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Abstract

INVESTIGATING TRUST IN THE MENTORING RELATIONSHIP:
THE BEGINNING TEACHER’S PERSPECTIVE

Nancy A. Edick

University of Nebraska at Omaha, 2001

Advisor: Dr. Gary Hartzell

The focus of this dissertation was to investigate the beginning teacher’s perspective on trust in the mentor-beginning teacher relationship. This was a qualitative study rooted in grounded theory modified to accommodate the use of received theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The investigative framework was based on two received theories, and each theory formed the foundation for the following research questions:

(1) Gabarro’s (1978) theory predicts that the trust one is willing to place in a workplace associate will be affected by her perceptions of the associate’s character, competence, and judgment. Is this true in the case of the beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentor?

(2) Lewicki and Bunker’s (1996) theory predicts that three levels of trust will emerge in workplace relationships: conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identity-based trust. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentor?

(3) Lewicki and Bunker (1996) predict that the three levels of trust develop in an evolutionary manner. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors?
Ten beginning elementary teachers from four metropolitan area school districts were interviewed four times during the 2000-2001 school year. Each of the teachers were participants in the CADRE Project, a comprehensive graduate induction program coordinated through the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO) and the Metropolitan Omaha Educational Consortium (MOEC).

The findings of this study indicate that trust rests upon teacher perceptions of the mentor's character, competence, and judgment (Gabarro, 1978).

Levels of trust, described by Lewicki and Bunker (1996) as conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identity-based trust were evident in the beginning teacher's perception of the establishment of trust in the mentoring relationship. This study did not confirm, however, that the levels of trust developed in an evolutionary, stage-model fashion. In fact, analysis indicates that there is a possibility that conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identity-based trust develop simultaneously and perhaps even interactively.
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Chapter I - Introduction

Recent decades have seen numerous studies concentrating on the challenges of first-year teachers. While all issues and problems facing education ultimately affect beginning teachers, several are especially influential. Among these are the assignment and misassignment of teachers, their working conditions, and the retention of teachers in the profession.

Teachers with the most experience often request and receive the most attractive assignments, leaving the more difficult assignments to be assumed by beginning teachers. These types of beginning assignments often put beginning teachers in situations which prevent them from succeeding in their first years of teaching (Huling-Austin, Putnam & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986).

If a profession is to remain viable and strong, it must be able to attract promising candidates to its ranks and retain a significant portion of its most talented members. Currently, as older teachers begin to retire in large numbers just as student enrollments are beginning a decade-long rise, a teacher shortage is emerging. Projections are that nearly 2 million new teachers will enter U.S. schools in the next decade (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). Research indicates that beginning teachers leave in the largest numbers. Schlecty and Vance (1983) estimate that first-year teachers are 2 \( \frac{1}{2} \) times more likely to leave the profession than are their more experienced counterparts. Schlecty and Vance further point out that approximately 15% of beginning teachers will leave after their second year and that an additional 10% will leave after the third.

A number of workplace conditions contribute to teacher dissatisfaction. Most
schools are structured so that teachers spend their entire workday isolated from other teachers. This isolation negatively influences both beginning and veteran teachers (Huling-Austin, 1992), but can be especially detrimental to the beginner.

In most professions new graduates learn a great deal from their more experienced colleagues during their initial years, and are not expected to assume the same responsibilities as veterans on the first day of employment. Yet in education this is precisely the case (Newberry, 1977). Relatively low salaries and professional status also contribute to dissatisfaction in the workplace, and many talented young persons who otherwise would consider teaching choose other rewarding career fields (Hanes & Mitchell, 1985). This contributes to the public's view of teaching as a low-status profession and increases public resistance to paying higher teacher salaries. The combination of low salaries and lack of public esteem is often enough to encourage talented teachers to leave the profession, further compounding the problem (Brooks, 1987).

The commitment to providing a caring and competent teacher for every classroom and every student is essential to securing America's future. Because better teaching lies at the heart of all efforts to improve schools, supporting the growth of beginning teachers should be a top priority for all those engaged in school reform. According to Darling-Hammond (1997), executive director of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, we must do two things to retain new teachers: (1) design good schools in which they can teach and (2) employ mentoring.

Because of the pending teacher shortage, increasing efforts to retain teachers, and
Legislative mandates in many states, school districts have begun teacher assistance programs designed to keep more beginning teachers in teaching. Those programs have come to be known as "induction programs," in which one component is individual mentoring (Andrews, 1987; Hawkeye, 1997; Huling-Austin, 1990). The mentor is a teacher, advisor, sponsor, guide, coach and confidante (Daloz, 1986; Kram, 1983; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). Kay (1990) defines mentoring as "a comprehensive effort directed toward helping...developing the attitudes and behaviors [skills] of self-reliance and accountability within a defined environment" (pp. 26-27). Research that identifies mentoring practices that contribute to the growth of effective teaching can help policymakers and program planners understand the power and limitations of this currently popular intervention and design more effective programs.

The literature offers many descriptions and studies of induction programs and mentoring. Most have been quantitative studies and have used surveys to evaluate programs. Their results indicate that mentoring support contributes to the retention of new teachers (e.g., Chapman, 1983, 1984; Sandefur, 1982; Stone, 1987). Some studies have determined that teacher induction programs with mentors ease the transition into teaching by assisting with the mediation of common problems beginning teachers experience. This assistance in the transition process often leads to a more positive view of the district (Freiberg, Zbikowski, & Ganser, 1994; Huling-Austin, 1990). In addition, studies have indicated that working with an experienced teacher will help shape a beginning teacher's beliefs and practices, and help him or her transfer the theories learned in pre-service to appropriate teaching practices (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Feiman-Nemser.
Several studies provide overviews of mentoring and its management (McIntyre, Hagger & Burn, 1994), but few examine or analyze the intricacies of mentoring interactions (Glickman & Bey, 1990), or how mentoring relationships develop between the individuals involved. Given that mentoring is a relationship experience, it’s clear that we need to know more about successful mentor-novice teacher relationships, and specifically, the interaction between mentors and beginning teachers (Feiman-Nemser, et al., 1993; Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986; Hawkeye, 1997; Little, 1990). The mentor-beginning teacher relationship, and how trust is established within this relationship, was the focus of this study.

Several studies conclude that trust is an essential element in school effectiveness (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Moran & Hoy, 1997). Most of the available trust studies have investigated the development of trust between teachers and administrators, and a few limited studies have examined the development of trust between colleagues. The development of trust between mentors and beginning teachers is an area worthy of investigation.

**Statement of Purpose**

The focus of this dissertation was to investigate the beginning teacher’s perspective on trust in the mentor-beginning teacher relationship.

**Research Question**

The grand tour question for this study was:

What is the beginning teacher’s perspective on trust in the mentor-beginning
teacher relationship?

