CMP has achieved its aims to some extent with the conclusion that some aspects of the program need to be reconsidered again in order to have a more effective mentoring program.

Finally, the results of this study will contribute much to the field of mentoring as a teacher development program and may direct us to a new model as the inservice teacher development program based on empowering.
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CHAPTER 1  INTRODUCTION

The definition of the mentor can be traced back to Greek Mythology. In Homer's 'Odyssey', Odysseus' adviser "Mentor" was responsible for the care of Odysseus' son, Telemachus. Since the days of Odysseus, 'mentor' and 'mentoring' have been used for a variety of purposes.

Main (1985) suggests that there is no single definition of mentoring which covers all of its forms as the word has gained currency in the professional world, where it is thought to be a good idea to have a mentor, a wise and trusted counselor, guiding one's career. "The term has become increasingly important in the context of organizational and political careers as empirical evidence has grown that mentoring is a critical aspect of career advancement" (Shafritz, Keep & Soper, 1988, p. 292). The term 'mentoring' has become widely used in different occupational contexts over the last few decades ranging from managerial, administrative counseling relationships in health care to institutional concerns in universities, industry or government (Mc Intyre, Hagger & Wilkin, 1994; Murray & Owen, 1991). As discussed in Mc Intyre et al. (1994), although many researchers have attempted to provide a concise definition of mentoring, definitional diversity continues to characterize the literature.

In education mentoring defined as a system which offers individual guidance and support through feedback, questioning, sharing, discussion, challenge and confrontation (Kelly, Back & Thomas, 1992). As stated by Wilkin (1992), the mentor is the teacher in the school who has direct responsibility for the trainee in the classroom. It is usual for there also to be a member of the school staff who has the
overall responsibility for the organization of training in the school. A staff member has a variety of names such as school mentor and general mentor, but probably the most frequently known name is that of ‘professional tutor’. In an educational context, mentoring is increasingly being used to describe the relationship between supervisor and trainee in initial training. Consequently, we witness that “the concept of mentoring is used by everyone loosely and variation in operational definition continues” (Jacobi, 1991, p. 506).

Mentoring is also a widely used term in English Language Teaching. Given the fact that the history of English language teaching is characterized by rapid and frequent changes in methodology, teacher development is considered very important in order to keep up with changes in language teaching (Finocchiaro, 1988; Lange, 1990; Main, 1985). Finocchiaro (1988) states that “teacher development has been a subject of deep concern to educators for nearly two centuries” (p.2). She describes teacher development as a continual process of growth and states that teachers should continue to develop in all aspects of their profession such as awareness of their strengths and weaknesses and skills. Sithamparam and Dhamotharan (1992) also describe teacher development as a process that is essential for teachers to develop their professional skills. Teacher development means change which can lead to professional growth and development assumes that teaching is a constantly evolving process of growth (Freeman, 1982). Hence as suggested in Main (1985), pedagogical growth and understanding and development are the purposes of teacher development programs.
In this study, the teacher mentorship program as a teacher development program at the Preparatory School of Eastern Mediterranean University was explored by assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the existing mentoring program which is currently in its second year. The terms teacher development and professional development are used interchangeably in this thesis while exploring the value of teacher mentorship program for teacher development at EMUEPS.

Background of the Study

This section describes firstly the Instructor Development Program (IDP) at Eastern Mediterranean University English Preparatory School (EMUEPS) and then, the Colleague Mentoring Program (CMP). Finally, the aims of the CMP, the weekly whole group meetings, the interview process and the individual development cycle which comprise the CMP are explained. The CMP is a part of the IDP and was first inspired from a seminar on teacher appraisal systems in Scotland in 1994. The CMP was thus initiated as a teacher appraisal system and then gradually evolved into a professional development system. The CMP is currently in its second year but given the change of focus it can be argued that as a teacher development program it is in its first year.
The following figure illustrates the components and structure of the IDP.

![Diagram of IDP components](image)

**Figure 1  Structure of IDP**

* Currently, there are 100 teachers working at Easten Mediterranean University English Preparatory School.

**Instructor Development Program**

As stated in the instructor's booklet, the existing mentoring system at EMUEPS "seeks to promote and maintain a professional working environment" (p. 87) including instructor development programs (See Appendix A).

All instructors working at EMUEPS with a total of about 100, attend an Instructor Development Program (IDP) for which they receive a two-hour teaching reduction weekly. In other words, the instructors' weekly teaching load is twenty hours, but two hours in a week are reserved for the IDP. Fifty six of the instructors attend training courses and 100 attend CMP as it is compulsory (see Table 1). As stated in the booklet, IDP includes specific training programs and intends to provide a
structured system of collaborative and explorative development that aims to contribute to the raising of standards of teacher competence at EMUEPS.

The CM Program is one component of IDP. The other component is teacher training programs which is categorized into four components programs as follows:

Table 1

**Components of the Instructor Development Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A- Teacher Training Programs</th>
<th>Number of candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- EMUEPS New Teacher Program (NT)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Cambridge Certificate for Overseas Teachers of English</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Cambridge Examination in English for Language Teachers (CEELT II)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Cambridge Diploma for Overseas Teachers of English (DOTE)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B- EMUEPS Colleague Mentor Program (CMP) 100

Teacher training programs like COTE, DOTE, CEELT II and programs for New Teachers (NT hereafter) which are offered at EMUEPS are not compulsory except NT.

**EMUEPS Colleague Mentor Program**

**Aims.**

The CM program aims to provide a structured system within which members of the staff can share problems, ideas and expertise and thereby collaborate in the development of the institution. It also aims to provide individual development, through which members of the staff can maximize their potential, increase their level of
involvement and career development in the institution. Finally, it aims to encourage teachers to analyze and evaluate their teaching as classroom researchers and problem solves (see Appendix A for the aims of the Program).

**Weekly Whole-Group Meetings.**

Colleague Mentor group meetings (CM group meetings hereafter) are held once weekly by the responsible Colleague Mentor (CMR hereafter) of each group (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Group Composition of CM groups](image)

As the CMP is compulsory, that all instructors join the program. There are two basic groups: Non-training and training groups. Instructors involved in training courses like COTE, DOTE, CEELT II are grouped according to the course they follow in their mentor group (CM Groups hereafter). They have their trainer as a mentor. Others are assigned to CM groups on the basis of the skill they teach. Table 2 indicates the group formation of the CM Program.
Table 2

Group Composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-Non-Training CM Group</th>
<th>Teachers + CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Grouped according to the skill taught)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Core English Instructors</td>
<td>9 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Reading Skill Instructors</td>
<td>9 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Writing Skill Instructors</td>
<td>9 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Listening/Speaking Skills Instructors</td>
<td>9 + 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-Training Group (Grouped according to the training program joined)</th>
<th>Teachers + CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-NT</td>
<td>20 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-COTE</td>
<td>11 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-CEELT II</td>
<td>12 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-DOTE</td>
<td>13 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these groups elects its own CMR for a year at the beginning of the fall semester in September. The purpose of group meetings is developmental, the aim being the discussion of problems pertaining to the professional development of
teachers. These group meetings are not training sessions and they do not have a pre-determined meeting agenda. Members of the CM group are equally responsible for raising matters of concern and contributing to the meetings.

Interview Process.

Interviews are individual meetings held three times a year by instructors and their CMR. This component of the program is one to one between a mentee and a mentor and aims to facilitate both individual and institutional development. In these interviews, professional interests are to be identified through target settings. The purpose of the interview is to focus on

- making future plans for teaching/career goals
- recognizing successes and areas of concern

(For details of the first, second and third interviews see Appendix A)

Individual Development Cycle.

The individual development cycle is the first meeting between the mentors and mentees in which instructors are helped to set goals (targets) to achieve in a semester (15 weeks). As displayed in Figure 3, the mentors and mentees negotiate methods of achieving the goal (target set). Possible alternatives include observation, classroom research, letter exchanges and peer observation (see Appendix A for the catalogue of tools).

| target + how you will do this + how you can measure the achievement |
| (an action plan) (the indicators of achievement)               |

Figure 3 Individual Development Cycle
Purpose of the Study

The objective of this study is to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher mentorship program at EMUEPS. The aim of this study shares the aim of formative evaluation studies as this study was done “during the development of the program” (Brown, cited in Johnson 1989). The study is not, however, an evaluation of the whole IDP, but one component of the CM Program at EMUEPS. It focuses on process firstly to establish whether the stated objectives have been met and secondly to determine which activities in this program need to be improved.

Research Questions

In order to find out the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher mentorship program at EMUEPS in terms of teachers' professional development, the aims and the activities in the present program will be investigated through the following research questions:

1- To what extent have the aims of the program been achieved?

2- What mentorship activities (group meetings, interviews, target settings) are perceived as efficient in operation and most productive of professional growth?

3- What mentorship activities (group meetings, interviews, target settings) are perceived as insufficient in operation and least productive of professional growth?
Significance of the Study

The CMP currently in its second year. As stated by the existing coordinator of the system, the system has not been fully implemented yet. As the CMP has recently been initiated, it is developing continuously. It is also true that any system brings with it its own unique set of problems that have to be solved, a system to progress. Equally, the more these problems can be anticipated, the more quickly the system can start to benefit the individual and the institution.

It is hoped that the outcomes of this research will contribute to the improvement and development of the CMP at EMUEPS. This study may help to see how beneficial the mentoring system is as a teacher development activity. In other words, it can show us whether this process helps the professional development of the people who are involved in the system. Finally, this study may help other institutions in showing the strengths and weaknesses of the mentoring program at EMUEPS as a teacher development program so that they can evaluate and improve their programs or build a mentoring system as an ongoing inservice teacher development program.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The aim of this study is to investigate how the strengths and weaknesses of the Colleague Mentoring Program (CMP) at Eastern Mediterranean University in Northern Cyprus (EMUEPS) and determine how the program can be made more effective. As mentioned in Chapter 1, this study aims to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of a program. Therefore, in terms of the related literature, firstly, there will be a review of the related literature on mentoring and on teacher development within the context of a possible definition of mentoring and mentoring models followed by a discussion of teacher development activities in mentoring, ending with an examination of effective mentor strategies.

A Possible Definition of Mentoring

As mentioned in the introduction in a study by Burn (1992), mentoring was defined in a very specific way. It was defined as the exploration of a particular technique that mentors could use in helping beginning teachers to learn to teach. This technique was defined as “collaborative teaching” meaning any lesson that is jointly planned and taught by a mentor (experienced teacher) and the beginning teacher. In their studies, Bailey and Branklin (1992) define mentoring as a system which deals with problems in the teaching situations. The mentor is treated as a shoulder to cry on. As stated by Carruthers (1993) mentoring is a complex process and it occurs between those who differ in their levels of
experience and expertise which incorporates interpersonal or psychological development, or educational development.

The above models explains mentoring in the pre-service context. In mentoring relationship there are two people, one is experienced and the other is less experienced. As stated by Moon (1994) teacher development can be facilitated both for preservice and inservice teachers and this study will look at teacher mentorship scheme at EMUEPS as an inservice teacher development activity.

**Current Mentoring Models**

In the literature there are different kinds of mentoring models related to the different kinds of occupations including English language teaching.

We can talk about two models of mentoring that currently exist. As stated in Murray and Owen (1991), one is structured or facilitated mentoring. The other is true mentoring. Facilitated mentoring is a structured series of processes designed to create affective mentoring relationships. As argued in Murray & Owen (1991), this means that it provides guidance for the desired behavior change of those involved and evaluates the results for the members, the mentors, and the organization with the primary purpose of systematically developing the skills and leadership abilities of the less experienced members of an organization.

A clear distinction is made between facilitated mentoring and other forms of formal mentoring. Facilitated mentoring typically includes the following components:
a) a design that meets the perceived needs of the organization, b) the criteria and process for the selection of members, c) strategies and tools for diagnosing the developmental needs of the members, d) the criteria and a process for qualifying mentors, e) orientation to the responsibilities of the role for both mentors and members, f) strategies for matching mentors and members on the basis of skills to be developed and a negotiated agreement between mentor, members and administration, g) a coordinator responsible for maintaining the program and supporting the relationships and doing formative evaluation to make necessary adjustments to the program. As implied in Murray & Owen (1991), facilitated mentoring is appropriate when an organization wants to bring about professional growth and development.

Representatives of the second model of mentoring suggest that true mentoring is spontaneous or informal, arguing that this can not be structured or formalized. In their opinion, a structured mentoring relationship lacks a critical, magical ingredient. They see it as an “arranged marriage but one which often lacks passion” (Murray & Owen, 1991, p. 6).

Fury (1980) writes “that the mentor/member relationship is a mysterious attraction of two people... prompt[ing] them to take the risks inherent in any close relationship “ (p. 47). “Mentoring .... seems to work best when it is simply allowed to happen” (Premac Associates, 1984, p. 55).

Having reviewed characteristics and types of facilitated and true mentoring models, another model which is explained in the work of McIntyre et al. (1993) is
'Beyond Competence' which is a kind of a preservice training model. In this model, it is emphasized that until learner-teachers demonstrate that they are competent enough for the teaching profession, there is the need for mentors to be authority figures "who, in teaching and assessing, may have to make judgments about what is satisfactory and what is needed" (McIntyre et al., 1993, p. 100). However, McIntyre maintained that (1993), once such necessary competence has been established, a very different role is appropriate for the mentor and responsibility for learner-teachers' further development lies with themselves. McIntyre et al. (1993) notes that guidance is still required, both because everyone benefits from a second perspective on their work, especially with such complex work as teaching, and also because learner-teachers need help in learning how to become professional teachers. "The kind of help needed is that which can best come from an experienced, but in important respects equal partner. In other words, the relationship between mentors and learners can be most fruitful, if from the very beginning, it is negotiated. It is the learner-teacher who should be now taking the lead in setting agendas" (McIntyre et al., 1993).

In this model there are two stages of development. In the first stage, the mentor sets the agenda and decides on which or what to develop. In the second stage, the learner-teacher sets his/her own agenda with a partner and the role of the mentor is guidance. The learner-teacher is thus responsible for his/her development. Nonetheless, it is argued that the responsibility of mentors continues in the second stage of professional development of learner-teachers. The transition to a new kind of relationship may not always be easy. No doubt most mentors find one or other kind of relationship easier for them. It is obviously
more demanding to have to learn the skills and disciplines of working in the two different ways appropriate for two stages which are guided stages with mentor and negotiation stages. In brief, the “Beyond Competence” model emphasizes mentor’s responsibility for the professional development of the learner-teacher.

Having explained three models of mentoring—facilitated, true and beyond competence, the fundamental difference can be summarized as: facilitated mentoring and beyond competence models are top-down and the true mentoring model is bottom-up. The following figure summarizes the similarities and differences between features of the three models discussed above as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitated Mentoring</th>
<th>True Mentoring</th>
<th>Beyond Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Top down</td>
<td>- Bottom up</td>
<td>- Top down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mentor offers a guidance</td>
<td>- Two people work together</td>
<td>- Mentor first as authority then as guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A coordinator controls the program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The mentor sets the agenda for development</td>
<td>- Peers work together and decide together</td>
<td>- The mentor sets the agenda for development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Until this point models of mentoring have been the focus of discussion and now the question is what teacher development activities are included in mentoring.

Teacher Development Activities in Mentoring

Teacher development has many faces. Coaching, peer assistance and mentoring are the popular ones among educators who are interested in school improvement and the improvement of teaching. This section turns to discuss the teacher development activities in mentoring.

As stated in McIntyre et al. (1993), one of the most frequently reported approaches that mentors claim to be using is that ‘active listening’. “Using such an approach, teachers report on their experiences in the school and classroom context...mentors become sounding-boards “ (McIntyre et al., 1993). It is argued that this approach not only encourages one to think of creative solutions to the areas of concerns, but encourages a level of independence in problem-solving. Moreover, it is argued that such an approach is empowering in that it involves one in the development agenda at the institution. This means that areas that people would like to develop in are specified beforehand and this is called the development agenda.