The goal of this study was to explore these questions:

(a) Gabarro’s (1978) theory predicts that the trust one is willing to place in a workplace associate will be affected by her perceptions of the associate’s character, competence, and judgment. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors?

(b) Lewicki and Bunker’s (1996) theory predicts that three levels of trust will emerge in workplace relationships: conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identity-based trust. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors?

(c) Lewicki and Bunker (1996) predict that the three levels of trust develop in an evolutionary manner. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors?

Definition of Terms

Induction.

This term refers to the process of assisting new teachers in the adjustment to their professional role through the orientation to the school and community, and through providing instructional and interpersonal support which fosters professional development and retention (Odell, 1992; Tisher, 1982).

Mentor.

This term refers to an employee of greater experience and seniority in an organization who facilitates the development of a less-experienced employee for the
Benefit of the individual as well as for the organization.

**Metropolitan Omaha Educational Consortium (MOEC).**

This term refers to a collaborative between the University of Nebraska at Omaha's College of Education and the seven metropolitan area school districts: Bellevue Public Schools, Council Bluffs Community Schools, Millard Public Schools, Omaha Public Schools, Papillion-LaVista Public Schools, Ralston Public Schools, and Westside Community Schools. The consortium is a catalyst for identifying high priority issues common to member organizations and a vehicle for addressing these issues through joint task forces and projects. MOEC provides a forum for professionals from across the educational spectrum and from across the community to share information and work together in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

**The CADRE Project.**

This term refers to a combined graduate induction, mentoring, and professional growth and development program. The CADRE Project is coordinated by MOEC. CADRE is an acronym for Career Advancement and Development for Recruits and Experienced teachers. The CADRE Project is a 15-month program for newly certified teachers, which begins with graduate coursework in June, includes a one year teaching assignment, and concludes with coursework completed the following August. CADRE Teachers receive support and guidance from a mentor as they complete their first year of teaching and complete a master's degree. Beginning and experienced teachers form protégé-mentor relationships that offer both the beginner and veteran opportunities to learn new skills and to enhance existing ones.
**CADRE Teacher.**

This title refers to a certificated member of the teaching profession who holds a regular Nebraska or Iowa Teaching Certificate and who assumes full responsibility for a classroom as a beginning teacher in one of the seven MOEC schools districts. The CADRE Teacher is selected by the MOEC school district according to that district’s hiring practices. The CADRE Teacher is an employee of the university while a participant in the CADRE Project. He or she is enrolled in a master’s degree program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Tuition is paid through the project. A stipend of $11,000 is paid to the CADRE Teacher.

**CADRE Associate.**

This title refers to an experienced teacher who holds a master’s degree and is selected from a MOEC school district according to criteria established by the participating school districts and the CADRE Project. Job responsibilities are approximately:

- 25% mentoring two CADRE Teachers
- 25% university responsibilities
- 50% school district responsibilities

**Mentor Project.**

This term refers to a program that helps ease beginning teachers’ entry into the teaching profession by training experienced instructors from the schools to serve as their mentors. The project annually matches approximately 50 veteran and new teachers in mentoring–protégé relationships that offer participants opportunities to grow and
develop. The project is a cooperative effort of the MOEC consortium.

**Interview.**

This term is defined as a purposeful conversation (Lincoln & Guba, 1995).

**Trust.**

This term is defined in the literature in many different ways. For purposes of this investigation, I used Mishra’s (1996) multi-dimensional definition: “Trust is one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) competent (b) reliable (c) open and (d) concerned” (p. 265).

**Methodological Outline**

This was a qualitative study rooted in grounded theory modified to accommodate the use of received theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The investigative framework was based on two received theories:

1. Workplace trust rests upon perceptions of the other person’s character, competence, and judgment (Gabarro, 1978), and

2. Trust exists at three evolutionary levels: conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identification-based trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

Received theory is appropriate because the informants for this study were first-year elementary teachers. The timeline was limited to the one year that they were “beginners.” It would be difficult, perhaps impossible in such a short time, to generate data that would reach a level of saturation necessary for the generation of an original grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Ten beginning teachers from four metropolitan area school districts were
interviewed four times over the course of the school year.

Limitation and Delimitations

1. This study was confined to a sample of ten beginning CADRE Teachers who were being mentored by five different CADRE Associates.

2. The sample was limited to elementary teachers who were in the first year of teaching.

3. The sample was limited to beginning teachers who were participants in the CADRE Project and were being mentored by a CADRE Associate with previous experience mentoring within the CADRE Project.

4. I am a past coordinator of the CADRE Project and continue to serve in an advisory role, which may have shaped my interpretation of the data.

5. The findings in this particular qualitative study could be subject to other interpretations.

6. The data was all self-reported.

7. The results of the study are not generalizeable since it was only an exploratory study guided by received theory.

Significance of Study

The critical nature of supporting the first-year teacher calls for additional contributions to the body of research on teacher growth and development as well as information about effective mentoring approaches.

The results of this study are important for several reasons. First, only a limited amount of research has investigated the personal interaction that occurs between mentors
and beginning teachers. Identifying the types of interaction that are beneficial to the growth and development of beginning teachers provides information to assist in developing appropriate training for mentors. The mentor-beginning teacher relationship may be the foundation for new teacher growth and development (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986).

Second, the information obtained may assist policymakers in developing and evaluating mentoring programs. Numerous states mandate teacher induction programs which include mentoring as a primary component. However, few programs include systematic evaluation components that provide information about their effectiveness. Assessing the relationship between the mentor and the new teacher, and in particular, if and how trust is established in that relationship, would be an important part of a program evaluation system.

The significance of this study lies in the information it provides (1) mentors about elements of effective mentoring, (2) beginning teachers about making the most of the mentoring experience, (3) program developers who design training for mentors, and (4) district and state policymakers whose intention is to provide a quality induction experience for beginning teachers.

Most research in the area of mentoring is descriptive, with a limited number of qualitative studies providing a deeper understanding of the potential impact of the mentor-protégé relationship. Information and insights gained from qualitative research should add to the body of professional literature about the benefits of mentoring.
Organization of This Report

Chapter II reviews the literature pertaining to (1) teacher induction, (2) what we know about beginning teacher development, (3) what we know about mentoring, (4) what we know about trust and the role that trust plays in mentoring, and (5) the implications of the existing research on mentoring and implications for practice. Chapter III discusses the qualitative data collection and analysis procedures utilized in the study. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study, and the conclusions of the study are discussed in Chapter V.
Chapter II – Literature Review

The concept of mentoring beginning teachers is worthy of exploration. During the 1980's, educators began to regard mentoring as a key component of reform in teaching. The high rate of teacher attrition during the first three years, as well as an awareness of the problems faced by beginning teachers, led to the logic of providing on-site support and assistance during the first year of teaching. More recently, a pending teacher shortage and projections of large numbers of new teachers entering U.S. schools in the next decade (Yasin, 1998) have led to a rapid increase in mandated mentoring support for beginning teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 1996).