There are other possible activities for teacher development applicable to mentoring programs. Mentors indicate that during discussion sessions they encourage discussions about teaching. There are range of positions about when members should be encouraged to discuss their views of teaching which types of incidents should be used to
stimulate critical thinking and how often the discussions should occur (McIntyre et al., 1993).

In addition, some activities can be used to develop teachers' decision making and awareness in order to bring about an effective teacher development. “Target setting is the very essence of managing the school performance of teachers, because they are at the heart of all staff management in any organization” (Trethowan, 1987, p.31). As questioned in Trethowan (1987) what does a teacher need to know to be able to give a good performance? The teacher needs to be aware of three essential issue in terms of classroom performance: targets, interviews and action. Targets are tasks mutually agreed upon between the teacher and the mentor which the teacher accepts over the basic tasks. "Because responsibilities vary from school to school, task to task, class to class and pupil to pupil, even qualified, experienced teachers need to know what the school expects of them. Another activity is the interview which noted in Trethowan (1987), is an essential feature of any effective development system. If development is the continual forming of judgments about performance then the interview is the occasion when these judgments and the action taken as a result of them throughout the year are reviewed. An action is the achieving period of the set target. Mentor monitors the performance of the targets and gives feedback. (Trethowan, 1987). A final teacher development activity in mentoring is observation in Richards and Nunan (1990) and Wajnryb (1992). Observation is described as a systematic conscious process of teacher’s professional development, with the primary goal “professional growth” and “development”.

Effective Mentor Strategies

As stated in McIntyre (1993), in order to be an effective mentor, training is necessary for instance in group meetings. There are some activities which are adopted by mentors. For instance, one mentor emphasizes that mentoring is a very personal thing, and you have to be born for it.

This section discusses effective mentor strategies. The fact that mentors can have a range of functions and a range of styles is in itself an important consideration when approaching the training of mentors. Shea (1992) comments on mentor styles as follows:

"Mentors are helpers. Their style may range from that of a persistent encourager who helps us to build our self-confidence to that of a stern task-master who helps us to appreciate excellence in performance. Whatever their style, they care" (Shea, 1992, p. 13).

The literature on the characteristics of effective mentors tends to concentrate on personal characteristics such as the following list taken from a brochure prepared by the Cheshire City Council.

"A mentor needs to be:

-a good communicator
-an experienced teacher
-a respected colleague who is a good listener
-a highly motivated person with the ability to motivate others
- a rational and thinker who is good at problem solving
- a calm and well organized person
- a teacher who has the ability to train adults (Cheshire City Council, 1993, p. 64).

It is interesting to look at how such lists, which have been termed "pious lists which it is difficult to fault" (Chambers, 1993), translate into training programs. At first sight many of the mentor training programs appear similar to traditional trainer training courses. The Cheshire City Council publication includes the following under "Training Needs of the Mentor": "Developing the generic skills of observing, listening, providing constructive feedback, target setting. However, also included are areas not traditionally seen as such: negotiating, problem-solving, managing success and managing time".

To consolidate the two lists above, mentor training program aims to develop the characteristics of mentors in order to have effective mentor

The following model which will be explained is designed for teacher educators as well and called The Czech Experience. What does the Czech mentor training program consist of? The Czech Republic mentor training program implemented in the Czech Republic is a three-stage course organized for new teacher’s supervisors stated by Thornton (1996) as follows:

Stage 1 (In-country) : Awareness raising
Skills identification
Skills prioritization

Stage 2 (U.K.) : Experiential (teachers shadow university supervisors and school mentors in UK schools)

Stage 3 : Action research (teachers carry out their own Action Research projects based on aspects of their own supervision)
As stated Thornton (1996), this list is used as the basis for drawing up a program for the Czech mentors which consisted of a two-week in-country course, followed by a week training at a university in United Kingdom where “mentors shadowed supervision, focusing on observations on areas of interest to them” (Thornton, 1996 p.8). Once the mentors turn back in their country they carry out their action research projects on particular areas of interest to them within their role.

To conclude, the review of the literature on teacher mentorship as a teacher development activity shows that mentoring programs have similarities and differences in their characteristics. Some of them exist as a top-down program and the others as a bottom-up program. All these programs have their strengths and weaknesses. This study intends to explore CMP’s strengths and weaknesses at EMUEPS.
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this descriptive study was to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of the current teacher mentorship program at the Preparatory School of Eastern Mediterranean University (EMUEPS) in Northern Cyprus. It focuses on process first to establish whether the stated objectives have been met and secondly to determine activities in this process that need to be improved. There are 100 instructors at EMUEPS all of whom were part of the CMP. 55 of the 100 instructors participated in the study. Data were collected through questionnaires administered to the mentors and mentees and interviews conducted with the administrators and the coordinator of the colleague mentoring program (CMP). This chapter describes the respondents, instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis techniques which were followed in conducting the study.

Respondents

In this study four groups were used as respondent as follows:

(a) the three administrators
(b) the coordinator of the teacher mentorship program
(c) six of the eight colleague mentors (CMR)
(d) fifty of the eighty-eight mentees
The respondents were grouped into four categories according to the roles they have in the CMP. The roles of these respondents are:

1. The administrators are responsible for the overall design, implementation and execution of the CMP,
2. The coordinator of the program is also responsible for the design, implementation and development of the program,
3. The colleague mentors are the teachers who are the representatives of each CM group and are responsible for the communication, educational development and professional guidance of the teachers in their mentor group (mentees). The communication consists of regular meetings with administration and colleague mentor group members who are the teachers (mentees). Communication aims to solve problems through forming a bridge between administrators and teachers when necessary. Educational development means negotiating and implementing a cycle of professional growth with individual teachers. Professional guidance means the recommendation of seminars, short courses and sharing ideas about teaching on a one to one base within the CM groups.
4. The last group is the teachers (mentees) further consisting of the training group and the non-training group. The training group includes teachers who have experience of less than a year and have joined to the new teacher training programs (NT) or COTE, DOTE candidates. The non-training groups includes teachers who do not attend any kind
of inservice program and only attend the required teacher development program. The experience of this group ranges from two years upward. In the selection of mentees for this study, the stratified random selection method was employed. (Cohen & Manion, 1989). That is, 50 of the 88 mentees from seven mentor groups (Training-NT, COTE, DOTE) and (Non-training-Core English, Reading, Writing, Listening/Speaking) were randomly selected so as to gather data from the different specialized groups of the whole mentee population. (see Table on the following page). Forty-seven out of fifty mentees and six mentors who were administered questionnaires returned them back.
### Table 3

**Respondents in the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number of the respondents interviewed</th>
<th>Number of the respondents who completed questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Coordinator of CMP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Colleague Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Teachers (Mentees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i- NT participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii- COTE/DOTE participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-training group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i- Core English Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii- Reading Skill Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii-Writing Skill Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv- Listening/Speaking Skill Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** CMP: Colleague Mentoring Program.
Instruments

This study employed three instruments to gather data. These were:

(a) questionnaires

(b) the interviews

(c) document analysis of the target setting forms

Questionnaires

The two questionnaires which were administrated to mentors and mentees were designed to investigate the present practices in the Colleague Mentoring Program, the subjects’ preferences among different possible practices in such a teacher development program and their suggestions for the development of the current program. Questionnaire 1 was for mentors and questionnaire 2 for mentees (see Appendices B and C for questionnaires).

With regards to the type of data elicitation techniques the two questionnaires included: ranking of the item choices, checklist items with open-ended sections like “others, please state ...” and Likert-scale questions.

The two versions of questionnaires both had twenty-nine items. Items were common in both versions of the questionnaires, so that it would be convenient to compare these answers across groups. In other words, an item intended to elicit certain information in a questionnaire was present in the other version to make sure that they were directly
comparable. In addition, the questionnaires included questions from the interviews as open-ended items, so it would also be convenient to compare the answers from questionnaires and interviews.

These questionnaires included five sections. The aim of Part A of the questionnaires was to find out whether people were aware of the aims of the program and second whether the system was achieving its desired aims. In this part checklist items and Likert-scales were used.

Part B of the questionnaires described different kinds of professional development activities and aimed to find out which of these activities were preferred in the current program and the reasons for these preferences. In addition in Part B there were items investigating suggestions for the development of the current activities (CM Group Meetings, interviews and target setting) in the CMP. This part included checked items, ranking and Likert-scale questions. Part C and D investigated the responsibilities of the colleague mentors and mentees in the program and firstly, the required skills and second the required training for being a mentor and mentee. These parts employed checklist items, ranking and Likert-scale questions.

In Part E subjects were asked what they would like to see in a teacher development program and any additional comments that they would like to make. There were checklist items, one frequency and one open-ended item.

The questionnaires were presumed to be reliable because they were pilot-tested to ensure that the questions, instructions and the design were appropriate to the research
questions and the wording of the questions and the format were clear. In addition, a representative sample of the actual items in the CMP at EMUEPS were included.

In order to further enhance the reliability of the responses, the respondents were assured of confidentiality. In other words, they were assured that their responses would not be used for any other purposes than for this study.

**Interviews**

The interviews were conducted with the two administrators and a coordinator (see Appendix D for interviews) and included semi-structured and open-ended questions to investigate the administrators and coordinator’s opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the current CMP. The interview questions focused on the aims of the program, activities (CM Group Meetings, Interviews and Target Settings) in the present program and suggestions for program improvement. Moreover questions about the responsibilities and training suggestions for the mentors were included. The interviews were valid and reliable as they included a representative sample of the actual items included in the CMP at EMUEPS.

**Document Analysis**

The target setting forms used by mentees to write the goals that they intend to achieve during the individual interviews with mentors. Forms were analyzed for their
content, practicality and usefulness. The target setting forms collected from the different
groups of mentors were coded and analyzed according to recurring themes.

Procedure

Preparation

The first step in the procedure was the design of the interviews and questionnaires.
These two instruments were designed following the “poster forums” techniques, which is a
brain-storming technique requiring participants to give feedback on the program they are
attending (Murrow & Schocker, 1993). In order to use the poster forum, some members
of the staff (one of the three administrators and several mentees) were interviewed at
semester break in January, 1996. The aim of these poster forum sessions was to collect
some data about the CM group meetings, interviews, target setting activity and the roles
of mentors in the existing CMP. The data collected from these interviews were used to
develop some parts of the questionnaire and interviews.

Piloting

The questionnaire was piloted at EMUEPS during the third week of April, 1996.
One of the three administrators, two CMs and nine teachers at EMUEPS joined the pilot
testing. The respondents were randomly selected. The questionnaires were piloted to The
respondents were asked to identify unclear items. Respondents who participated in the
piloting process were not included as respondents in the actual study.
Changes

After piloting, the necessary changes based on the feedback given by the pilot-testers were made. In this case the number of the questions was increased from twenty-four to twenty-nine. The pilot testing revealed that the respondents had difficulties in ranking the subitems. They tended to check items instead of ranking. Thus, in some questions the format was changed to Likert-scale and checklist items. In part B an item was added to the group meeting part. In question eighteen there had been a continuum with numbers and respondents had difficulty understanding whether they were supposed to follow the continuum from left to right or top to bottom. In this case for each item the line was drawn between each item from left to right. In pilot testing the duties of the mentor and mentees were ranked. However respondents said that these duties were processes so they found it very difficult to rank them as they thought it cut the process into pieces. In this case these questions were changed to Likert-scale items. Items related to the mentor/mentee relationship were open-ended in order to determine the closed question in the actual questionnaires (see Appendices B and C for questionnaires).

Application

A revised version of the questionnaire was administered at EMUEPS by the researcher during the data collection period of the MA TEFL Program May 6-10, 1996. The questionnaires was distributed to the fifty mentees and six mentors in the CM group meetings. Upon completion, the researcher visited the students one by one and collected
the completed questionnaires. The interviews were conducted with two administrators and
the coordinator of the current CMP with appointments in a specific place decided
beforehand.

Data Analysis

The results of the study were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative
techniques. The closed items were analyzed using quantitative descriptive statistic. The
types of descriptive statistics employed were rank comparison across groups, frequency
analysis of preferred and non-preferred practices, and mean comparison of Likert-Scale
items. Due to the fact that this was a descriptive study, the results were given as
frequencies and central tendencies (Selinger and Shohamy, 1990) for checklist items.
Ranking and Likert-scale items were presented as means of responses. These results were
interpreted in tables. Since the two questionnaires were devised to elicit similar
information from mentors and mentees, the responses from the two groups were analyzed
together and the responses for mentors and mentees displayed in the same tables.

Finally, the responses to the open-ended parts of the checklist items, that is the
“other, please state...” options were analyzed and reported within the analysis of each
checklist questionnaire item. The open-ended question in the final part of the
questionnaires was analyzed through qualitative analysis techniques and reported
separately. Target setting forms were analyzed to strengthen the data collected about the
target setting activity which is designed by mentees before the individual interview to
discuss the goals with mentors at the interviews.

Data collected from interviews were analyzed using qualitative techniques.
Data was coded and recurring themes were put into categories, from that were
predetermined from the actual interview questions (see Appendices D and E for interview
questions and coding system). The data collected through questionnaires, interviews and
target setting forums were then triangulated. (Cohen & Manion, 1989; Selinger &
Shohamy, 1989).
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data Analysis Procedures

The objective of this study was to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of the existing Colleague Mentoring Program (CMP) at EMUEPS. This chapter is allocated to the presentation and analysis of the data gathered from the following three sources: (a) questionnaires, (b) interviews with administrators and the coordinator of the CMP and (c) document analysis of target setting forms.

The data collected through questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively and were presented in two different ways. Firstly, questions with the checklist items were presented in frequencies (f) and percentages (%) for each item. Questions in which the respondents tick the items were two types. In the first type respondents were asked to tick “all” the appropriate answers and in the other type they were asked to tick the “most appropriate” item. The presentation of total percentages in tables related to the questions in which the respondents were asked to tick from the checklist responses, does not add to one hundred due to the fact that the respondents were allowed to mark more than one item in these questions. The responses to the “other option” at the end of each item was analyzed for content and reported within the analysis of the related items. Secondly, questions in which the respondents were asked to rank or rate the items were presented in mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD).

In rank-order or rating questions number 1 was considered as the most important item (1=most important). The mean scores which was closest to one was considered the
most preferable item. In some of the rank-order questions and likert-scale questions, apart from mean scores (M), the standard deviations' (SD) of the items were also interpreted.

Both the means of the responses for all the items or the frequencies or percentages of the responses for all the items on the questionnaires were reported in the same table in the sections on mentees and mentors in order to compare the responses of mentees and mentors.

The open-ended questions in the last section of the questionnaire were analyzed qualitatively and recurring themes were put under pre-determined categories based on the interview questions.

The interviews were analyzed qualitatively and the recurring themes were put under the pre-determined categories which were the actual interview questions.

Some of the target-setting forms which were used by mentees to set their targets during the first interviews with the mentor were also examined and cross-referenced with the data collected through interviews and questionnaires for purposes of triangulation.

**Analysis of Questionnaires**

This section discusses the findings of the questionnaires administered to the mentees and mentors. The questionnaires consisted of closed items which were analyzed quantitatively and open-ended items which were analyzed qualitatively.
The questionnaire fell into five parts as follows:

1. The aims of the CM Program
2. Tools, CM Group Meetings and Individual Meetings
3. The roles of mentors
4. The roles of mentees
5. The benefits of the CM Program

The following table displays the distribution of questionnaire items into five parts.

Table 4

The Categorization of Questionnaire Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The aim(s) of the CMP</td>
<td>Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. i. Tools</td>
<td>Q6, Q7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. CM Group Meetings</td>
<td>Q8, Q9, Q10, Q11, Q12, Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Individual Meetings</td>
<td>Q14, Q15, Q16, Q17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The roles of mentors</td>
<td>Q18, Q19, Q20, Q21, Q22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The roles of mentees</td>
<td>Q23, Q24, Q25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Benefits of the CMP</td>
<td>Q26, Q27, Q28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CMP=Colleague Mentoring Program; Q=Question.
The questions in Part A, which investigated the aims of the CMP, were analyzed under the following headings:

1. The mentees' purposes for attending the CMP (Q1)
2. Demotivating factors which prevent the attendance of the mentees in the CMP (Q2)
3. Current CMP at EMUEPS (Q3)
4. Mentees' preference for the ideal professional development program (Q4)
5. Ideal CMP (Q5)

The questions in the first section of Part B were analyzed under the following headings:

1. Developmental tools (Q7)
2. Strategy use (Q8)

Secondly, the responses of the two groups ideas about the group meetings are presented under the following headings:

1. CM Group Meetings (Q8, Q9 and Q12)
   i. Frequency of CM Group meetings
   ii. Duration of CM Group meetings
   iii. Group Formation
2. Benefits of the CM Group Meetings (Q10 and Q11)
3. Possible ways to share ideas from group projects (Q13)
And finally the two groups’ responses about the individual meetings were analyzed under the following headings:

1. Target setting (Q14)
2. Purposes of the interviews (Q15)
3. Frequency of the interviews (Q16)
4. Content of the interviews (Q17)

The questions in Part C and D of the questionnaire are displayed together under the following headings:

1. Role of CMR (Q13)
2. The ideal mentor/mentee relationship (Q21)
3. Skills required of mentor and mentee (Q19 and Q23)
4. Duties performed by mentor/mentee (Q20 and Q24)
5. On-going mentor/mentee training (Q22 and Q25)

The questions in Part E are categorized under the following headings:

1. Improvement of the professional development (Q26)
2. Benefits of the CMP for EMUEPS (Q27)
3. Benefits of the CMP for professional development (Q28)

A criteria followed in order to make the interpretation of questionnaire items explicit for the presentation of checklist items (%) and Likert-scale items (M) as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A- Checklist items (%)</th>
<th>less than half</th>
<th>half</th>
<th>more than half</th>
<th>majority</th>
<th>the vast majority</th>
<th>most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% to 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% to 55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% to 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% to 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B- Likert-Scale Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>most important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very beneficial</td>
<td>beneficial</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>not really beneficial</td>
<td>least beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most interesting</td>
<td>interesting</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>not really interesting</td>
<td>least interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequently</td>
<td>seldom</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>almost never</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part A: The Aims of the CMP

Purposes of attendance.

Question 1 investigated mentees' purposes for attending in the CMP and the results were displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

The mentees purposes for attending in the CMP (Q1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentees (n=47)</td>
<td>Mentors (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exchanging ideas</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upgrading knowledge about teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving teaching abilities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>149%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that a vast majority of mentees (89%) first purpose of attendance in the CMP is to exchange ideas with other colleagues. The responses of mentees to item 3 show that less than half of the mentees' (31%) second purpose is to improve their teaching abilities in attending the CMP. A third purpose as stated by less than half of the mentees (29%) is to upgrade their knowledge about teaching.
The vast majority of mentors (83%) think that mentees' first purpose of attendance in the CMP is to exchange ideas with other colleagues. The mentors' results show that item 2 and 3 have equal value (66%) for mentors.

A comparison of mentees' and mentors' responses of the mentees' purpose of attendance in the CMP shows a similar tendency. Mentees attending CMP to exchange ideas has more or less equal value between mentees and mentors (89% and 85%).

As regards the "other" option in this item, one mentor and one mentee added their comments about the mentees' purposes of attendance in the CMP. The mentor reported that mentees attend the CMP to give feedback to management on shared problems and to address their common problems through collective action. The mentee stated that mentees another reason for attending is to discuss the possible solutions in their teaching with their colleagues.

Demotivating factors which prevent attendance.

Question 2 asked the respondents to indicate the factors which might demotivating mentees attendance in the CMP is displayed in Table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching load</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time spent on classroom preparation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other extra curricular responsibilities (e.g. substitution)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>142%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that more than half of the mentees, (55%) and all the mentors (100%) think that the teaching load prevents mentees' attendance in the CMP. Half of the mentees (51%) and more than half of the mentors (60%) responses show that other extra curricular responsibilities like substitution is the second factor which prevents mentees' attendance in the CMP. The findings also indicate that less than half of the mentees (36%) and mentors (20%) think that time spent on classroom preparation might be the third factor which affects attendance in the CMP.
As regards the “other” option, three mentors and four mentees added their comments about the factors which prevent the attendance in the CMP. Mentors stated that mentees feel that there are too many meetings and the meeting time of the CM group meetings (Friday afternoon) is not applicable. Mentees also reported that the meeting time of the CM group meetings was not applicable and they spent too much time for the preparation of the training courses that they attend (DOTE).

Despite the fact that all the mentees have two hours teaching reduction to join in the CMP, it seems that teaching load still prevent mentees attendance in CMP.

**Current CMP at EMUEPS.**

Question 3 investigated mentees and mentors opinions’ about the actual CMP at EMUEPS. The results are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

**Current CMP at EMUEPS. (Q3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentees (n=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Improving teaching efficiency through researching the activities at institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhancing teaching effectiveness through observing and giving feedback about classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving teaching abilities through exchanging ideas with their colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Helping people to get together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** (Rating Scale: 1= strongly agree, 5= strongly disagree).
"Improving teaching abilities through exchanging ideas with colleagues" with the highest mean scores (M=2.61) indicate that mentees think that CMP improves teaching abilities through exchanging ideas with colleagues whereas the mentors give the highest mean scores (M=2.00) to item 4 indicating that they agree that CMP helps people to get together. For items 1, 2, 4 the mean scores of mentees responses are all below three (M=3.00, M=3.00 and M=3.14) which suggests that mentees are neutral to improving teaching efficiency through researching the activities at institution, enchanting teaching effectiveness through observing and giving feedback about classes and helping people to get together. With a slight difference, mentors agree that CMS improves teaching efficiency through researching the activities at the institution (M=2.60) and improves teaching abilities through exchanging ideas with their colleagues (M=2.20) and enhances teaching effectiveness through observing and giving feedback (M=2.40).

In sum, the results implies that CMP improves teaching efficiency through cooperation among colleagues at EMUEPS.

**Mentees' ideal professional development practice.**

In question 4 of the questionnaires, mentees and mentors were asked about the mentees' ideal professional development practice. The results are displayed in Table 9.
Table 9
Mentees' ideal professional development practice (Q4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Upgrading professional knowledge by taking part in curriculum/testing development through joining the comities</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improving their knowledge and skills by attending teacher training courses offered at institution like COTE/CEELT/DOTE</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being part of a teacher development program</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Rating Scale. 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree).

The analysis of data indicates that both mentees and mentors’ first choice is "Improving knowledge and skills by attending teacher training courses offered at institution like COTE/DOTE/CEELT II with the mean scores of 2.17 for mentees and 2.60 for mentors.

The mean scores for the second professional development practice which is taking part in curriculum/testing committees is 2.75 and for the third professional development choice of respondents which is being part of a teacher development program, the mean scores is 3.15.

The results imply that mentees and mentors results show similarity. Both mentees and mentors prefer to upgrade their knowledge through attending the training courses like
COTE/DOTE/CEELT II. This shows that there is a tendency to join in the teacher training program more than the teacher development program among the colleagues at EMUEPS.

**Ideal CM Program.**

Question 5 was concerned what kind of CMP would mentees and mentors like to see in future. The frequencies and percentages of mentees and mentor groups are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal CM Program (Q5)</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentees (N=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual research</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collaborative research projects with colleagues</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workshops, seminars, lectures run by experts</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workshops, seminars, lectures run by CM group</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enhancing teaching effectiveness through observing and giving feedback about a colleague’s class</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Less than half of the mentees (47%) would like to have workshops, seminars run by experts as well as run by CM groups. All mentors (100%) would also like to have workshops, seminars lectures run by expert and all of them (100%) would like to have collaborative research projects among colleagues.

The results imply that both mentees and mentor think that the ideal teacher development program should provide opportunities for members through workshops or seminars run by experts.

Part B: Tools, CM Group Meetings, Individual Meetings

This section first presents the data concerning the two groups’ responses about their preference of the tools they are interested in using while achieving the target set and the frequency of the use of some strategies to improve mentees professional development. Secondly, the two groups responses about the group meetings are presented.

Tools

Interest in developmental tools.

Question 6 asked mentees and mentors to rank some of the developmental tools in terms of how interested they might be in using them while achieving the target set. The results are displayed in Table 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentees (n=47)</td>
<td>Mentors (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Audio recordings</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Video recordings</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Peer observation</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classroom observation</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-evaluation</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher’s journal</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learner feedback</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Letter exchange</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Action research</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project-based approach</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Case studies</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Ranking M: 1=Most interesting, 11=Least interesting).
Mentees are most interested in using self-evaluation ($M=4.20$) followed closely by peer observations ($M=4.46$). Mentees are least interested in using project-based approach ($M=7.79$) and letter exchange ($M=7.72$). On the other hand, mentors results’ indicate that they think mentees are most interested in using video recordi gs ($M=4.00$). However, mentors think that mentees are least interested in using classroom observation ($M=8.20$) while achieving the target set.

There seems to be a similarity among mentees and mentors in the use of audio recordings. Both of the groups indicate that mentees are interested ($M=5.81$ and $M=5.80$) in the use of audio recordings. A comparison of the findings also indicate that there is an agreement among mentees ($M=7.72$) and mentors ($M=7.00$) that mentees are less interested in using letter exchange as a developmental tool while achieving their set target.

**Strategy use.**

In question 7 mentees and mentors were asked about how often they use strategies to improve their professional knowledge in English language teaching.
Table 12

Frequency of strategy use (Q7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Talking about ideas with colleagues</td>
<td>1.59 .79</td>
<td>1.40 .54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Doing research in classroom with the help of other colleagues</td>
<td>3.67 1.09</td>
<td>2.80 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keeping teacher journals</td>
<td>3.80 1.18</td>
<td>3.80 .83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Writing academic essays to share ideas with a colleague mentor</td>
<td>4.21 1.10</td>
<td>4.00 .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attending conferences, seminars, courses, workshops at institution</td>
<td>2.97 1.37</td>
<td>3.60 .54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Doing research in classroom through using different research techniques like action research</td>
<td>2.50 1.32</td>
<td>3.20 .83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recording the lessons (audio/video)</td>
<td>4.06 1.27</td>
<td>3.60 .54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Rating M: 1=Frequently, 5=Never).

The results in Table 12 show that both mentees (M=4.21) and mentors (M=4.00) think that mentees rarely write academic essays to share ideas with a colleague mentor and they frequently (M=1.59 and M=1.40) talk about ideas with their colleague.

The SDs of the items 1, 5, 8 are below 1.00 and same (.54). Apart from this as items 3, 4, 6 are below 1.00 as well, there is agreement among mentees on the frequency of the strategy use.
CM Group Meetings

Questions 8, 9 and 12 asked mentees and mentors to indicate how frequently and how long they would prefer to have group meetings and how they would prefer the formation of CM Groups to be. The results of questions 8, 9 indicated in Table 13 and the results of the question 12 indicated in Table 14.

Table 13

Frequency and Duration of CM Group Meetings (Q 8,9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Once a week</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Once a fortnight</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Once a month</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 40 min.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 50 min.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 60 min.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 80 min.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Formation of CM Groups (Q12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal target-setting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Skills</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>233%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table, less than half of (36%) the mentees prefer to have group meetings once a fortnight for forty minutes whereas half of the mentors (50%) prefer to have meetings every week for sixty minutes (33%). The results show that the vast majority of the mentees (85%) would like to have groups formed according to the teaching level and the majority's (76%) preference is according to the skill they teach whereas all the mentors (100%) prefer to have group formation according to the personal-target setting or skill mentees' teach..

The results implies that mentees do not prefer to follow frequency or duration of the current CM group meeting which is once a week and for 50 minutes. However,
mentors partly would like to follow the current system. They would like to have meetings once a week but for 10 minutes longer than the existing duration.

Benefits of CM group meetings and group projects.

In questions 10 and 11 mentees and mentors were asked about how beneficial they think the group projects and discussions in group meetings are. The means and standard deviations of mentees and mentors groups are displayed in Table 15.

Table 15

Benefits of CM group meetings and group projects (Q10, 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Groups N=53</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentees (N=47)</td>
<td>Mentors (N=6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Benefits of group projects</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discussions in group meetings</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Rating Scale: 1=very beneficial and 5=least beneficial).

The results indicate that mentees think the group projects are neither beneficial nor not beneficial. They are neutral (M=2.77) and group meetings are almost beneficial (M=76 and M=2.51). Mentors think that group projects are very beneficial (M=1.83) for the mentees professional development. Mentors results also indicates that discussions in group meetings are very beneficial (M=1.66) for the mentees professional development.
A comparison of mentees and mentors results indicate that mentors think that
group projects and group meeting discussions are more effective than mentees think.

Sharing ideas in group projects.

In question 13 mentees and mentors were asked to identify the possible ways of
sharing ideas presented in group projects within the whole institution among all the
colleagues.

Table 16

Sharing ideas in group projects (Q13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentees (n=47)</td>
<td>Mentors (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f  %</td>
<td>f  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Newsletter e.g SIGMA</td>
<td>37 78%</td>
<td>6 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Weekly Inset sessions run by CM groups</td>
<td>6 12%</td>
<td>4 66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seminars, workshops, lectures run by experts</td>
<td>20 42%</td>
<td>4 66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 132%</td>
<td>14 232%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 16 less than half (37%) of the mentees and all the
mentors (100%) think that the existing system in the institution is the best possibility for
sharing ideas in group projects which is the publication of the newsletter. Mentors also
value other ways to share ideas of group projects. More than half of the mentors (66%) think that second alternatives might be weekly inset sessions run by CM groups or seminars, workshops, lectures run by experts.

**Individual Meetings**

**Target setting.**

Question 14 was concerned with people's ideas about the personal target setting.

The results are displayed in Table 17.

**Table 17**

**Target Setting (Q14)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Applicable to the teaching situation</td>
<td>15 32%</td>
<td>4 66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improves the quality of the work</td>
<td>20 43%</td>
<td>3 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Achievable</td>
<td>18 38%</td>
<td>3 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 113%</td>
<td>10 166%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than half of the mentees think that the personal target setting improves the quality of their work (43%). More than half (66%) of the mentors think that it is applicable to the mentees' teaching situation. A comparison of the results imply that they are similar, less than half of the mentees second and third choice (38% and 32%) is that
these activities are achievable and applicable to the teaching situation. Half of the mentors (50%) states that target setting both improves the quality of work and achievable as a second choice.

**Purposes of the interviews.**

Question 15 asked mentees and mentors to rank the purposes of the interviews from the most to least important.

Table 18

**Purposes of the interviews (Q15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (N=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning for my future development task for the forthcoming year</td>
<td>2.16 .87</td>
<td>2.50 .57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recognizing strengths</td>
<td>2.17 .79</td>
<td>2.50 .57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognizing areas of concern</td>
<td>1.43 .59</td>
<td>1.0 .00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Ranking M: 1=Most important, 3=Least important).

The results in Table 18 indicate that mentees think that the most important purpose of the interviews is to help them to recognize the areas of concerns in their teaching with the mean of 1.43. Mentors think that interviews help mentees to recognize their areas of concern in their teaching as the most important purpose (M=1.00).
Analysis of SDs indicates that, there is homogeneity within the groups as becomes apparent from the standard deviations which are all below 1.00. The mentees' responses showed a similar tendency to the mentors responses in item 3 which has the lowest SD and closest to 1.00. This indicates that there is agreement between groups on the purpose of the interviews that is the most important purpose is to recognize the areas of concern in mentees teaching.

Frequency of the interviews.

Mentees and mentors were asked about to indicate whether having interviews three times a year is effective in question 16 and the results are shown in Table 19.