The following review of literature begins with a discussion of induction, a broad term which encompasses all aspects of assisting new teachers in adjusting to the teaching environment. Mentoring is an increasingly common component of induction. This is followed by a discussion of what we know about beginning teacher development. Information on beginning teacher development includes retention, specific challenges of the first year of teaching, socialization, and the beginning teacher stages of development. The third section of the review discusses what we know about mentoring. Approaches to mentoring, mentor preparation and the merits of mentoring are discussed. The fourth section of the review discusses what we know about trust and the role that trust plays in mentoring. Finally, the review addresses implications of the existing research on mentoring, and the existing research on the role trust plays in the mentoring relationship.
Induction

Definition.

Induction is a broad term carrying a variety of meanings among researchers. Evey (1956) defined induction as assisting new teachers in adjusting to a new teaching environment. He explained that induction encompasses all activities, efforts and experiences that are designed to assist newcomers to adapt satisfactorily to new work and a new situation. Evey asserted that the induction period begins as early as “the decision is made by the employing agent and the employed person to enter into a contractual relationship” (p. 68). Assisting with the mastery of two tasks - effectively employing the skills of teaching and adapting to the social system of the school - was defined by McDonald (1980) as induction. Tisher (1982) referred to induction as assisting new teachers in becoming professionally competent. More recently, Gregory (1998) indicated that induction practices have three main objectives: (1) To help new employees settle into their environment, (2) to help them understand their responsibilities, and (3) to ensure that the organization receives the benefits of a well-trained and highly motivated employee as quickly as possible. In each definition, induction is the process of supporting the work of beginning teachers.

Mentoring.

The most recent U.S. Department of Education (1999) report on professional development shows that participation in teacher induction has steadily increased in recent years. A typical component of many induction activities is a mentoring program that enables new teachers to work with a mentor teacher for at least a year (Ganser, Bainer,
Bendixon-Noe, Brook, Stinson, Giebelhaus, & Ruyon, 1998).

The term "mentor" originated in Homer's *The Odyssey*. Mentor was a tutor given the responsibility of caring for Odysseus' son, Telemachus, when Odysseus left to fight in the Trojan War. Mentor was described as providing both wise and sensitive counsel to the son as he groomed him to become king.

A number of modern definitions have been offered to describe a mentor, but a synthesis of these reveals that a mentor is an employee of greater experience and seniority who facilitates the development of a less-experienced employee for the mutual benefit of the individual and the organization. The mentor is a teacher, advisor, sponsor, guide, coach, and confidante (Daloz, 1986; Kram, 1983; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). In the California Mentor Teacher Program, for example, mentors represent an outstanding group of teachers who have the training and expertise necessary to help newcomers (Schulman & Colbert, 1985).

Traditionally, mentoring has been defined as an intense interpersonal exchange between an experienced colleague (mentor) and a less experienced colleague (protégé or mentee) in which the mentor provides support, direction, and feedback regarding career plans and personal development (Dalton, Thompson, & Price, 1977; Hall, 1976; Kram, 1983). Beginning-teacher induction programs with mentors in key roles refer to a planned program intended to provide systematic and sustained assistance, specifically to beginning teachers for at least one school year (Huling-Austin, 1990).

Mentoring programs are commonly viewed as efficient ways to induct new teachers into the profession. For over a decade, reformers and policymakers have called
for induction programs; Recruiting New Teachers, an organization based in Belmont, Massachusetts, recently published a poll showing that 91% of the general public approves of mentoring programs as a way to help meet the staffing needs of schools (1999).

What Do We Know About Beginning Teacher Development?

Many education scholars agree that the first year of teaching is exceptionally challenging (Huling-Austin, Odell, Ishler, Kay & Edelfelt, 1989). As Veenman (1984) noted, during the first year, “The collapse of the missionary ideals formed during teacher training is replaced by the harsh and rude reality of classroom life” (p. 143). Estimates are that about 30% of beginning teachers do not teach beyond two years and that almost 40%, and especially the most academically talented, leave the profession within their first five years of teaching (Heyns, 1988; Schlechty & Vance, 1981, 1983; Stone, 1987). Data from the National Center for Educational Information (Feistritzer, 1990) show that the attrition rate for beginning teachers is approximately 4.1% annually, approximately twice the rate of experienced teachers.

Retention.

Most researchers have affirmed that the likelihood of new teacher retention is enhanced by providing emotional support and positive reinforcements, and assistance with management, instructional strategies, and resources (Stone, 1987). However, it has been understood for some time (Lortie, 1975) that levels of teacher retention are determined by many factors: demographic, professional, environmental, psychological, organizational and social. Variables such as age, sex, socioeconomic status, minority or non-minority membership, marital status, the adequacy of preparation, the extent of
professional and social integration into teaching, job and career satisfaction, context, and stress have all been hypothesized to influence retention (Heyns, 1988).

Sandefur (1982) determined that lack of appropriate induction is a major cause of teachers leaving the profession during the first three years of teaching. A more recent study by Odell and Ferraro (1992) suggests that mentoring may have reduced the typically high beginning teacher attrition rate to a level more usually found among experienced teachers. This study, a four year retrospective assessment of mentoring support derived from questionnaire data, showed that beginning teachers who were still teaching after four years most valued the emotional support that they had received from their mentors in their first year. Providing emotional support to beginning teachers may have an efficacious impact on subsequent teacher retention.

Chapman (1983, 1984) demonstrated a social learning model of the many influences on teacher retention and found that long-term teacher retention can be improved by mentoring teachers during their first year. He determined that the roots of long-term teacher retention are grounded in the teachers' early commitments to and experiences in teaching. The quality of the first teaching experience seems to be more positively related to teacher retention than either their prior academic performance or the adequacy of their teacher preparation programs (Chapman, 1984).

First-Year Challenges.

The first year of teaching provides a wide range of challenges. The novice tries to cope with a staggering variety of adjustments. The problems of first-year teachers are well known. Johnston and Ryan (1983) capture the first-year teacher's dilemma:
Beginning teachers are strangers to the school communities they enter. They bring no credible background of professional experience. They bring no reputation other than ‘beginner.’ At no other time in a teacher’s professional career are others so unsure of the beginner’s competence as during his or her first year of teaching.