Table 19. Frequency of the interviews (Q16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Effectiveness of the frequency of the interviews</td>
<td>Y   22</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N   24</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suggestion for the frequency of the interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Less than three</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. More than three</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Y=Yes, N=No.

Half of the mentees (51%) think that the frequency of the interviews is not appropriate. Less than half of the mentees (36%) results displayed that they should be less than three times in a year. However, half of the mentors (50%) think that having interviews three times in a semester is not applicable, it should be more than three times in a year. Interestingly almost half of the mentees (47%) and half of the mentors (50%) tended not to answer this question. The reason for this might be that one of the three interviews had not been completed at the time of the study.
Content of the interviews

Question 17 asked mentees and mentors to indicate to what extent the content of the first, second and third interviews were applicable to their professional development.

Table 20

Content of the interviews (Q17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (N=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Facilitating individual development</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitating institutional development</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identifying professional interest</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Setting the targets enables one to analyze the progress</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The second interview aims to review the achievement of the stated target</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The third interview aims to review what has been done during the whole year</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Rating Scale: 1=Completely agree, 5=Completely disagree).

The results in Table 20 indicate that mentees agree that the interviews aim to facilitate institutional development (M=2.71), identify professional interests (M=2.25) and facilitate individual change (M=2.15). They also agree that the first interview enables one to analyze the target set (M=2.35), the second interview aims to review the achievement
of the stated target ($M=2.13$) and the third interview reviews what has been done during
the whole year ($M=2.16$). The mentors agree that the interviews aim to facilitate individual
development ($M=2.60$). They also agree that the first interview enables mentees to analyze
their progress in the defined area for development with the mean score of 2.60. Mentors
agree that the interviews aim to facilitate the institutional development ($M=2.00$) and the
interviews aim to identify professional interest ($M=1.6$).

Like mentees mentors agree that the second interview reviews the achievement of
the stated target with the mean of 2.20 and the third interview reviews what has been
done during the whole year ($M=2.40$).

Category C and D: The roles of mentors and mentees

The focus of this section is on the items which investigated the role of mentors and
mentees according to the two groups

Roles of Mentors and Mentees

Question 18 asked mentees and mentors to indicate the role of the colleague
mentor on the continuum. The results show in Table 21 on the following page.
Table 21

Role of CMR (Q18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor or colleague</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lecturer or listener</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sole or fellow expert</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leader or facilitator</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Authority figure or fellow group member</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trainer or helper/advisor</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (Semantic differentials: 1=Supervisor, 5=Colleague).

Both mentees and mentors agreed on the continuum and they think the roles of the colleague mentor are more towards a colleague role (M=3.90 and 3.60), listener (M=3.61 and 4.00), fellow expert (M=3.85 and 4.40), facilitator (M=3.95 and 4.20), fellow group members (M=4.16 and 4.40) and helper/advisor(M=4.06 and 1.09).
Ideal mentor/mentee relationship.

Question 21 asked to indicate the ideal relationship between mentees and mentors.

Table 22

Ideal mentor/mentee relationship (Q21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. One to one</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agreement between the two</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appreciate with each other's skills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empathy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Respect</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Equality</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3133%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 22 indicate the majority of the mentees (80%) think that the ideal relationship is based on respect. More than half of the mentees (68%) think that the ideal mentor/mentee relationship is based on appreciating each others' skills. A vast majority of mentors (83%) think that this relationship is based on respect and appreciate each other's skills. Comparison of the results indicate that mentees and mentors result are similar.
Skills required of mentor and mentee

Question 19 and 23 presents the data concerning that mentees and mentors rank the skills required of mentor and the mentee from the most important to least important.

The result indicate in Table 23.

Table 23

Skills required of mentor and mentee (Q19, 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills required of mentor</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being a skilled and sensitive listener and respondent</td>
<td>3.29 1.73</td>
<td>3.40 2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being non-judgmental</td>
<td>4.84 2.20</td>
<td>6.80 1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being fair to colleagues in the group</td>
<td>4.13 1.94</td>
<td>6.60 1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encouraging involvement and participation of all members of the group</td>
<td>4.79 2.28</td>
<td>3.20 1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avoiding giving the impression that he/she is superior</td>
<td>4.06 2.52</td>
<td>3.40 1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being prepared to act on mentees' concerns</td>
<td>4.36 2.13</td>
<td>2.40 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being a good presenter of new ideas</td>
<td>4.43 2.34</td>
<td>5.00 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Using meeting time efficiently</td>
<td>5.88 2.36</td>
<td>5.20 2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ranking Scale: 1=Most Important, 8=Least Important.)
Table 23 continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills required of mentees</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being an active listener and respondent</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being non-judgmental</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being fair within the group</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dealing with concerns of other mentees within the CM group</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Involving and participating in the group development</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Ranking Scale: 1=Most important, 5=Least important).

Mentees think that the most important skill required from mentor is being a skilled and sensitive listener and respondent (M=3.29) and the least important skill required from the mentor is using meeting time efficiently (M=5.88). Mentors judge that the most important skill required of the mentor is being prepared to act on mentees’ concerns and worries (M=2.40) and the least important one is being non-judgmental in the meetings (M=6.80).

Mentees think that the most important skill required from them is being an active listener and respondent (M=2.40) followed by involving and participating in the group development (M=2.84) and dealing with concerns of other mentees (M=2.93).
The least important skill is being non-judgmental with the mean score of 4.60. Mentors think that the most important skill required from the mentees is involving and participating in group development with the mean score of 0.44 and the least important skill is being non-judgmental (M=4.60). Comparison of mentees and mentors result indicate that there is agreement on the least important skills required from mentees among mentees and mentors.

**Duties performed by mentor/mentee**

The items in this category asked about the duties performed by mentor and mentees. In Table 24, the two groups responses to the question 20 and 24 are displayed on the following page.
### Table 24
**Duties performed by mentor/mentee (Q20, 24)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duties performed by mentor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Running group meetings</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing interview skills</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Guiding mentees to use methods from the catalogue of tools while achieving targets</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Helping mentees to set and clarify targets</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reviewing targets and gives feedback</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Filling in forms like interview documents</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sharing ideas with mentees</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Guiding the post-observation interview</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Being a friend to mentee</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Training mentees</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duties performed by mentees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sharing personal pedagogical concerns within a group</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Joining group meetings and interviews</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being responsible for setting and clarifying targets</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Using methods while achieving targets</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Getting information about unknown tools from the mentor</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avoiding uncooperative and assertive behavior</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** (Rating M: 1= Completely agree, 5= Completely disagree)
The responses to question 20 indicated that mentees agree that “sharing ideas with mentees (M=1.86), “running group meetings” (M=1.82), “being a friend to mentee” (M=1.60) are performed by mentors. Mentors strongly agree that “reviewing targets and giving feedback (M=1.00) is performed by mentor. Mentors agree that item 3 (M=1.80), item 7 (M=1.60) and item 9 (M=1.40) are performed by mentors. It seems that mentees and mentors share the similar perception that items one, seven and nine are performed by mentors.

The responses to question 24 showed that mentees completely agree that they join the group meetings and interviews (M=1.95), share personal pedagogical concerns within the group (M=1.84) and avoids uncooperative and assertive behavior (M=1.53). Mentees agree that they use the methods from the catalogue of tools (M=2.48), they are responsible for setting and clarifying their own targets (M=2.00). Mentors completely agree that (M=1.00) mentees join the group meetings and interviews. Mentors agree that mentees gets information about the unknown tools from the mentor (M=2.66) and gets information about the unknown tools from the mentor (M=2.22).

**Ongoing mentor and mentee training**

In response to the questions 22 and 25 whether mentors and mentees would like to have ongoing mentor and mentee training and suggestions for the areas of training are displayed in Table 25 on the following page.
Table 25

**Ongoing Mentor and Mentee Training (Q22, 25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. On going mentor training</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 68%</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 30%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>1 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 100%</td>
<td>6 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ongoing mentee training</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 55%</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 40%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 5%</td>
<td>1 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 100%</td>
<td>6 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ongoing training areas for mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. group meeting skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 38%</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. target setting</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 45%</td>
<td>3 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. interview skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 28%</td>
<td>4 66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Groups (N=53)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mentee (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentor (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing training areas for mentees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. group meeting skills</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. target setting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. interview skills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>198%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Y=Yes, N=No.

The results indicate that more than half of the mentees (68%) suggest an ongoing mentor training. The mentees responses to the question 25 indicate that less than half (35%) of the mentees think the most important area for mentor training is target setting. Mentors result indicate that a vast majority of mentors (83%) think that mentors and mentees should be trained. A comparison of the mentors results with mentees clearly show that a vast majority of the mentors (83%) think that they should be trained in group
meeting skills. However, almost all the mentors think that mentees should be trained in all the areas.

In sum, a strong difference is observed between mentees and mentors in the training areas of mentors and mentees.

Category E: Benefits of CMP

The items in this category asked about the benefits of the CMP.

Improvements of the professional development

Table 26 displays that the results of the CMP’s contribution to the improvement of the CMP.

Table 26

Improvements of professional development (Q25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees(n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors(n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP improved the professional development</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note (Rating M: 1=Extremely, 5=Not at all).

CM Program is contributed little to the professional development (M=3.75) according to the mentees. On the other hand mentors think the CMP contributed lot to the professional development.
Benefits of the CMP for EMUEPS

Question 27 asked mentees and mentors responses about the benefits of the CMP for EMUEPS and the results were displayed in Table 27 on the following page.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of CMP for EMUEPS (Q 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups (N=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mентees (n=47) &amp; Mentors (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Helping the teacher at EMUEPS to refine their objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improving communication within the EMUEPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving relationship between the colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supporting major developments within the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses indicated that more than half of the mentees (62%) think that CMP mostly improves the communication within the EMUEPS and improves relationship between the colleagues (62%). The mentors results indicates an agreement with mentees result as all the mentors think that the most important benefit of the program is to provide
improvement in communication within the institution (100%) and improves the relationship among the colleagues (83%).

Benefits of the CMP for Professorial Development

Table 28 summarizes data collected in respect to questionnaire item twenty eight regarding possible areas that CMP has proven to be useful for the professional development. Mentees and mentors responded item two as the highest which is 47% in mentees group and 100% in mentors group. This means that both mentees and mentors think that CMP has proven to be useful for improving the working relationship among colleagues. Mentors think that in the area of giving appropriate feedback on the mentees strength the program is least useful. However mentors judge that the program is least useful for improving the confidence of mentees in their present job.
Table 28 (Q 28)

**Benefits of the CMP for Professional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mentees (n=47)</th>
<th>Mentors(n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. improved confidence/competence in people's present job</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. improved working relationships among colleagues</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. given appropriate feedback on people's strengths</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. given appropriate feedback on the areas that have planned to improve</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. given an opportunity to influence the development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. increased the level of satisfaction in work and the way it has done</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. improved the understanding of roles in the institution</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>181%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentees and mentors responded item two as the highest which is 47% in mentees group and 100% in mentors group. This means that both mentees and mentors think that CMP has proven to be useful for improving the working relationship among colleagues.

Less than half of the mentees (19%) think that in the area of giving an opportunity to
influence the development and increased the level of satisfaction in work CMP has proven to be useful. However mentors judge that the program is least useful (33%) for giving appropriate feedback on people's strengths.

**Summary of the Results of the Open-Ended Questionnaire Item**

Six mentors and nine mentees responded to the open-ended question. The respondents were asked to make additional comments on the development of the CMP and analyzed by coding. The data collected from each group were analyzed separately and coded into categories. The results indicate that mentees prefer to have mentoring program that would not be compulsory. Many of the mentees stated that they would like to be given the opportunity to teach either two hours more which is a reduction provided for every member of the institution as they are part of CMP or join in the CMP. One of the mentees think that mentees should be trained including the information about the aims of the program. Two of the mentees stated that mentees should take the CMP seriously and attend the facilities of the program.

Mentors think that the program should avoid imposing certain tasks (such as target setting) as a professional development activity. One of the mentor stated that mentees should be given an awareness of the importance and use of such a system for an educational institution. The most important development is to define clearly what CMP Program is for and what benefits this program has for the institution and individual teachers.
Summary of the Questionnaire Results

The findings in the aims of the CMP part of the questionnaires indicated that the mentees purpose of attendance in the CMP is to exchange ideas with other colleagues whereas the teaching load prevent mentees attendance in the CMP. The current CMP improves the teaching abilities of the mentees through exchanging ideas with colleagues. Concerning mentees and mentors responses to the mentees' preference of the ideal professional development practice indicated that mentees and mentors prefer to improve knowledge and skills by attending teacher training courses offered at institution like COTE/DOTE/CEELT II. All mentors and the majority of the mentees would like to have workshops, seminars run by experts or CM groups. Mentors also would like to have collaborative research projects among colleagues.

The results in the activities of the CMP part showed that mentees are most interested in using self-evaluation and peer-observation while achieving the target set. Concerning the results of the CM group meetings, mentees would like to have meetings once a fortnight for forty minutes in the groups formed according to the skills they teach whereas mentors indicated that mentees prefer to have meetings every week for fifteen minutes in the groups formed according to the personal target setting. Mentees and mentors result related to the target setting and the interviews showed that target setting improves the quality of work and helps to recognize the areas of concerns in their teaching. However, the personal interviews should be less than three times in a year.
The result in the third and fourth part of the questionnaires which was about the roles of mentors and mentees in the CMP indicated that the CMR are facilitator, colleague, listener, fellow expert and group members and advisor. The ideal mentee and mentor relationship is based on respect and appreciation of each other's skills. The findings also indicated that most important skills required from mentors are being a skilled and sensitive listener and respondent, being prepared to act on mentees concerns and worries, using meeting time efficiently, being non-judgmental in the meetings. Considering the results related to the most important skills required from mentees are involving and participating in group development and being non-judgmental in the meetings. The results showed that ongoing mentor and mentee training is essential.

Finally, the CMP improves the relationship among colleagues whereas some parts of the program should be reconsidered in order to have more effective CMP.
Analysis of Interviews

This section discusses the interviews with two administrators and the coordinator of the current Colleague Mentoring Program which were interviewed on May 6-10, 1996 at EMUEPS.

The data collected through interviews were analyzed qualitatively according to the topics which were formulated from the actual interview questions to find the emerging themes. Then the themes which fell into these categories were coded. Finally the responses of each subject were formulated into descriptions of text.

The headings for administrator interviews were formulated from interview questions as follows:

1) Aims (Q1)
2) Strengths of group meetings, interviews and target settings (Q2)
3) Weaknesses of group meetings, interviews and target settings (Q3)
4) Advantages of the CMP (Q4)
5) On-going mentor training (Q5)
6) Modifications of the CMP (Q6) The interviews with coordinator will be analyzed under the above headings. However 7) Mentors feelings about their role as a CMR is added for this part.
Themes from Administrator Interviews

Aims

Out of the two administrators both of them stated that it is very early to give genuine and valid evaluation of the system and they emphasized that starting CMP has been great success. One of the administrators stated that all of the aims which are mentioned in the instructor's handbook have been fulfilled. Another administrator said that the main outcome which he found pleasing is that collaboration between teachers resulted in two very interesting examples. One is, one of the training group which is DOTE teachers assesses the needs analysis of planned program of learner training. The outcome of DOTE group's research is to put into a learner training program for all the students at all levels. He also mentioned that at the moment a number of the non-training CM groups are conducting some surveys to establish the feelings of the Preparatory School teachers about the implication of a skill-based syllabus or an integrated syllabus. He repeated that the learner training program and research about the types of syllabus implication are the two very positive examples which demonstrate the successes of the collaborative approach among the members of the Preparatory Schools.

Strengths of group meetings, interviews and target setting.

The administrators agreed on that the interviews have been very successful. One of them mentioned that after reconsidering the previous year's evaluation about the system it
has been shifted from the appraisal system to the self-directing professional development approach so that group meetings, target-settings and personal interviews become the focal point of the system this year. He also said that among the interviews which take place three times a year, the first interviews were the most successful ones. He stated that mentors are quite satisfied with the outcome of the first interviews which are basically include the target-setting. They also mentioned that people generally like the idea of having some personal attention. They think that the institution goes bigger so it is very easy for teachers to feel lost. They said that the personal interviews are important and hay have been very successful so that the overall result is quite satisfactory. However, one of the administrators stated that people in most of the groups perform a group project as one of the aims of the group meetings. The topics of the group projects were decided by the individual group considering the most important case in the EMUEPS according to the group.

**Weaknesses of group meetings, interviews and target setting.**

Another administrator stated that the group meetings have been least successful because some of the mentees think that take much of their time and they did not like the idea of having to meet weekly. One of the administrators emphasized that he would regard not the target-setting but the achieving the target set by mentees seem achievable on paper but in practice mentees faced with some problems whilst achieving these targets.
He emphasized that it is the first time that mentees experiencing this so having difficulties is an expected outcome.

**Advantages of the CMP.**

The administrators said that CMP provides many advantages. They stated that the most important one is giving teachers responsibility to run their school and to improve themselves in other words empowering them. They emphasized that teachers contribute to the school system much more and this makes teachers job much harder. They also emphasized that EMUEPS is growing and people may feel be isolated from the whole community. In this respect, this system in some extend help people not to feel themselves isolated and identify themselves within the whole school system. They also claimed that people can have a chance to share ideas and start the discussions within the institution through the newsletter of EMUEPS (SIGMA) which is the concrete outcome of the CMP.

**On-going mentor training.**

One of the administrators stated that on-going mentor training is very important but they have not had that yet. He added that they had a week input session from an expert from Bilkent University which was very helpful but he emphasized that the continuation is necessary. He suggested that mentors should be able to conduct meetings in order to get best from the meetings, not to waste time, not to have one person to dominate the meetings and to make sure that everyone is able to say what they want to, so
that they do not leave the meeting feeling they could not contribute to. He also added that mentors should be able to listen to as a mentor. He emphasized that it is very important for a mentor to be able to listen partially without interrupting and just letting people to speak.

**Modifications.**

They said that two things they taught possibly being modified. First, the group meetings may not be weekly, may be fortnightly and also with the target-setting, possibly teachers may have one target per semester instead of two.

**Summary of Administrator Interviews**

The findings show that the CMP has been effective so far in terms of it maintains and promotes ongoing professional development and provides a system of collaborative and explorative development among the teachers at EMUEPS. The data shows that administrators think that the first interviews have been achieved its aim and people in the institution not feel isolated through getting personal attention. The data shows that there is a slight difference among administrators about group meetings. Some findings show that group meetings has been achieved its aim as it provides group opportunities to perform group initiated projects about areas which needs consideration at EMUEPS. Some other shows that teachers find group meetings as an extra responsibility and they think they are not beneficial.
The data also shows that achieving the target-set has been least successful. Mentees generally could not manage to develop the area they planned to develop at the beginning of the program. The data shows that one of the concrete advantages of the CM Program is to provide people not to feel isolated from the community at the institution and share ideas within the institution.

The result indicate that the system was mostly successful according to the administrator. However the frequency of group meetings and interviews should be reconsidered. The data indicate that according to the administrators ongoing mentor training is essential in order to conduct group meetings efficiently.

Themes from Coordinator Interview

Aims.

The coordinator stated that the mentoring system firstly provide a contact between the members at EMUEPS. He mentioned that EMUEPS is a growing institution and they are working with a large number of people. He said that CMP at EMUEPS fill the gap as people sit around, discuss matters of shared interest, do small projects and develop themselves. He emphasized that through CMP contact between the members have been provided in other words this is one of the positive outcome of the system.

The coordinator stated that there are some successes and some failures in essence of promoting professional development. He said that there is a question how far teachers take upon the opportunity to develop themselves. He added that it is necessary to continue
to emphasize that the development can not be imposed from administration or mentors.
The aim of the CMP is to allow the development to this extend, the responsibility is for
each member of the teachers at EMUEPS.

The coordinator stated that the CM partially facilitate change by helping teachers
to become self-directing and researchers of their own work. He mentioned that he thinks
that some of the teachers become more self-directive, some teachers have done research,
they have started EMUEPS newsletter SIGMA which is a way to publish some of the
projects done. He added that a few people use action research or experimenting different
ideas. He said that there are people who are some extend unwilling and how far these
unwilling group understand what is meant by self-directing is an open question. He stated
that the reason for this is that the system started two years ago as an appraisal system. In
that system the first thing is the schedule observation and every teacher was going to
observed twice in a semester. This is not a bottom-up self-directing system. Later this was
renewed but the system with the self-direction would come in people as appraising. He
continued to mention that appraising does not entail self-development. In self-
development system people would be put into self initiated groups, direct their own
research or their own work. he said that he thinks they may not be so much succeeded in
getting a full understanding of what the CMP really entails through the people. He also
said that we should not expect great results early in process. As people experience things,
they will understand what self-directing or research their own work mean.
He stated that to some extend the CMP provides a structured system of collaborative and explorative development. He noted that one of the problems in group meetings is up to the people in the group to plot the course through the year. He added that the group sets its own syllabus and design it. He expressed his views as follows: “One problem is this self-contained group have unusual responsibility. I think to promote or to put their own agenda for discussions, decide how they are going to go about these discussions, who is going to lead the discussions, who is going to prepare whatever material necessary”. He also said that anecdotes can easily turn out to share the frustrations of the people and at the end of the meetings there has not really be an outcome so that this can lead to frustration. He added that the idea of having smaller groups is to increase the collaboration in the sense that with a large meeting, with the hundreds of teacher there can not be collaboration. He emphasized that the explorative development is fulfilled to some extent and the reason for this is again the tendency for unstructured discussions in the meetings and those discussions go round in circles when they are not carefully monitored.

He said that the CMP can not show instant or visible improvements in raising the teaching standard of EMUEPS at this point. He added that he believes some teachers have encouraged to examine their own teaching a little more critically, to experiment with different teaching techniques and find ideas from the mentoring program and help in small definable ways to improve their teaching so that their students learning in small degrees. However he added that these improvement may not be visible but ultimately these small
improvements can be add up and takes in the totally will equal to the institution quite large in development. He said that there are lots of other things which effect the improvement of the teaching standard at EMUEPS.

**Strengths of group meetings, interviews and target setting.**

The coordinator stated that the opposition to the system is not as greatest as it was introduced in the first year and he added that there is a lot less resistance to the set system. He mentioned the reason for this is there is more understanding of it. He added that it is a matter of number of years before the ideas and principles of such a system will take root. He said that group discussions have mostly been successful and people piloted group produce. These projects worked extremely well and related to these group intitated studies the publication of the newsletter has been started.

**Weaknesses of group meetings, interviews and target setting.**

The coordinator stated that he will consider target setting and interviews together and mentioned that mentors chase mentees to ensure whether these interviews take place. The coordinator expressed his views as follows “I suppose this is contradictory in some respect to the idea of equal collaborative relationship. The mentor feeling if I have to go and say you will have an interview with me at ten o’clock tomorrow because you want come an agree on a specific time with me, collaborative nature of the system starts to disappear, the mentor starts to become an authority figure which he/she did not want to
be". He added that at the beginning people have a bit of difficulty while setting their targets during the interviews. He said that people had a difficulty in setting realistic, concrete, achievable targets. He added that this is expected so as it is quite difficult to set a narrow target. He continued to mention that second interview is dependent on the target-setting and target achieving process. He added that some people have these and some good work come out. He added that some others do not have as they mentioned they have no time, they have teaching load and other extra responsibilities like substituting others classes. The coordinator continued to say that two hours reduction of twenty hours of teaching is for CMP and this is happened as the system is self-directing so that unusual responsibility is passed over to the teachers.

**Advantages of the CMP.**

He stated that CMP helps people to get together, get the responsibility over in other words empowering them. He said that in an appraisal system there is no benefit or actual improvement in any practice. In self-directing professional development system like CMP at EMUEPS when people find methods to work with and process the change and share with other people and encourage them to try it the system turns out to be very beneficial.
On-going mentor training.

He said that they had a short-training from Bilkent University first year. This year the coordinator provided the training for the mentors. He mentioned that the training was mostly based on the interviewing techniques. He suggested that more continuous training should be provided for mentors. He added that mentors themselves have said that they need to know more about their subject and group-meeting skills.

Modifications.

He stated that the frequency of the group meetings should be reconsidered. He suggested for having meetings either sixty or seventy minutes once a fortnight or three hours once a month.

He said that the element of involvement is another issue which should be reconsidered. He added that the involvement of the people who are doing training courses like COTE, DOTE, NT, MA should be reconsidered. He added that the people in the meetings raised the point that there is no point in forcing the people into such a system. If the unwilling group would like to teach two more hours we may let them function in that way.

He stated that the formulation of the groups should be reconsidered again and he suggested several ways for the formulation of the groups. He said that one way of forming groups would be according to the natural shared interest. He added that the other way
would be to ask people to form their group with the people they want to work with. He mentioned that if the targets set in advance the groups can be formed according to these. He said that it is unavoidable to have a shared interest within the group.

He said that in order to prevent unstructured discussions, the content of the meetings should be narrowed down and specific details should be discussed in order to get specific outcomes. He stated that target setting activity may be taken from the individualized meetings of mentor and mentee and take part in the group meetings.

He said that in the training the mentors part in the system the mentee training is missed out. He stated that in the interview process you have got to have two people and in order to have successful interviews and achievable target-setting the training of the mentees in the interview skills and notion of target-setting should have been looked at in advance.

He stated that two hours reduction for CMP means hundred minutes in a week and fifty minutes of that goes to the group meetings every week and the remaining time for the other activities in the system is fifty minutes. He said that what can people achieve in that fifty minutes time scale should be discussed.

The mentor/mentee’s feeling about his/her role as a mentor/mentee.

The coordinator mentioned that the essence of the role of the mentors should not be an authority figure. He said that the mentor in a sense should be a person who facilitates the target-setting process, the group-discussion. He added that the mentor
should be an organizer and representative of the group that they represent. He said that mentor is not a training people

He said that it is another discussion whether the role of the mentor should be elective or should be a post for only for the experienced and qualified teacher. He said that it is better if it stays as it is now. In other words people can elect their mentor of the group and that person join the mentor training. he stated that he sees the role of a mentee equal to the mentor and responsible from himself/herself.

**Summary of the Coordinator Interview**

The findings show that the coordinator thinks that all of the aims of the CMP have been in some extend achieved their aims. data shows that some of the people work collaboratively and they become self-directing and researchers of their own work and the proof of these are the mini group projects and the publication of the newsletter SIGMA. However, the findings show that there are some unwilling people who does not want to take part in the CMP and there are two basic reason for this. One is the system was started as an appraisal system and these people still does not entail the full understanding of the CMP and another one is that the program bring unusual responsibility over the teachers.

The data indicates that in order to set up a new program time is necessary. People should experiment things, believe in its benefits and then encourage other people to examine their own work. However teachers are not as resistance as they are at the beginning to the system.
The findings indicate that interviews and target setting activity should be reconsidered. Mentors and mentees need ongoing training on group meeting and interview skills. The data show that the frequency and content of the group meetings and the community who should take part in the CMP should be restructured.

The data shows that the mentors should not be an authority figure and they should be facilitator and representative. They also should be elected by the mentees in their own group. However, the mentees should be equal to the mentors.

Comparison of the findings of Coordinator and Administrator

Interviews

The comparison of the data collected from the administrator and coordinator interviews indicate that the coordinator and out of the two administrators interviewed both of them think that the aims of the CMP has been achieved in some extend and professional development is effective as the mentees take over the responsibility and collaborative development provides contact between the people. In addition coordinator thinks that some of the teachers become self-directing as they do research.

The results show that the coordinator and administrators agreed on that the strength of the group meeting is that they provide opportunities for mentees to perform group initiated projects. The administrators think that some of the teachers find the CMP and in this case group meetings as an extra responsibility. Coordinator thinks that the mentees in the group have an unusual responsibility as they are responsible for their own
professional development. Both of the two administrators agreed on that through personal interviews people do not feel isolated as they get personal attention. However coordinator think that mentors chase people to ensure if these interviews take place. There is a slight discrepancy between administrators and mentors about the target setting. Although administrators think that mentees are able to set targets, coordinator think mentees have a difficulty in setting realistic targets. There is an agreement among the ongoing mentor training is essential in order to develop the group meeting skills. The ongoing mentor training is essential in order to develop the group meeting skills. The frequency of the group meeting skills and interviews should be reconsidered. Coordinator stated that who should involved in this program should be discussed again.
### Table 29

**Summary of The Analysis of The Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS CONSIDERED</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims</strong></td>
<td>Professional development: Effective</td>
<td>Achieved in some extend. Professional development: &quot;Responsibility is for each member of the teachers at EMUEPS&quot;. Collaborative development: Provides contact between people. Self-directing and researcher: Some of the teachers become self-directing, do research and they have started newslet SIGMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative development: Provides a system among the teachers.</td>
<td>Strength: People piloted group projects. Weakness: &quot;The self-contained group have the unusual responsibility&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Strength: Provides opportunities to perform group initiated projects. Weakness: Some teachers find CMP as an extra responsibility.</td>
<td>Strength: People piloted group projects. Weakness: &quot;The self-contained group have the unusual responsibility&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td>Strength: People do not feel isolated through getting personal attention.</td>
<td>Weakness: “Mentors chase mentees to ensure whether these interviews take place”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target setting</strong></td>
<td>Strength: Mentees managed to set targets. Weakness: Mentees could not manage to develop the area they have planned to develop.</td>
<td>Weaknesses: People had a difficulty in setting realistic targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages of CM Program</strong></td>
<td>People do not feel isolated from the community at the institution through sharing ideas among colleagues.</td>
<td>Helps people to get together, get the responsibility over, empowering them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Mentor Training</strong></td>
<td>Essential Areas: Group meeting skills</td>
<td>Continuous training is essential for mentors. Areas: Group meeting skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modifications</strong></td>
<td>Frequency of group meetings and interviews should be reconsidered</td>
<td>Frequency of the group meetings and the element of involvement should be reconsidered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Target Setting Forms

At EMUEPS, mentees fill in the target setting forms while they are setting their targets (see Appendix F). After mentees identify their target for that semester they have an individual meeting with their mentor to get feedback whether they set realistic/achievable targets. All the target setting forms have the same format. at the beginning of the form there is a guideline. This guideline asks mentees to set not more than three precise/clear tasks and the tools they are going to use while achieving their target. the final part of the guidelines requires to set a specific time to achieve these targets.

In the target setting forms the targets set by the mentees are generally related to the classroom management however they are broad to achieve in fifteen weeks. In the forms mentees tend not to specify any tools and specific time period while they are achieving their personal target setting.
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find out ways to make the current Colleague Mentoring Program (CMP) at Eastern Mediterranean University English Preparatory School (EMUEPS) more effective through investigating the strengths and weaknesses of the existing CMP at EMUEPS which currently operates inservice teacher development program.

The data was collected through distributing questionnaires to the mentors and mentees and interviewing two administrators and the coordinator of the current CMP.

The mentors’ questionnaires consisted of same items with mentees’ questionnaires (see Appendix B and C for questionnaires). Likert scale items, ticking items, ranking items and one open-ended item were included in the questionnaires. In the analysis of the questionnaires, means and standard deviations of Likert-scale and ranking items were displayed in tables and frequencies and percentages of responses for checklist items questions were reported. Written responses to the open-ended items at the end of the mentees and mentors’ questionnaires were analyzed by identifying categories such as the strengths and weaknesses of the CMP.