First-year teachers are aliens in a strange world, a world that is both known and unknown to them. Though they have spent thousands of hours in schools watching teachers and involved in the schooling process, first-year teachers are not familiar with the specific school setting in which they begin to teach. Beginning teachers must learn the geography of their new community setting, the location of supplies, the music teacher’s room, and the PE director’s office. They are not familiar with rules and regulations, which govern the internal operation of the school community and the larger system in which they are teaching. (p. 137)

First-year teachers are expected to undergo a miraculous metamorphosis from student to full-fledged, competent teacher, assuming responsibility for the learning, growth and self-esteem of other individuals. The relationship between personal growth and development and learning to teach may be a vital one. A number of researchers (Haberman, 1991; Huling-Austin, 1992; Reiman & Edelfelt, 1991; Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983) have confirmed the seemingly obvious notion that teaching, which requires guiding the growth of others, requires a certain level of maturity in the teacher.

Numerous studies have identified the characteristic limitations of first-year
teachers (Broadbent & Cruickshank, 1965; Bullough, 1987; Dropkin & Taylor, 1963; Elias, Fisher, & Simon, 1980; Lortie, 1975; Ryan, 1970; Smith, 1950; Stout, 1952; Veenman, 1984; Wey, 1951). From Smith’s work in 1950 through Bullough’s 1987 case study, there have been very few shifts in labeling the problems of first-year teachers: knowledge of subject matter, instruction, discipline, classroom management, students’ needs, relationships, frustrations, isolation, and lack of training.

Research on effective teaching (Brophy & Good, 1986; Fielding & Pearson, 1994; Yates & Yates, 1993) indicates that student learning is related to organization and management of the classroom, instructional clarity and variety, student success rate, and student engagement in the learning process. Studies of effective classroom instruction indicate that effective teachers tend to be particularly successful with respect to classroom management (Dropkin & Taylor, 1963; Evertson et al., 1995).

Ryan et al. (1980) identified several areas of difficulty for first-year teachers. These areas include personal life adjustment, teachers’ expectations and perceptions of the task of teaching, the strains of daily interactions, and the teaching assignment itself. The researchers conclude that these difficulties lead to intense strain, which, in turn, leads to fatigue, depression and subsequently, for many, exit from the profession.

Socialization.

Organizational socialization is the process by which new members learn about the important features of their new work settings (Ashford & Taylor, 1990). Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) investigated the effects of mentoring during the initial transition to career-oriented work in new organizational settings, and found different patterns of
information acquisition for newcomers with and without mentors. Mentored newcomers are more quickly sensitized to the importance of organizational culture, politics, history and other system-wide features than are their nonmentored colleagues. In contrast, newcomers without mentors tend to focus more on the immediate contextual features of their jobs and workgroups, and they rely on their co-workers for obtaining information about these content domains.

In *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*, his classic work on teacher socialization, Lortie (1975) identified several social norms for teachers. Lortie and others (Little, 1990; Sarason, 1982) have described the norms resulting from teachers working in isolation and the struggles of first-year teachers. When teachers do interact, they rarely discuss or request assistance with significant problems in their classrooms (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). Socialization literature has also identified a norm discouraging teachers from telling a peer to do something different in the classroom (Newberry, 1977). Schools do exist in which teachers support one another and may socialize out of school, but even in these cases, teachers tend to avoid talking about instructional practices (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986).

In general, many beginning teachers experience feelings of isolation, inadequacy, and poor self-image (Kuzmic, 1994). However, Hart (1989) describes how schools’ conservative traditions of individualistic and egalitarian social organization shape the mentor roles. The norm of isolation means that many skilled veteran teachers have had little experience communicating with other teachers about their practice. The conservative norms for teacher interaction make it difficult for the mentor to critique the
work of beginning teachers and for beginning teachers to request help with problems in their classrooms (Little, 1990).

**Stages of Development.**

The critical issue of supporting teachers in their first year of teaching can be addressed by identification of the stages of development of beginning teachers. Several writers have developed models of the stages that teachers typically go through in their professional development (Berliner, 1987; Fuller, 1969; Kagan, 1992). Berliner (1987) identifies five levels of teacher development, ranging from novice through beginner, competent, proficient, to expert teacher. Competent teachers tend to rely on a set of maxims or rules in their decision making drawn from personal experience and the prevailing culture of teaching. Experts, on the other hand, tend to be improvisational performers (Borko & Livingston, 1989), and their actions depend very much on the circumstances of each situation.

From a sociological and psychological perspective, Maynard and Furlong (1993) suggest five distinct stages of development that students and beginning teachers typically move through in learning to teach: early idealism, survival, recognizing difficulties, hitting the plateau, and moving on.

These studies are congruent with the research on organizational socialization across a variety of occupations. Research has long supported the notion that the process of organizational socialization occurs in stages (Feldman, 1976; Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975; Schein, 1978; Wanous, 1980, 1992). Generally, stage models recognize from three to five steps, but virtually all models involve the following:
1. A pre-entry period in which anticipations and expectations about the job and about one's self in the job, are developed by the employee (Feldman, 1976; Nicholson & West, 1988; Porter et al., 1975; Shein, 1978).

2. An entry or encounter period, in which the newcomer and his or her expectations meet the reality of life in the organization (Feldman, 1976; Louis, 1980; Schein, 1978).

3. A stabilization or role management period in which the employee achieves integration into the organization and integration of the work into his or her non-work life (Feldman, 1976; Schein, 1978).

It is not uncommon for the stages to overlap; first because the boundaries between stages are not completely clear, and, second, because individuals will proceed through the stages at varying rates depending on personal and workplace variables (Wanous, 1992).

The three stages illustrated in the sociological research closely parallel the stages proposed by Ryan et al. (1980), who draw extensively on Fuller's (1969) work. Ryan et al. argue that teachers go through four loose but identifiable stages on the way to professional competence: A "fantasy" stage, a "survival" stage, a "mastery" stage, and finally an "impact" stage.

An awareness of beginning-teacher concerns and stages of development theory are useful in understanding effective practices for supporting beginning teachers. The challenges experienced in the first year create a pattern of behavior and understanding that is played out in subsequent years. Habits develop and ideas are solidified. How well or how poorly the teacher's career begins has profound importance for future personal
and professional development (Bullough, 1987).

In summary, support for beginning teachers has many potential benefits for education. Induction improves the retention rate of those entering the profession (Odell & Ferrar, 1992; Sandefur, 1982). In addition, the rate of new learning that occurs in the first year of teaching as the beginner faces the challenges of the classroom, as well as the adjustment to the social norms of the school and classroom, require support. Finally, research about the stages of development of beginning teachers indicates that appropriate support at the various stages is beneficial to beginning teacher development.

What Do We Know About Mentoring?

Mentoring research is characterized by three distinct, but related approaches. First, some writers have taken a functional approach, identifying stages of development and corresponding models of mentoring to meet beginning-teacher needs (Berliner, 1987; Caruso, 1996; Fuller, 1969; Gray & Gray, 1985; Kagan, 1992; Maynard & Furlong, 1993). A second approach emphasizes the interpersonal aspects of learning to teach at the various stages of new teacher development (Brooks, 1996; Field, 1994; Kram, 1983; Wildman, Magliero, Niles, & Niles, 1992). The final approach argues that mentors bring their own values, assumptions and perspectives to the mentoring task, consequently, influencing the type of mentoring that takes place (Abell, Dillon, Hopkins, Mcinerney & O'Brien, 1995; Martin, 1997; Wildman et al., 1992; Williams, 1994).