The responses to interview questions were analyzed qualitatively and the recurring themes were put under pre-determined categories which were the actual interview questions (see Chapter 4 for the headings).
Summary of Findings

The results of this study show that the current CMP at EMUEPS has achieved its aims to some extent with the conclusion that some aspects of the program need to be reconsidered again in order to have a more effective mentoring program. Administrators, the coordinator, mentors and mentees think that the CMP has been effective so far in terms of maintaining and promoting ongoing professional development and providing a system of collaborative development among the teachers at EMUEPS. However, as the coordinator emphasized the program has not fully been effective in terms of providing teachers an awareness of teaching methods through self-initiated research. The reason for this may be the time is required to set up a new system and people should experiment and believe in the benefits of the program. In addition, the program was started as an teacher appraisal program and then evolved into self-directing professional development program. As a result of this change, a group of unwilling people appear who does not entail the full understanding of the CMP and have the unusual responsibility through the CMP. The findings indicate that all of the respondents agreed on that group meetings, interviews and target setting activity should be reconsidered. The frequency of the group meetings can be once every fortnight, the target setting activity and interviews once in a semester.

As regards group meetings, CMP seems to achieve its aims because people in the groups were able to work cooperatively providing the collaborative studies like the mini
projects which dealt with the problems and considerations at EMUEPS. Moreover this cooperative studies shared within the whole institution through the publication of the newsletter SIGMA which is the product of CMP.

Closely related to the issue of frequency is the fact that mentors and mentees need to have ongoing training in the area of group meeting skills and interview skills as become apparent from the data.

The findings of the open-ended question at the end of the questionnaire (see Appendix B and C for questionnaires) indicated that all the teachers think that the CMP should not be compulsory for the teachers. The suggestion is that if somebody is part of a training program, for example COTE, they should not join in the teacher development program. Moreover, if there are people who do not want to take part in CMP for professional development they may be given a chance to join in the other activities like joining curriculum committee or testing committee and develop themselves through these activities (see Questionnaires item 4).

In order to make the current CMP more effective and beneficial both mentors and mentees should realize the responsibility that such a program bring and some activities should be reconsidered and develop according to the responses of the respondents in this study. (Table 30 summarizes these findings).
### Table 30

**Summary of Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>REASON/SUGGESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Collaboration among colleagues</td>
<td>- Self-direction not encouraged</td>
<td>- Time needed for experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Change from appraisal program to self-directed professional development system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Some groups does not entail the full understanding of the CM Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ongoing professional development</td>
<td>- Frequency of group meetings and interviews</td>
<td>- Group meetings-fortnightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews-once a semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cooperation in group meetings producing mini projects and the newsletter SIGMA</td>
<td>- Ongoing mentor/mentee training Essential</td>
<td>- Group meeting skills and interview skills should be developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table is read from top to down.

### Discussion

The results indicate that the CMP at EMUEPS carries some of the characteristics of the facilitated mentoring which is one of the two models of mentoring exist in today’s world (Murray & Owen, 1991). As mentioned in chapter 2 facilitated mentoring is a structured series of processes designed to create affective mentoring relationships. Facilitated mentoring includes the following components; a design that meets the perceived needs of organization, criteria and a process for the selection of the members, strategies
and tools for diagnosing the developmental needs of the members, criteria and a process for qualifying mentors, orientation to the responsibilities of the role for both mentors and members, strategies for matching mentors, members and administration. A coordinator responsible for maintaining the program. If we accept that, facilitated mentoring is appropriate for organizations is aiming at professional development and increased productivity and increased quality of service. In this respect, the result of this study can be said to indicate that CMP to some extent meet the perceived needs of the organization.

The mentees use some tools while they are diagnosing their developmental needs. There are strategies for matching mentors and members on the basis of skills to be developed. However, the results indicate that the strategies for the skill development for mentors and mentees should be reconsidered again. In the current CMP mentors are elected by the group members with no set criteria for mentors. The results of this study indicated the necessity of having set a criteria in the selection of mentors. In sum, facilitated mentoring is a kind of top down process and CMP carries the characteristics of this system so that this means CMP is not completely bottom up process, it also carries the characteristics of top down process.
Limitations of the Study

The CMP is in its second year as a self-directed professional development program. At the time when the questionnaires distributed, some of the activities had not been tried out by the mentors and mentees. For example, the third interview of the spring semester was not given when the questionnaire distributed. The number of the interviews related to the development of the target setting activity required is three times in a semester.

As a result of this many people tended not to answer the questions related to the frequency of the interviews whether they should be three times in a semester or not (Questionnaires item 16).

Implications of the Study

The results of this study indicate that teachers need more awareness in self-directing research in order to have professional development and benefit from the CMP. It is also necessary to reconsider some parts of the program which needs development and restructured them again.

Implications for further research

A needs analysis may be carried out within the members at EMUEPS to find out whether people prefer to have training or development programs in relation to mentoring. In addition to this the researcher so far found out mentoring programs as an preservice
programs so that a research can be done about the needs and the expectations of the preservice and inservice teacher education program candidates and develop the mentoring program as an inservice program according to the needs and expectations of the members of the institution.

The findings of this study indicated that mentoring program is applicable to the inservice teacher development program needs of the members but activities like group meetings, interviews and target setting should be reorganized again according to the EMUEPS members' needs and expectations.

Educational Implications

Within EMUEPS, the results of this study show that people should have a chance to choose to join in either teacher training or teacher development program which is mentoring. These programs should not be compulsory people should join in these programs if they are interested in them. The members of the program should be well informed about the aims of the program. Teachers need to be able to aware of the difference between teacher development and teacher appraisal systems. There should be continuous training for mentors and mentees so that the activities in the program can reach its aims. The program aims at professional development. Seminars, workshops, lectures should be run by the members of the program.
The results of this study will contribute much to the field of mentoring as a teacher development programs and may direct us to a new model as the inservice teacher development program based on empowering.
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7. EMUEPS INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

"...the role of teacher education is now not to deliver sacred principles to a grateful profession but to facilitate change by helping teachers to become self-directing and researchers of their own work."

(Legutke, M. & Thomas, H. "Process and Experience in the Language Classroom" Longman 1991)

All instructors are automatically part of the Instructor Development System (which includes specific training programmes); this is intended to provide a structured system of collaborative and explorative development that will contribute to the raising of standards at EMUEPS. The IDP comprises the following:

EMUEPS New Teacher programme (NT)
Cambridge Certificate for Overseas Teachers of English (COTE)
Cambridge Examination in English for Language Teachers (CEELT II)
Cambridge Diploma for Overseas Teachers of English (DOTE)
EMUEPS Colleague Mentor System (CMS)

All the above, with the exception of the NT and CMS programmes are externally approved and moderated by the University of Cambridge.

All instructors will be part of an Instructor Development group, for which they receive a two-hour teaching reduction. Those instructors involved in training courses will be grouped according to the course they follow, and will have a trainer as a mentor. Others will be assigned to CM groups on the basis of the skill they teach. Each of these groups will then elect its
own Colleague Mentor. A short, intensive training course will be given to all mentors.

Every year a small number of places will be made available on the M.A.ELT/Education programme at EMU. EMUEPS instructors must have served at least two years in the school and if accepted on the course will be given a reduction in teaching hours equivalent to one quarter of their full-time teaching obligation.

As far as other M.A. courses are concerned, instructors must have served at least two years at EMUEPS before any application will be approved. No reduction in teaching hours will be given for these courses.

7.1 Interviews

In order to facilitate both individual and institutional development, it will be necessary for there to be regular contact between instructors and CM/ITT (Instructor Training Tutors) in the form of interviews to identify professional interests, skills and needs.

The purpose of the interview is to focus on:

- making future plans for teaching/career goals
- recognising successes and areas of concern
- discussing the above
- evaluating processes and services at EMUEPS.

Interviews will be held 3 times a year with your CM/ITT

7.1.1 First interview

The first meeting (at the beginning of the first semester) is to discuss what you hope to achieve as an instructor during the semester (see Appendix 1):

**target(s) + how you will do this (an action plan) + how you can measure the achievements (your indicators of achievement).**

For example: An instructor might state that s/he wants to improve skills in teaching listening/speaking over a period of 8 weeks.

The first step in the process would be to break this down into objectives that are far more specific, concrete and measurable, e.g:

To provide students with the language and strategies to clarify instructions.

To enable students to make accurate notes from mini lectures.

Next, the mentor and mentee would negotiate methods of achieving and measuring this. E.g., taking the first of these two objectives:

- by researching and listing useful language that could be used
for clarification;
- by designing material to present and practise the above;
- by evaluating the effectiveness of the material through an observation;
- by 'chairing' a CM group session, reporting back, and asking for further ideas.

See Catalogue of Tools (Appendix 3) for detailed itinerary of methods.

Thus one element of the process is making measurable progress in a narrowly defined area, and the second is in sharing experiences and ideas with the other staff members in order to make the process as fruitful for as many people as possible.

7.1.2 Second interview

The second interview will be held at the end of the first semester in order to:

- review achievement of the stated target(s)
- where appropriate, set new targets or determine a new action plan for the second semester
- comment on assistance provided by your CM/ITT and others
- refer to developmental methods used during the first semester and discuss outcomes

7.1.3 Third interview

The third and final meeting of the year will take place at the end of the second semester. Again, the purpose will be to review the work of that semester and the year as a whole, and to identify future interests and goals (see Appendix 2).

7.1.4 Documentation

There will be only two copies of relevant documentation, kept by the instructor and the CM. This documentation will be in English, and will be confidential.

7.2 Specific Development Schemes

7.2.1 N.T. course

A one-year structured programme of instructor development for new graduates and those new to classroom teaching. This programme includes a pre-service intensive course, weekly INSET sessions, tutorials, and a minimum of two observations per semester. The programme aims to provide instructors with basic classroom skills and techniques relevant to EMUEPS.

7.2.2 COTE

A one-year course requiring four written assignments (1500 words), six shorter language development assignments, six observations by your ITT, and eight peer observations. Also included are weekly three-hour input sessions, weekly one-hour language development sessions, regular meetings with your ITT,
and a final written exam. The programme, although practically based, aims to link ELT theory with the classroom, and give a thorough grounding in current approaches and techniques.

7.2.3 CEELT II

CEELT II is an internationally recognised, advanced language examination for practising English language instructors. The examination is in three parts (i) speaking (ii) reading, writing error correction and (iii) listening. Sessions to prepare for this examination are held weekly. Trainees who pass all sections of the examination are exempt from the DOTE language paper. The aim of the programme is to improve instructors' own command of the English language, with special reference to professional needs. Instructors who wish to take DOTE (see below) are required to take this course.

7.2.4 DOTE

An eighteen to twenty-four month advanced methodology course requiring ten written assignments (1500-2000 words), a written project (4000 words), and six observations by your ITT. Also included are weekly three-hour input sessions, weekly one-hour language development sessions, regular meetings with your ITT, and a final written exam. The aims of the programme are: 1) To develop a more detailed awareness of the links between ELT theory and practice. 2) To extend this awareness to develop reflective practice and encourage the ability to conduct classroom research. 3) To provide candidates with the opportunity to acquire organisational and analytic skills relevant to the current and future development of EMUEPS.

7.2.5 MA ELT/EDUCATION

Those interested in this course should contact the ELT Department for further details.

7.2.5 CM system

The purpose of the CM system is:

- to facilitate and encourage greater communication between administration and instructors;

- to improve the standards of EMUEPS through a structured system of collaborative and individualised instructor development;

The mode of operation of the CM system comprises:

- weekly whole-group meetings, for the purpose of collaborative development;

- the interview process (see above, 7.1);

- individual or group development cycles. The exact form these will take should be negotiated with the CM, and will be dependent on the targets set. Possible alternatives include
observation, classroom research, letter exchanges, peer observation etc.  
(see catalogue of tools, Appendix 3, for a detailed breakdown)

It should be emphasised that the CM system is not a mechanism for 'evaluating' instructors. Rather it should be seen as an organisational structure through which the quality of language education at EMUEPS can be improved. Within the given structure, instructors have the freedom to map out their own developmental path, and the opportunity to share areas of expertise, ideas, and concerns with their colleagues. The ultimate beneficiaries of this process will be the students.

It should be noted that all teachers have a two-hour teaching reduction in order to be part of this system. Full attendance at meetings and participation in the system is therefore not negotiable.

7.3 Observations

These are an obligatory element of the NT, COTe and DOTE courses. For the CM system, observations are a valuable but optional element.  
(see catalogue of tools, Appendix 3, for alternatives)

The observation scheme is comprised of three stages:

1. The pre-observation meeting
2. The observation
3. The post-observation meeting

(see Appendix 4 for general information and specific guidelines)

7.3.1 Lesson plans

As part of the observation procedure, it is necessary to prepare a lesson plan and give this to the CM/ITT. The plan should:

- give a clear idea of what is to be achieved during the lesson and how this is to be done;
- provide information for the observer concerning the content and aims of the lesson.

7.3.2 Self-evaluation

The purpose of the self-evaluation form is to provide a structure for reflecting on the lesson. These points will then be discussed with the CM/ITT at the post-observation meeting. This form, completed, should be brought to the post-observation meeting.

8. SUBSTITUTION UNIT

The Substitution Unit is a group of instructors who work on reduced scheduled teaching hours in order to be able to cover for any other instructors who may be unable to come to school.
If for any good reason an instructor is unable to attend work, s/he should immediately telephone the Substitution Unit (SU). The telephone number is 366-1634 (an answering machine has been installed). In no instance should this call be later than 8AM on the day in question, in fact, because there is an answering machine, instructors can call at any time the night before. The SU should be informed which classes need covering, what materials are to be used and where they can be found. Excuses should be given to the director, not the SU.

To facilitate this procedure, the backs of attendance sheets should be kept fully up to date and the attendance sheets and materials should be left on your desk in a prominent position so that they can be easily located by the SU. Please do not take class sets of materials home as they cannot be duplicated at a moment's notice.
APPENDIX 2

END OF YEAR INTERVIEW AGENDA

1. Reflection on semester's work:
   1.1 What are the areas of teaching in which you feel you have been successful?
   1.2 What areas of teaching have you enjoyed?
   1.3 What do you think you have done less successfully?
   1.4 What frustrations have you experienced that have prevented you from doing your job as you might have liked?
   1.5 In which areas of your work has your CM/ITT been effective in assisting you?
   1.6 Are there any areas in which you required more assistance?
   1.7 Are there any areas in which you required different assistance?
   1.8 How useful do you think the processes followed have been in assisting you in your professional development? (state which processes you followed)
   1.9 In which skills essential to your job do you feel you are competent?
   1.10 Which skills essential to your job do you think you need to develop?
   1.11 How might you achieve this?

2. Goals:
   Indicate your professional goals:

3. Comments

3.1 CM/ITT:

3.2 Instructor:

Signed: Instructor CM/ITT
APPENDIX 3

Possible Tools for Use in Instructor Development

1. Audio Recordings

Short sections of audio tapes are usually transcribed and then analysed for, e.g., study of instructor instructions, error correction, group interaction, etc. Bear in mind that transcription takes a long time.

2. Video Recordings

As above. The advantage of video is that it provides more context. For analysis, say, of body language, it is essential. The disadvantage of it is that it is more intrusive and needs setting up. Also, students need time to get used to it.

3. Classroom Observation

Observations are a central part of any classroom-based development/research programme. Having said this, there are numerous different forms of observation, ranging from the general to the very narrowly specified. The exact form of the observation should be negotiated beforehand, and should be linked to specific objectives (e.g., one would use a general observation to set targets - having then set the targets, subsequent observations would be more focused). See the catalogue of observation types (available from the Assistant Director for Academic Affairs), and bear in mind that it is a perfectly legitimate exercise to create one's own.

4. Peer Observation

Useful as a method of comparison, and one which enables the instructor to see the classroom from the perspective of a student. Again, it tends to be far more productive if there is a definite focus.

5. Self-Evaluation

To organise one's own thoughts, in terms of target setting, generating hypotheses, etc. As this is a somewhat impressionistic exercise, it needs triangulation, e.g. with 3., above. A variety of self-assessment forms are available (from the Assistant Director for Academic Affairs) to assist in this process.

6. Teacher Diary

As in item 5 above. The point here is that rather than being a one-off exercise, it is done over a period of time. The instructor makes a daily entry concerning his/her lessons and then discusses them with his/her mentor. Particularly useful for new instructors or those engaged in training courses.
7. **Learner Feedback**

Another useful way of getting student perspectives. One requirement however is some kind of system (e.g. a questionnaire) to enable the learners to respond meaningfully, and with at least some objectivity. Could be part of a programme of learner training.

8. **Learner Diary**

Could be combined, for instance, with item 6. Otherwise, the rationale is much the same as it is in item 7, the difference coming in the time taken and length of the finished product. Doesn't have to be done in the target language, but the learners would require considerable guidance if it were.

9. **Letter Exchange**

Here the instructor and mentor exchange letters over a period of time (negotiated beforehand). The purpose is to encourage reflection, and self-assessment of lessons. This can be very usefully combined with personal writing skills development, and thus would be very good, say, for those taking CEELT II.

10. **Directed Research**

In consultation with the mentor, the instructor finds and examines the available publications in an agreed area (e.g. an instructor might find books, articles, videos etc. about using visuals).

11. **Action Research**

This tool, used within the classroom, follows the classic cycle of: PLAN > ACT > OBSERVE > REFLECT which continues until it is decided that enough has been gained from the process to end it.

12. **Interventionist Research**

The instructor does things in a different way and compares with his/her 'normal' practice. For example, an instructor might consciously vary his/her amount of "wait time" and compare the effects on students' responses. This approach could also be used to compare group sizes, methodologies, materials, methods of error correction.

13. **Case Studies**

Might involve detailed analysis (including observation, interview, questionnaire, etc.) of the progress of a small group of learners, say between 1 and 3.

14. **Group Studies**

As above, except the group is larger, probably of one or more classes. Such a study would lack the detail of item 13., but would be more representative. If, for example, one was interested in needs analysis, this would be a far more appropriate tool than
15. Tests

As instrument for measuring progress, diagnosing problems, or indeed for analysis of the tests themselves (as opposed to their more common evaluative use). Keep in mind that if one wants to measure progress through this method, there has to be some kind of pre-testing.

16. Learner Interview

This process could serve a variety of different purposes, including eliciting from students their attitudes, study methods and difficulties; and would gather data for analysis of pronunciation, intonation, grammar, and so on. The interview could be formal and structured, informal and unstructured, or be in the form of a role play. One advantage is that good quality audio recordings can be made, without all the background noise one gets in a classroom.

17. Record Reviews

This technique includes (i) 'thinking aloud' (externalising the content of the mind while engaged in a task mentioning everything however irrelevant it may be); (ii) 'introspection' (very similar to 'thinking aloud', but sticking to relevant issues); and (iii) 'retrospection' (which probes subjects for information after the task has been completed). These processes are used to find out what goes on in students' minds (or for that matter in instructors' minds) when, for instance, they are writing compositions.

18. Needs Analysis

This process can take many forms, e.g., questionnaire, interview, test, etc. Although it is often done at the beginning of a course, it can also be employed on an ongoing basis. Analysis of needs is time consuming and would be far more effectively done by a 'team'.

19. Discourse/Conversation Analysis

Would probably serve as a form of needs analysis on a linguistic level.

20. Questionnaires

Given to instructors or learners or both. Questionnaires can range from the very open, to the more closed (e.g. multiple choice, true/false). Careful thought needs to go into their design, sensitivity should be shown to those involved, and confidentiality respected.

21. Research Replication

To see if generalised research findings hold true in a local situation. (For instance, it has been suggested that the optimal
'wait time' is 3 seconds. But is this the case in a EMU 'C' level class?

22. **Documentation Analysis**

This process uses written documentation as a basis for development, for instance the instructor and mentor might analyse a series of lesson plans to see if the syllabus is being realised, how far needs are being catered for, or find out problems in implementation, etc.

23. **Materials Analysis**

Coursebooks and supplementary materials need to be analysed in terms of appropriacy, effectiveness, and so on.

24. **Hypothesis Testing**

An idea is taken, say, 'Too much error correction interferes with second language acquisition', and then one decides on methods of testing it, as opposed to:

25. **Hypothesis Generating**

Which is really the reverse procedure - first data is collected, and then examined to see what hypotheses are generated.

26. **Product-based Approach**

This approach involves setting a target that has an achievable, and visible result, e.g. 'the production of six well-presented word-processed worksheets.' Compare this with the more amorphous 'to improve word processing skills'.

27. **Process-based Approach**

This approach focuses on the way in which a target is achieved. For example, with the teaching of writing, one might look at how students arrive at a finished piece of work (planning, drafting, correcting, proof reading, and so on).

28. **Group Brainstorm**

This would involve telling a group (i.e., CM group) about a problem/concern/interest, and asking for ideas from them. This could be a matter that has arisen from a recent observation, or something of more general interest. It needs to be remembered that for the process to be beneficial, detailed description of the 'problem' and proper follow-up will be required. The advantage over the one-to-one approach is that one would probably get different perspectives and ideas. Obviously the group needs to be supportive and non-judgemental.

29. **Project-based Approach**

The idea here is to come away from a developmental cycle with something tangible, e.g., an article for an EFL magazine, or the basis for an INSET session or even a short presentation to the
CM group.

30. Team-based Approach

Mentioned here simply to emphasise that there is no need for development to take place in isolation. If one instructor has a target that is the same or similar to another instructor's, it clearly makes sense to pool resources.

Note: Each of these suggested information-gathering tools does not necessarily exist in isolation; there are large degrees of overlap.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MENTEES

Dear Colleague,

This questionnaire is designed to investigate the present practices in the colleague mentoring system at EMUEPS and to find out your ideas and suggestions for the development of this program. Therefore, your cooperation would be much appreciated.

Your identity will remain confidential.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Years of teaching experience at EMUEPS : __________

Years/Months of teaching experience (If different) : __________

Please tick [√] all the qualifications you hold

Bachelor Degree (BA/BS) □

COTE □

CEELT II □

Masters Degree (MA) □

Doctorate Degree (PhD) □

Others, please state __________________________

Thank you for your cooperation,
Feryal Varanoglugulari
PART A
AIMS OF THE COLLEAGUE MENTORING PROGRAM
1. For what purposes do you attend the Colleague Mentoring Program (CM Program)?
   (Please tick the appropriate ones)
   □ to exchange ideas with other colleagues
   □ to upgrade my knowledge about teaching
   □ to improve my teaching abilities
   Others, please state ________________________________

2. Which of the following factors might demotivate your attendance to CM Program?
   (Please tick the appropriate ones)
   □ teaching load
   □ time spent on classroom preparation
   □ other extra curricular responsibilities (e.g. substitution)
   Others, please state ________________________________

3. Please read the following statements and tick one for each item that best shows your opinion about the actual practice at EMUEPS (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree).

   Colleague Mentoring Program ---------------------
   □ □ □ □ □
   □ □ □ □ □
   □ □ □ □ □
   □ □ □ □ □
   □ □ □ □ □

   a. improves my teaching efficiency through researching the activities at institution
   b. enhances my teaching effectiveness through observing and giving feedback about classes
   c. improves my teaching abilities through exchanging ideas with my colleagues
   d. helps people to get together
4. Please read the following statements and tick one for each item that best shows your opinion. (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

I prefer ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. to upgrade professional knowledge by taking part in curriculum/testing development through joining the committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. to improve my knowledge and skills by attending teacher training courses offered at institution like COTE/DOTE/CEELT II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. to be part of a teacher development program (CM Program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What kind of CM Program would you like to see in future? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

- [ ] individual research (e.g. library research, writing diaries)
- [ ] collaborative research projects with colleagues
- [ ] workshops, seminars, lectures run by experts
- [ ] workshops, seminars, lectures run by colleague mentoring groups
- [ ] enhance teaching effectiveness through observing and giving feedback about a colleague’s class

Others, please state ________________________________
PART B  1-TOOLS
6. Please rank the following developmental tools in terms of how interested you might be in using them while achieving the target set (1=Most interesting and 11=least interesting one).

1. Audio recordings
   (Transcribing sections of audio tapes and analyzing, for example instructions or error correction)

2. Video recordings
   (Transcribing sections of video tapes and analyzing, for example body language)

3. Peer Observation
   (Observing a colleague’s teaching)

4. Classroom observation
   (Being observed by a mentor)

5. Self-evaluation
   (Organizing one’s own thoughts, in terms of target setting using available self-assessment forms)

6. Teacher’s journal
   (Taking daily notes about lessons and discussing them with mentor)

7. Learner Feedback
   (Getting students’ perspectives through distributing questionnaires)

8. Letter Exchange
   (Exchanging letters among mentor and mentee over a period of time which is negotiated beforehand)

9. Action Research
   (Developing range of skills to plan, monitor and evaluate in my own teaching)

10. Project-based approach
    (Doing a short presentation to the CM group about an EFL topic)

11. Case studies
    (Involving detailed analysis including observation, interview, questionnaire etc. of the progress of small group of learners)
7. How often do you use the following strategies to improve your professional knowledge in the field of English Language Teaching? Please tick one box for each item.
(1= Frequently and 5=never)

1. I talk about ideas with my colleagues

2. I do research in the classroom with the help of other colleagues

3. I keep teacher journals

4. I write academic essays to share ideas with a colleague mentor

5. I attend conferences, seminars courses or workshops at institution

6. I do research in my classroom through using different research techniques like action research

7. I record the lessons (audio/video)
PART B

2-CM GROUP MEETINGS

8. How frequently do you prefer to have CM group meetings? (Please tick one)
   □ once a week
   □ once a fortnight
   □ once a month

   Others, please state ________________________________

9. How long do you prefer to have CM group meetings? (Please tick one)
   □ 40 minutes  □ 50 minutes
   □ 60 minutes  □ 80 minutes

   Others, please state ________________________________

10. How beneficial do you think the group projects are? Please tick one.
    (1=very beneficial and 5=least beneficial)

   □  □  □  □  □

11. How beneficial do you think the discussions in CM group meetings?
    Please tick one (1=very beneficial and 5=least beneficial)

   □  □  □  □  □

12. How the CM groups would be formed? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

   □ teaching level  □ skills (Listening/speaking/reading/writing)
   □ personal target setting  □ experience

   Others, please state ____________________________________
13. What would be the possible ways to share the ideas presented in the group projects within the whole institution among all the colleagues? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

☐ newsletter e.g. SIGMA
☐ weekly inset sessions run by CM groups
☐ seminars, workshops, lectures run by CM groups

Others, please state ________________________________

PART B
3- INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS

14. Please state whether the personal targets setting ________________ (Please tick the appropriate ones).

☐ is applicable to my teaching situation
☐ improves the quality of my work
☐ is achievable

Others, please state ________________________________

15. Please rank the purposes of the interviews from the most to least important one for you. (1=most important and 3=least important one)

The interviews can help me to _____________ in my teaching.

☐ plan for my future development task for the forthcoming year
☐ recognize strengths
☐ recognize areas of concern
16. Do you think it is effective to have the interviews three times a year? (Please tick one)

□ YES     □ NO

If NO, how many times do you think it should be? (Please tick one)

□ less than three □ more than three

Others, please state ___________________________

17. Please tick one for each statement about whether the content of the first, second and third interviews are applicable to your professional development? (1=Completely agree and 5=Completely disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The interviews aim to facilitate individual development</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The interviews aim to facilitate institutional development</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The content of the interviews aims to identify your professional interests</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the first interview the targets set enables one to analyze the progress in the defined area for development</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The second interview aims to review the achievement of the stated target</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The third interview aims to review what has been done during the whole year</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C
THE ROLES OF MENTORS
18. Please circle a number on the continuum below as what you think the role of the colleague mentor is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sole expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Authority figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trainer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Please rank the skills required of the mentor from the most important to least important one. (1 = most important and 8 = least important one)

1. √ Being a skilled and sensitive listener and respondent
2. √ Being non-judgmental in the meetings
3. √ Being fair to colleagues in the group
4. Encouraging involvement and participation of all members of the group
5. √ Avoiding giving the impression that he/she in any way is superior to the mentee
6. √ Being prepared to act on mentees’ concerns and worries
7. √ Being a good presenter of new ideas
8. √ Using meeting time efficiently
20. Which of the following duties do you think are performed by a mentor? Please **tick** one column for each item (1=Completely agree and 5=Completely disagree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. runs group meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. develops interview skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. guides mentees to use the methods (from the catalogue of tools) while achieving targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. helps mentees to set and clarify targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. reviews targets and gives feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. fills in forms like interview documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. shares ideas with mentees, for example in the pre-observation interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. guides the post-observation interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. is a friend to mentees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. trains mentees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. What do you think the ideal mentor/mentee relationship is? (Please tick the appropriate ones).

☐ one to one   ☐ empathy
☐ agreement between the two   ☐ respect
☐ appreciate with each other’s skills   ☐ equality

Others, please state ________________________________

22. Would you suggest an ongoing mentor training for mentors? (Please tick one)

☐ YES   ☐ NO

If YES, in which areas would you suggest ongoing training? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

☐ group meeting skills (to provide collaboration in CM group meetings)
☐ target setting (to guide mentees to set an achievable target)
☐ interview skills (to conduct effective interviews with mentee)

Others, please state ________________________________

PART D THE ROLES OF MENTEES
23. Please rank the skills required of the mentees in CM group meetings from the most to least important one (1=most important and 5=least important one)

1. ☐ being an active listener and respondent
2. ☐ being non-judgmental
3. ☐ being fair within the group
4. ☐ dealing with concerns of other mentees’ within the CM group
5. ☐ involving and participating in the group development
24. Which of the following duties should be performed by a mentee? Please tick one box from each line for each item (1=Completely agree and 5=completely disagree).

1. Sharing personal pedagogical concerns within a group
   □ □ □ □ □

2. Joining group meetings and interviews
   □ □ □ □ □

3. Being responsible for setting and clarifying his/her own targets throughout the year
   □ □ □ □ □

4. Using methods (from the catalogue of tools) while achieving targets
   □ □ □ □ □

5. Getting information about the unknown tools from the mentor
   □ □ □ □ □

6. Avoiding uncooperative and assertive behavior
   □ □ □ □ □

25. Would you prefer to have an ongoing mentee training? (Please tick one)
   □ YES □ NO

   If YES, in which areas would you prefer to have training? (Please tick appropriate ones)
   □ group meeting skills (to collaborate in CM group meetings)
   □ target setting (to set an achievable target)
   □ interview skills (to conduct an effective interview with mentor)

   Others, please state ________________________________

PART E
BENEFITS OF CM PROGRAM

26. How much do you think that the CM Program has improved your professional development (Please circle the most appropriate one).

  1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______ 4 ______ 5 ______
Extremely A lot Much Little Not at all
27. In which areas do you think that the Colleague Mentoring Program provides development for the EMUEPS? (Please tick the appropriate ones).