Mentoring Approaches.

Based on stage model theories of socialization and of beginning teachers' experience, mentoring support programs often mirror and operate in response to teacher
stages of development (Berliner, 1987; Fuller, 1969; Kagan, 1992). Maynard and Furlong (1993) conceptualized three models of mentoring to help address the needs of beginning teachers at each stage of development. They refer to these models as the apprenticeship model, the competency model, and the reflective model. In the apprenticeship model, the mentor provides the type of support necessary for the novice teacher who needs support and guidance with the most basic decisions of teaching. The competency model provides support to the beginning teacher who is working at the stage of competence and requires support and guidance that involves collegial support, sharing, and coaching. The reflective model of mentoring provides support for beginning teachers who are at the competent-to-proficient stage of development and require support and guidance focused on developing reflective thinking about teaching.

Similarly, organizational socialization research (Chao, 1997; Kram, 1983, 1985) suggest that there are four phases of mentoring. First, the relationship begins with the initiation period. The relationship becomes more intense during the second phase, cultivation. After this time, the mentor and newcomer may begin to break apart, and the relationship is characterized by a separation phase. In this phase, there is a structural and psychological separation between the mentor and newcomer. Following this, the mentor and newcomer enter into the fourth, and final phase, redefinition, where the relationship changes from a mentorship to a collegial or peerlike relationship.

The second approach argues that not only are cognitive skills and professional classroom competencies to be developed, but also a host of affective and interpersonal factors that affect the mentor's task and the beginning teacher's development. The
relationship established between mentors and beginning teachers is the foundation of all mentoring processes, complete with the interplay of cognitive, affective, and interpersonal factors (Wildman et al., 1992). In addition to the personalities involved, the relationship involves interpersonal or psychosocial development, career and/or educational development, and socialization (Field, 1994) between individuals of different experience, expertise and orientations. Given the complexities of the relationship, the probability of difficulties is high.

Mentors and beginning teachers bring their individual sets of beliefs, orientations, concerns, and pressures to the mentoring process, according to the third approach to mentoring. Wildman et al. (1992) conclude that “because mentoring involves highly personal interactions, conducted under different circumstances in different schools, the roles of mentoring cannot be rigidly specified. Mentoring, like good teaching, should be defined by those who will carry it out” (p. 212). Just as beginning teachers must address the constructs they bring to teaching, mentors must examine and be able to articulate the perspectives they bring and pressures they find, in order to see the patterned behaviors of their mentoring practice.

The emerging picture of mentoring is extremely complex, one in which enormous variation of practice persists. To some extent, such variation is inevitable and desirable; however, establishing some underlying consistency for mentoring practice is needed to help assure a high rate of success. Wildman et al. (1992) recommend that experienced teachers work together collaboratively to design and implement mentoring programs. Mentoring interactions tend to be complex and are based on intentions grounded in
thoughtful professional judgment. When given the opportunity to act on the basis of their own beliefs and knowledge, mentors are able to attend to the needs of beginning teachers within their school contexts and cultures.

**Mentor Preparation.**

Given that the mentoring relationship is very complex, an examination of approaches to mentor preparation is essential. Common topics of study include clinical supervision, research on effective teaching, beginning teacher concerns, and theories of adult learning. Less common, but no less important, are opportunities for mentors to analyze their own beliefs about learning to teach and to articulate their practical knowledge of teaching (Hawkeye, 1997).

Daloz (1986) describes the characteristics of support and challenge and discusses ways in which these two can combine to enhance learning within mentoring relationships. He describes support as an affirming activity in which the beginning teacher feels cared for, whereas the function of challenge “is to open a gap between student and environment, a gap that creates tension in the student, calling for closure” (p. 213). In this definition of challenge, generating cognitive dissonance is the mainspring for learning; without such dissonance and at the same time “mitigation of pre-existing images, the knowledge acquired during preservice teacher education appears to be superficial and ephemeral” (Kagan, 1992, p. 147).

Daloz conceptualizes how different levels of support and challenge can combine to affect learning within a mentoring relationship by describing four different outcomes. When support is high but challenge is low, the learner will respond with feelings of
confirmation but will not be prompted into further development. When support is low but challenge is high, the learner will retreat and withdraw from learning. When support and challenge are both low, the learner will face a standstill. When support and challenge are both high, the learner will grow and make progress (see Figure 1).
Figure 1. Daloz's (1986) description of different levels of support and challenge combining to affect learning.
Merits of Mentoring.

Many researchers believe that working with an experienced teacher will help shape a beginning teacher's beliefs and practices (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Feiman-Nemser et al., 1993; Koerner, 1992; Staton & Hunt, 1992). By promoting observation and conversation about teaching, mentoring is believed to help teachers develop tools for continuous improvement. If learning to teach in reform-minded ways is the focus, mentoring may also fulfill its promise as an instrument of reform.

A two-year study by Freiberg et al. (1994) concluded that mentoring can make a difference in solving some of the problems new teachers encounter by providing encouragement, resources, information and a model of good teaching. In addition, they found that mentored teachers have a mirror in which to view themselves - their progress, their strengths and weaknesses, and their effectiveness - in a realistic manner. Moreover, mentors open up avenues for communication and encourage teachers to use them. Finally, they found that while the actual benefit of mentoring will be different for each teacher, knowing that their needs are being addressed through mentoring results in the teachers having a more positive view of the district.

Theoretically, mentoring goes beyond the evaluative role of supervision. Mentoring involves modeling and learning together (Stanulis, 1994). Experienced teachers, reflective practitioners, argue that they do not master teaching skills but continue to grow and develop skills as the result of continued reflection on and improvement of teaching practice. Fox and Singletary (1986) found that successful assistance provides "new teachers with skills that will assist them in developing methods
for problem-solving and transferring the theories learned in preservice training to appropriate teaching practices" (p. 14).

Experienced teachers find they have much to learn from mentoring new teachers. Stevens (1995) believes that mentoring is a basic form of education for human development because it provides a holistic, yet individualized, approach to learning. Adults who work as mentors grow in their own sense of intellectual competence, as well as in their sense of purpose, their feelings of autonomy, and their personal integrity. Benefits for mentors include: (a) recognition of their expertise, (b) development of leadership skills, (c) development of professional friendships, (d) opportunities to learn from newer teachers, and (e) the resulting tendency to reflect on established practices (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986; Ganser, 1993; Huffman & Leak, 1986; Killion, 1990; Stevens, 1995; Wildman et al., 1992).

In summary, research indicates numerous benefits to mentoring for both the new and veteran teacher. In addition, while many approaches to mentoring seem to be based on stage theories of beginning teacher development, it is apparent that there is no “best way” to mentor. Mentoring practice involves cognitive, affective and interpersonal factors that make the mentor-beginning teacher relationship extremely complex. One thing seems clear – mentoring involves highly personal interactions that are inevitably defined by those who carry it out.

Trust and the Mentoring Relationship

Scholars have widely acknowledged that trust can lead to cooperative behavior among individuals, groups, and organizations (Gambetta, 1988; Good, 1988; McAllister,
In an era where organizations are searching for new ways to promote cooperation between people and groups, it is not surprising that interest in the concept of trust and, in particular, how to promote or actualize trust is increasing (Kramer & Tyler, 1996). This holds true for educational organizations, which are searching for new ways to induct teachers, with mentoring as a key component of the induction process.

Understanding why people trust, as well as how trust shapes relationships, has been a central focus for psychologists, sociologists, political scientists, economists, anthropologists, and students of organizational behavior (Kramer & Tyler, 1996). Trust is a complex concept. According to Moran and Hoy (1997), “studying trust is like studying a moving target because it changes over the course of a relationship, and the nature of a trusting relationship can be altered instantaneously with a simple comment, a betrayed confidence, or a decision that violates the sense of care one has expected of another” (p. 335).

Definitions of Trust.

Schlender, Helm and Tedeschi (1973) defined trust as the “reliance upon information received from another person about uncertain environmental states and their accompanying outcomes in a risk situation” (p. 149). Most contemporary definitions attempt to capture its complexity with multidimensional definitions, highlighting the many facets of a trusting relationship. Cummings and Bromily (1996) define trust as “an individual’s belief or a common belief among a group of individuals that another individual or group (a) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit and implicit, (b) is honest in whatever negotiations preceded
such commitments, and (c) does not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available" (p. 337).

Mishra’s (1996) definition of trust is multidimensional with respect to the qualities possessed by the trusted person. “Trust is one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) competent (b) reliable (c) open and (d) concerned” (p. 265).

Trust has been defined many different ways in the literature in many different ways. Common to the definitions are the level of openness that exists between two people, the degree to which one person feels assured that another will not take malevolent or arbitrary actions, and the extent to which one person can expect predictability in the other’s behavior in terms of what is “normally” expected of a person acting in good faith (Gabarro, 1978).

Building Trust in the Relationship.

According to Gabarro (1978), criteria for workplace trust can be grouped in terms of a person’s perception of the other’s character, competence and judgment. Gabarro refers to these as the three bases of trust, and each of these bases will be discussed below.

Character includes the integrity and honesty that exists in the relationship. Motive is also an important source of character, and is described by Gabarro (1978) as “what one perceived as the other’s intention” (p. 296). Consistency and predictability of behavior are important sources for character. Finally, the ability to be open and discreet is necessary for character to be a source of trust.
The second base of trust is *competence*, which is unique to workplace trust. Three different areas of competence emerge as being important: (1) specific competence, which is the specialized knowledge and skills required to do a particular job, (2) interpersonal competence, which refers to an understanding of how to work with people within an organization, and (3) business sense, which refers to a more generalized competence, and is often referred to as experience and/or wisdom.

The third base of trust is *judgment*, which transcends the others. For example, judgment and competence are sometimes difficult to distinguish, as are discreetness and interpersonal competence. Judgment seems to be based on an accumulation, or on the cumulative effects of the accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems, and events. Some of the interactions leading to judgment as a source of trust may involve critical incidents; most, however, involve routine interactions of an everyday nature.

Expanding on a model of relationship developed in a business context that was proposed by Shapiro, Sheppard, and Cheraskia (1992), Lewicki and Bunker (1996) describe three levels of trust. At the start of a relationship the trust that exists is *conditional*. This level of trust is based on consistency of behavior – that people will do what they say they are going to do. People are willing to transact with each other, as long as each behaves appropriately. Individuals fear the consequences of not doing what they say, but they also realize that there are rewards in preserving trust. If continued contact and communication do not result in increased trust, then the relationship may remain at this level. At this early stage, trust is partial and quite fragile. Progress in the
development of trust in the relationship is slow, and even a single event of inconsistency may challenge the relationship.

The next level of trust, according to Lewicki & Bunker (1996), is knowledge-based trust, which depends upon knowing the other well enough to be able to anticipate his or her behavior. Lindskol (1978) and Rotter (1971) identify three dimensions of knowledge-based trust: (1) information contributes to the predictability of the other, which contributes to trust, (2) predictability enhances trust, and (3) accurate prediction requires an understanding that develops over repeated interactions in multi-dimensional relationships. Communication and spending time together are key in knowledge-based trust development (Shapiro et al., 1992). Regular communication puts a party in constant contact with the other, exchanging information about wants, preferences, and approaches to problems. Without regular communication, one can “lose touch” with the other – not only emotionally, but in the ability to think alike and to predict the reactions of the other. At this level, trust is not necessarily broken by episodes of inconsistent behavior. If people believe that they can adequately explain or understand someone else’s behavior, they are willing to accept it, forgive that person, and move on in the relationship.

As the relationship evolves, a deeper identification between partners emerges. This leads to the third level of trust, identity-based trust, which is characterized by complete empathy with the other party’s desires and intentions. Identification-based trust develops as one both knows and predicts the other’s needs, choices, and preferences and also shares some of those same needs, choices, and preferences.
Many of the same activities that build and strengthen provisional trust and knowledge-based trust also serve to develop identification-based trust. Four additional factors strengthen identification-based trust (Shapiro et al., 1992): (1) developing a collective identity, such as name, title, logo, etc. (2) co-location, (3) creating joint products or goals, (4) committing to commonly shared values. Jones and George (1998) propose that in order for organizations to have the capability for real synergy among their members, the organization and members must develop tacit knowledge – the unspoken, implicit knowledge embedded in the interactions among people in teams that contributes to superior performance. The development of tacit knowledge can only happen when identity-based trust exists.

Work relationships are often knowledge-based trust relationships, and identification-based trust may not develop for several reasons: one or both of the parties lack the time or energy to invest beyond the knowledge-based trust level, or they may have no desire for a closer relationship.

Jones and George (1998) propose that trust is a psychological construct, the experience of which is the outcome of the interaction of people’s values, attitudes, and moods and emotions. According to Mayer, Davis & Schoorman (1995), a person’s value system furnishes criteria that a person can use to evaluate and make sense of events and actions in the surrounding world, guiding her behavior and interpretation of experiences. That value system determines whether certain types of behaviors, events, situations, or people are desirable or undesirable. An individual whose value system emphasizes
loyalty and honesty, for example, will strive to achieve loyalty and honesty in his or her relationships with others.