CM Program

1. [ ] helps us refine our objectives and priorities
2. [ ] improves communication within the school
3. [ ] improves relationships between colleagues
4. [ ] supports major developments within the school

Others, please state ____________________________________________

28. In which areas do you feel that the CM Program has proven to be useful for professional development? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

1. [ ] improved my confidence/competence in my present role
2. [ ] improved my working relationships with colleagues
3. [ ] given me an appropriate feedback on my strengths
4. [ ] given me an appropriate feedback on the areas that I have planned to improve myself
5. [ ] supported me in developing my professional practice
6. [ ] given me an opportunity to influence the development of the institution
7. [ ] given me an opportunity to set my personal goals
8. [ ] increased the level of satisfaction with my work and the way I do it
9. [ ] improved the understanding of my own role within the institution

Others, please state ____________________________________________
29. What additional comments would you like to make for the development of the Colleague Mentoring Program?
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MENTORS

Dear Colleague,

This questionnaire is designed to investigate the present practices in the colleague mentoring system at EMUEPS and to find out your ideas and suggestions for the development of this program. Therefore, your cooperation would be much appreciated. Your identity will remain confidential.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Years of teaching experience at EMUEPS: ________

Years/Months of teaching experience (If different): ________

Please tick [✓] all the qualifications you hold

- Bachelor Degree (BA/BS)
- COTE
- CEELT II
- Masters Degree (MA)
- Doctorate Degree (PhD)

Others, please state ____________________________

Thank you for your cooperation,
Feryal Varanoglulari
PART A
AIMS OF THE COLLEAGUE MENTORING PROGRAM

1. For what purposes do mentees attend the Colleague Mentoring Program (CM Program)?
   (Please tick the appropriate ones)

   □ to exchange ideas with other colleagues
   □ to upgrade my knowledge about teaching
   □ to improve my teaching abilities
   Others, please state ________________________________________________

2. Which of the following factors might demotivate mentees attendance to CM Program? (Please tick the appropriate ones).

   □ teaching load
   □ time spent on classroom preparation
   □ other extra curricular responsibilities (e.g. substution)
   Others, please state ________________________________________________

3. Please read the following statements and tick one for each item that best shows your opinion about the actual practice at EMUEPS (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree).

   Colleague Mentoring Program ---------------------

   a. improves my teaching efficiency through researching the activities at institution
      □ □ □ □ □
   b. enhances my teaching effectiveness through observing and giving feedback about classes
      □ □ □ □ □
   c. improves my teaching abilities through exchanging ideas with my colleagues
      □ □ □ □ □
   d. helps people to get together
      □ □ □ □ □
4. Please read the following statements and tick one for each item that best shows your opinion. (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

Mentees prefer  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. to upgrade professional knowledge by taking part in curriculum/testing development through joining the committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. to improve their knowledge and skills by attending teacher training courses offered at institution like COTE/DOTE/CEELT II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. to be part of a teacher development program (CM Program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What kind of CM Program would you like to see in future?  
(Please tick the appropriate ones)

- [ ] individual research (e.g. library research, writing diaries)
- [ ] collaborative research projects with colleagues
- [ ] workshops, seminars, lectures run by experts
- [ ] workshops, seminars, lectures run by colleague mentoring groups
- [ ] enhance teaching effectiveness through observing and giving feedback about a colleague's class

Others, please state ________________________________
PART B  1-TOOLS

6. Please rank the following developmental tools in terms of how interested mentees might be in using them while achieving the target set (1=Most interesting and 11=least interesting one).

1. □ Audio recordings  (Transcribing sections of audio tapes and analyzing for example instructions or error correction)

2. □ Video recordings  (Transcribing sections of video tapes and analyzing for example body language)

3. □ Peer Observation  (Observing a colleague’s teaching)

4. □ Classroom observation  (Being observed by a mentor)

5. □ Self-evaluation  (Organizing one’s own thoughts, in terms of target setting using available self-assessment forms)

6. □ Teacher’s journal  (Taking daily notes about lessons and discussing them with mentor)

7. □ Learner Feedback  (Getting students’ perspectives through distributing questionnaires)

8. □ Letter Exchange  (Exchanging letters among mentor and mentee over a period of time which is negotiated beforehand)

9. □ Action Research  (Developing range of skills to plan, monitor and evaluate in my own teaching)

10. □ Project-based approach  (Doing a short presentation to the CM group about an EFL topic)

11. □ Case studies  (Involving detailed analysis including observation, interview, questionnaire etc. of the progress of small group of learners)
7. How often do mentees use the following strategies to improve your professional knowledge in the field of English Language Teaching? Please tick one box for each item.
(1= Frequently and 5=never)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. They talk about ideas with my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They do research in the classroom with the help of other colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. They keep teacher journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They write academic essays to share ideas with a colleague mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They attend conferences, seminars courses or workshops at institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. They do research in my classroom through using different research techniques like action research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. They record the lessons (audio/video)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B
2-CM GROUP MEETINGS
8. How frequently do you prefer to have CM group meetings? (Please tick one)

☐ once a week
☐ once a fortnight
☐ once a month

Others, please state ______________________

9. How long do you prefer to have CM group meetings? (Please tick one)

☐ 40 minutes
☐ 50 minutes
☐ 60 minutes
☐ 80 minutes

Others, please state ______________________

10. How beneficial do you think the
group projects are? Please tick one.
(1=very beneficial and 5=least beneficial)

1 2 3 4 5

11. How beneficial do you think
the discussions in CM group meetings?
Please tick one (1=very beneficial and
5=least beneficial)

1 2 3 4 5

12. How the CM groups would be formed? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

☐ teaching level
☐ skills (Listening/speaking/reading/writing)
☐ personal target setting
☐ experience

Others, please state ______________________
13 What would be the possible ways to share the ideas presented in the group projects within the whole institution among all the colleagues? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

☐ newsletter e.g. SIGMA

☐ weekly inset sessions run by CM groups

☐ seminars, workshops, lectures run by CM groups

Others, please state __________________________

PART B
3- INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS

14. Please state whether the personal targets setting ------------------------ (Please tick the appropriate ones).

☐ is applicable to their teaching situation

☐ improves the quality of their work

☐ is achievable

Others, please state __________________________

15. Please rank the purposes of the interviews from the most to least important one for you.(1=most important and 3=least important one)

The interviews can help mentees to ----------- in their teaching.

☐ plan for their future development task for the forthcoming year

☐ recognize strengths

☐ recognize areas of concern
16. Do you think it is effective to have the interviews three times a year? (Please tick one)

☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, how many times do you think it should be? (Please tick one)

☐ less than three ☐ more than three

Others, please state __________________________

17. Please tick one for each statement about whether the content of the first, second and third interviews are applicable to the professional development? (1=Completely agree and 5=Completely disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The interviews aim to facilitate individual development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The interviews aim to facilitate institutional development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The content of the interviews aims to identify professional interests</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the first interview the targets set enables one to analyze the progress in the defined area for development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The second interview aims to review the achievement of the stated target</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The third interview aims to review what has been done during the whole year</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C

THE ROLES OF MENTORS

18. Please circle a number on the continuum below as what you think the role of the colleague mentor is.

1. Supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 Colleague
2. Lecturer 1 2 3 4 5 Listener
3. Sole expert 1 2 3 4 5 Fellow expert
4. Leader 1 2 3 4 5 Facilitator
5. Authority figure 1 2 3 4 5 Fellow group member
6. Trainer 1 2 3 4 5 Helper/advisor

19. Please rank the skills required of the mentor from the most important to least important one. (1 = most important and 8 = least important one)

1. □ Being a skilled and sensitive listener and respondent
2. □ Being non-judgmental in the meetings
3. □ Being fair to colleagues in the group
4. □ Encouraging involvement and participation of all members of the group
5. □ Avoiding giving the impression that he/she in any way is superior to the mentee
6. □ Being prepared to act on mentees’ concerns and worries
7. □ Being a good presenter of new ideas
8. □ Using meeting time efficiently
20. Which of the following duties do you think are performed by a mentor? Please **tick** one column for each item (1=Completely agree and 5=Completely disagree).

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>runs group meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>develops interview skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>guides mentees to use the methods (from the catalogue of tools) while achieving targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>helps mentees to set and clarify targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>reviews targets and gives feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>fills in forms like interview documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>shares ideas with mentees for example in the pre-observation interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>guides the post-observation interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>is a friend to mentees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>trains mentees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. What do you think the ideal mentor/mentee relationship is? (Please tick the appropriate ones).

☐ one to one ☐ empathy

☐ agreement between the two ☐ respect

☐ appreciate with each other’s skills ☐ equality

Others, please state _________________________________

22. Would you prefer you have an ongoing mentor training for mentors? (Please tick one)

☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, in which areas would you suggest ongoing training? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

☐ group meeting skills (to provide collaboration in CM group meetings)

☐ target setting (to guide mentees to set an achievable target)

☐ interview skills (to conduct effective interviews with mentee)

Others, please state _________________________________

PART D THE ROLES OF MENTEES

23. Please rank the skills required of the mentees in CM group meetings from the most to least important one (1=most important and 5=least important one)

1. ☐ being an active listener and respondent

2. ☐ being non-judgmental

3. ☐ being fair within the group

4. ☐ dealing with concerns of other mentees’ within the CM group

5. ☐ involving and participating in the group development
24. Which of the following duties should be performed by a mentee? Please tick one box from each line for each item (1=Completely agree and 5=completely disagree).

1. Sharing personal pedagogical concerns within a group

2. Joining group meetings and interviews

3. Being responsible for setting and clarifying his/her own targets throughout the year

4. Using methods (from the catalogue of tools) while achieving targets

5. Getting information about the unknown tools from the mentor

6. Avoiding uncooperative and assertive behavior

25. Would you suggest an ongoing mentee training?(Please tick one)

YES □  NO □

If YES, in which areas would you suggest an ongoing training? (Please tick appropriate ones)

- group meeting skills (to collaborate in CM group meetings)
- target setting (to set an achievable target)
- interview skills (to conduct an effective interview with mentor)

Others, please state __________________________

PART E

BENEFITS OF CM PROGRAM

26. How much do you think that the CM Program has improved your professional development (Please circle the most appropriate one).

1 Extremely 2 A lot 3 Much 4 Little 5 Not at all
27. In which areas do you think that the Colleague Mentoring Program provides development for the EMUEPS? (Please tick the appropriate ones).

CM Program

1. [ ] helps us refine our objectives and priorities
2. [ ] improves communication within the school
3. [ ] improves relationships between colleagues
4. [ ] supports major developments within the school

Others, please state ____________________________________________

28. In which areas do you feel that the CM Program has proven to be useful for professional development as a mentor? (Please tick the appropriate ones)

1. [ ] improved my confidence/competence in my present role
2. [ ] improved my working relationships with colleagues
3. [ ] given me an appropriate feedback on my strengths
4. [ ] given me an appropriate feedback on the areas that I have planned to improve myself
5. [ ] supported me in developing my professional practice
6. [ ] given me an opportunity to influence the development of the institution
7. [ ] given me an opportunity to set my personal goals
8. [ ] increased the level of satisfaction with my work and the way I do it
9. [ ] improved the understanding of my own role within the institution

Others, please state ____________________________________________
29. What additional comments would you like to make for the development of the Colleague Mentoring Program?
Dear colleague,
This interview is designed to investigate the present practices in the colleague mentoring system at EMUEPS and to find out your ideas and suggestions for the development of this program. Therefore, your cooperation would be much appreciated.

Biographical information

Years of teaching experience at EMUEPS: ____________

Years (months) of teaching experience (If different): ____________

Please tick all the qualifications you hold
Bachelor Degree (BA/BS/Any kind of teaching certificate) : ____________

Masters Degree (MA) : ____________

Doctorate Degree (PhD) : ____________

Others, please specify : ____________
Interview Questions

Interviews with administrators

1. As it is mentioned in Instructor's Handbook the following are the aims of the present CMS. Among these which one(s) can you say have been fulfilled?

   a. to promote and maintain ongoing professional development

   b. to facilitate change by helping teachers to become self-directing and researchers of their own work?

   c. to provide a structured system of collaborative and explorative development?

   d. to raise/improve the teaching standard at EMUEPS?

2. Mentoring system includes three basic parts, interviews, target-setting and group meetings.

   Which of these part(s) has/have been most successful? WHY?

3. Which of these part(s) has/have been least successful?

4. What do you think are the advantages of this system?

5. What components do you think may be modified next year?

6. Is there anything you would like to add?
Interviews with the coordinator

1. As it is mentioned in Instructor's Handbook the following are the aims of the present CMS. Among these which one(s) can you say have been fulfilled?

   a. to promote and maintain ongoing professional development
   b. to facilitate change by helping teachers to become self-directing and researchers of their own work?
   c. to provide a structured system of collaborative and explorative development?
   d. to raise/improve the teaching standard at EMUEPS?

2. Mentoring system includes three basic parts, interviews, target-setting and group meetings.

   Which of these part(s) has/have been most successful? WHY?

3. Which of these part(s) has/have been least successful?

4. What do you think are the advantages of this system?

5. What components do you think may be modified next year?

6. How do you feel about your role as a coordinator and CM?

7. Is there any developmental changes provided for CMs’?

8. What do you think the roles of mentors/mentees should be in the program?

9. Is there anything you would like to add?
APPENDIX E

Interviews with Administrators

Question one

-- It's very early to give genuine and valid evaluation of the system. The main thing which was pleasing is collaboration between teachers which in fact resulted in two very interesting things. One was, training group, DOTE teachers came together and assess the needs analysis of planned program of learner training which in fact was to put into last semester for all the programs and all levels. Also at the moment a number of the non-training groups are conducting some surveys to try and establish the feelings of the community here in Prep. School, about a skills-based syllabus or an integrated syllabus. So there's a two very positive things to demonstrate the sort of collaborative approach has really been successful.

Question two

-- I think interviews have been very successful. Obviously people like the idea of having some personal attention. As the schools goes bigger it's very easy for teachers to feel lost. At the moment we have about hundred teachers. So the personal interviews I think important and have been successful.

Question three

-- The group meetings, I think have been least successful because I think they take much of their time. That has been problems for some teachers, they didn't like the idea of having to meet weekly and they found it problem.
Question four

-- Of course, I think there are many responsibility for running their school which I think they are part of the school and they must contribute to the running of it. It does make their job that much harder of course because they’re much more involved in everything.

Question five

-- Of course that’s very important. We haven’t had that. We just had very short, one week input session from Jane Anderson, Bilkent University. It’s very helpful but we need sort of continuation. One of the areas for anyone which has this responsibility is how to conduct meetings. In order to get best from the meetings, not to waste time, not to have one person to dominate, to make ensure that everyone is able to say what they wanted to say. this is very important. Plus, the other thing which is equally important being able to listen to as a mentor. To listen impartially without wanting to contribute all the time by yourself wanting not to interrupt, just letting people to speak.

Question six

-- Two things we thought possible being modified. The group meetings may not be weekly, may be fortnightly. And also with the target-setting, possibly we may say one target per semester instead of two. These are sort of small things. one never knows, Because it’s a sort of bottom-up system. Other things may change, it depends on the result of the end of year evaluation.
APPENDIX F
TARGET SETTING FORM

TARGETS FOR SEMESTER ____  (Dates: ________________)

Name:

State the target as clearly and precisely as possible. State through what mechanism/tools it will be achieved, and how success will be measured. Give an approximate indication of the amount of time each task will take. Do not choose more than three tasks.

1. ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

2. ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

3. ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

Signed:

(Colleague Mentor)  (Colleague Mentee)
Teacher's Name:

Group(s) :

State the targets as clearly and precisely as possible. State through what mechanisms/tools it will be achieved, and how success will be measured. Give an approximate indication of the amount of time each task will take. Do not choose more than three tasks.

1. To help students to write more correct papers by teaching them the 'symbols' used in correcting writing papers, and requiring them to re-write them. The students will be asked to correct their mistakes themselves with the guidance of the symbols provided by the teacher. The teacher will collect data on how the students' writing improves when symbols are used to correct their mistakes and will report back to the mentor the outcomes at the end of the semester.
EMUEPS COLLEAGUE MENTOR SYSTEM

FALL 1995-1996

TARGETS FOR SEMESTER

Teacher's Name:

Group(s) :

State the targets as clearly and precisely as possible. State through what mechanisms/tools it will be achieved, and how success will be measured. Give an approximate indication of the amount of time each task will take. Do not choose more than three tasks.

1. To help students to do more effective pre-reading by providing them with 2 appropriate pre-reading activities and materials that are interesting. The mentee will report back to the mentor the improvement in the students' pre-reading at the end of the semester.