Attitudes, according to Jones and George (1998), are viewed as the knowledge structures containing the specific thoughts and feelings people have about other people, groups, or organizations.

Moods and emotions can be described in terms of the extent to which they entail positive or negative affect (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Moods and emotion are fundamental aspects of the experience of trust for three reasons.

First, the experience of trust embodies emotions and moods. For example, if, when meeting a stranger, a person experiences high negative affect, he or she may initially distrust that person. However, in the presence of a trusted party, a person may experience positive affect and be excited or enthusiastic.

Second, one’s current affective state may color one’s experience of trust and the way a person forms opinions and makes judgements about the trustworthiness of others (Schwartz, 1990). Experiencing positive moods or emotions may cause one to have more positive perceptions of others resulting in a heightened experience of trust in another person.

Third, trust is built on expectations that are, in part, emotional. Since people tend to be most concerned with current feelings much more than with attitudes or values, emotions contribute greatly to the ongoing experience of trust. Emotions change frequently, providing changing signals concerning the nature of trust with other people or
in particular situations (Frijda, 1988). The evolution of trust depends on the development of favorable attitudes and expectations through behavioral exchanges.

**Trust in Schools.**

Trust in schools has been called the foundation of school effectiveness (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993). When trust is present, individuals can focus on the task at hand, which results in a more productive working and learning environment.

Research has demonstrated that the behavior of the principal impacts the quality of trusting relationships in schools. Hoy and Kupersmith (1986) determined that the authenticity of the principal's behavior is positively correlated with faculty trust. Trust in the principal is determined primarily by the principal's behavior. A teacher's trust in the principal has also been linked to a positive school climate (Tarter, Sabo & Hoy, 1995), as well as to school effectiveness (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992).

Limited research has been done in the area of inter-teacher behavior and trust. Recently, Moran & Hoy (1997) examined the authenticity of teacher behavior and trust in an exploratory study in middle schools. They found what one might intuitively expect: that faculty trust in colleagues is basically determined by how teachers behave in relation to one another. The principal's behavior had little influence on the trust that teachers had with one another.

When examining the dynamics of trust in schools, it is important to take into account the social context of groups and subgroups that exist in schools. Networks of friendships may form on the basis of grade-level or subject taught, location in the building, time of lunch break, gender, race, ties with or against the principal, veteran
teachers as opposed to novices, or any number of other factors. Norms of these groups can strengthen trust within the subgroup, but may diminish trust for those outside of the subgroup (Moran & Hoy, 1997).

In summary, teacher trust is closely linked to how individual teachers of a school treat each other. Faculty behavior that is open, collegial, professional and authentic produces trust in colleagues. Open and authentic principal behavior creates teacher trust in the principal.

Implications of the Literature for Research

As this literature review suggests, much research has been done in the area of beginning teacher development, approaches to mentoring, and the merits of mentoring. Those promoting mentoring have found easy acceptance for mentoring on the basis of the cultural legacy of the mentor-beginning teacher relationship and its potential for providing support for beginning teachers and a new professional responsibility for experienced teachers. Little (1990) asserts that the emphasis on comfortable and harmonious relations, combined with the norm of noninterference found in schools, constrains mentors from posing tough questions about practice. This seems to be particularly true when programs have been implemented with too little conceptual understanding of mentoring, unrealistic expectations, and poorly thought out implementation strategies. Ultimately, the continued application of mentoring in teacher development efforts may depend upon better definitions of mentoring (Healy & Welchert, 1990), a stronger empirical warrant (Little, 1990), and a more informed and collaborative approach to program development (Wildman et al., 1992).
The key to developing mentoring relationships that help beginning teachers learn the ways of thinking and acting associated with reform-minded and effective teaching practices may be the level of trust that is developed and maintained in the mentor-beginning teacher relationship. By acquiring more knowledge about the element of trust in the relationship, school districts may gain information specifically useful in selecting and training mentors.

The concept of trust has been explored in several social science literatures—psychology, sociology, political science, economics, anthropology, history, and sociobiology (Gambetta, 1988; Lewicki & Bunker, 1995; Worchel, 1979). Each of the social sciences examines trust from its individual disciplinary perspective. In the profession of education, trust has been examined primarily from the perspective of faculty trust in principals and faculty trust in colleagues, which are important elements of organizational life in schools, but which represent only part of the complex trust relationships found in schools.

This study sought research data regarding the development of trust in the mentoring relationship. Most work on the mentor phenomenon continues to be descriptive, and a limited number of studies provide a deeper understanding of the potential impact of the mentor-beginning teacher relationship. These studies support the potential for mentor-beginning teacher relationships that go far beyond emotional support relationships. It is important to envision and work toward cultures in which teacher collaboration and teacher leadership in career development is supported at all levels. Merriam (1983) suggests the importance of clarifying what occurs in the relationship.
between a mentor and beginning teacher. A number of case studies have examined the
importance of mentor-beginning teacher dialogue and coaching in the development of
higher cognitive views of teaching and classroom practices (Kilbourn & Roberts, 1991;
Lambert & Lambert, 1985; Ponticell & Zepeda, 1994). Since trust is the foundation for
thoughtful dialogue and coaching that leads to reflective teaching practice, a study of the
development of trust in the mentoring relationship makes a significant contribution to the
body of literature that exists on the mentor-beginning teacher relationship.
CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY

A general discussion of qualitative research design and the specific design chosen for the study is contained in this chapter. A description of the writer’s role as researcher, the plan for selecting participants, and the procedures used in data collection and analysis are presented.

The Qualitative Research Design

This study investigated the beginning teacher’s perspective on trust in the mentor-beginning teacher relationship. It was an exploratory study into an area of trust research not previously examined. The literature review provided valuable information regarding what we know about the induction of beginning teachers, beginning teacher development, the benefits of mentoring and the role of trust in schools. The literature review also helped to formulate the problem and determine the methodology (Merriam, 1988).

Exploratory studies are appropriate when researchers are investigating and responding to descriptive questions which have not been previously studied in depth, or for which theory has not been developed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The outcome of exploratory studies is not the generalization of results, but a deeper understanding of experience from the perspectives of the participants selected for study.

Although Merriam (1983) and others have argued the importance of clarifying what occurs in the relationship between a mentor and beginning teacher, how teachers come to trust their mentors was an area that had not yet been explored. Some studies have examined mentor-beginning teacher dialogue and coaching in the development of higher cognitive views of teaching and classroom practice (e.g., Kilbourn & Roberts,
1991; Lambert & Lambert, 1985; Ponticell & Zepeda, 1994), but no studies could be found that examined the development of trust in the mentoring relationship.

The investigation utilized qualitative methods of grounded theory, modified to accommodate received theory. The purpose of the study was not to generate new theory, but to explore whether existing theory regarding the nature and development of trust in the workplace could be extended to schools. The study was short-term longitudinal in scope. The logic for this methodology is described below.

Qualitative Grounded Theory Methodology

In grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), a phenomenon of interest is identified for study. All data gathered during the study direct the design of each step of the study as it evolves. The categories, themes, and subsequent hypotheses that emerge are "grounded" (have their initial foundation) in the data themselves. It is expected that the most important questions will emerge during the course of the study. The proposed outcome of this research method is the generation of hypotheses, which will eventually be tied together in theory.

Received Theory

The methodology utilized for this study was a modified grounded theory approach, described by Glaser and Strauss (1967) as received theory. In received theory, an existing theory or conceptual framework is used as the foundation of the research. The researcher collects additional data to clarify or elaborate the existing theory or conceptual framework. The researcher aims at validating the derived concepts, but does not further question the received theory. The test is whether the received theory applies
within the context under consideration. The focus of the investigation is to generate new insights, categories, and hypotheses, but only within the limits of the original theoretical framework.

In this study, data were collected through a series of interviews with each of the participating teachers. These data were analyzed to build an understanding of how and why a beginning teacher does or does not develop trust in a mentor assigned to him or her as part of a professional induction experience. Since the study centered on why the beginning teacher does or does not come to trust the mentor, only the CADRE Teachers were interviewed and not the mentors.

The investigative framework was based on two received theories:

(1) Workplace trust rests upon perceptions of the other person’s character, competence, and judgment (Gabarro, 1978).

(2) Trust exists at three evolutionary levels: conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identification-based trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

Received theory is appropriate because the informants for this study were first-year elementary teachers. The timeline was limited to the one year that they were “beginners.” It would be difficult, perhaps impossible in such a short time, to generate data that would reach a level of saturation necessary for the generation of an original grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

In addition, the one-year timeline of this study was dictated by the fact that beginning teachers and mentors work together for only the first year of teaching. Also, one year constitutes the natural cycle of a work year for teachers. Similar events and
experiences repeated during the second or subsequent years of teaching are encountered in a different context and have a different impact on individual teachers and mentors.

Role of the Researcher

In the qualitative paradigm, the researcher becomes a part of the ecology of the study. Theoretical sensitivity is an essential element for qualitative research and refers to the attributes of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand, and the capability to separate the pertinent from that which is not pertinent (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

My perceptions of the support provided by, and benefits achieved from, the mentoring experience have been shaped by my personal experience. From 1982 to 1993, I served as a teacher in a large metropolitan school district. From 1990 to 1993, in addition to my teaching role, I served as a mentor to beginning teachers. From 1993 until May of 2000, I served as coordinator of the Metropolitan Omaha Educational Consortium’s (MOEC) Mentor and CADRE Projects. Each year, I had direct responsibility for training approximately fifty mentor teachers from throughout the metropolitan area in the art and skill of mentoring. In addition, I worked collaboratively with twelve CADRE Associates who provide mentoring support to 24 CADRE Teachers. In June of 2000, I was appointed Director of Special Projects for MOEC, and I continue to serve as an advisor to the Mentor and CADRE Projects.

I believe my closeness to the mentoring process enhanced my awareness, knowledge, and sensitivity to many of the challenges, decisions, and issues encountered by mentors and beginning teachers. I believe my experiences and the relationships I
developed assisted me in working with the informants in this study and reduced the odds that some important facet of the experience might have been overlooked and omitted.

Because of my previous experiences with mentor teachers, as well as my service as trainer and coordinator of the Mentor and CADRE Projects, I brought unique ideas, values, beliefs, and biases to this study. Although every effort was made to ensure objectivity, these biases inevitably had some influence on the way I viewed and interpreted the data I collected and the way I interpreted experiences. Merriam (1988) refers to this as the researcher's preconceived ideas that help him or her become immersed in the research. The researcher observes, responds, and interprets situations in ways that represent his or her own unique understanding. This immersion is not a liability, but a way of providing insight into a situation. This involvement is considered useful and positive to the research process (Eisner & Peshkin, 1990).

Data Collection Procedures

Population and Sample

At the time of this study, there were a total of 24 CADRE Teachers and 12 CADRE Associates in the CADRE Project. Using purposeful sampling (Creswell, 1994), 10 of the CADRE Teachers, mentored by 5 of the CADRE Associates were used as informants for this study. As Merriam (1988) points out, purposeful sampling is "based on the assumption that one wants to discover, understand, gain insight; therefore one needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most" (p. 48).

According to Patton (1986), "the idea in qualitative research is to focus in depth on a small sample of 'information rich' individuals to learn a great deal about specific
issues of central importance" (p. 169). The decision to limit the number of interviewees was based on four factors.

First, the study was limited to elementary teachers only. The decision to exclude secondary teachers was intended to isolate members of the sample into a single organizational structure and eliminate any organizational or operational factors that might impact the trust beginning teachers develop in their mentors at one level but not at the other.

Second, in order to reduce the chance that the relationship between the beginning teacher and the mentor would be affected by mentor inexperience, all the teachers selected for study were mentored by CADRE Associates with prior experience mentoring in the CADRE Project.

Third, the time demands of the multiple interview approach dictated limiting the number of participants.

Lastly, the small sample size increased the odds that I could build trusting relationships with each individual in the study. According to Rubin & Rubin (1995), successful interviewing is, in part, the result, of an ongoing relationship that is built on trust and interest in what is being said. The strongest relationships evolve when interviewer and interviewee talk face-to-face over time in several separate encounters.

The teachers represented four different midwestern school districts. Two of the informants were in a large school district in a metropolitan urban center, and eight were in three smaller suburban school districts. All ten were Caucasian females. They ranged in age from 22 to 27; the average age was 24.
As participants in the CADRE Project, each teacher had been assigned a CADRE Associate to serve as her mentor. The associates had been selected as mentors by their respective school districts based on the following criteria:

1. Possession of a current state teaching certificate;
2. Completion of requirements for tenure;
3. Possession of a master's degree or higher;
4. Completion of a minimum of five years of highly successful teaching experience with the school district;
5. Demonstration of effective teaching practices in the classroom;
6. Adeptness at problem solving;
7. Recognition of positive interpersonal skills with both students and peers;
8. Participation in mentor training, which included information about establishing and maintaining trust in the mentoring relationship.

As CADRE Associates, each of the mentors had had one or two years of prior mentoring experience within the CADRE Project. The associates ranged from 33 to 44 years old; the average age was 40. Their teaching experience ranged from 10 to 22 years, averaging 17. All were female Caucasians. Each associate mentored two beginning teachers.

**Ethical Considerations**

Every attempt was made to carry out this study in an unbiased fashion, respecting the rights of the informants. By its very nature, qualitative research is more intrusive than quantitative approaches because qualitative methods are highly interpersonal. It was
important for me to protect the informants by maintaining confidentiality of the data and by using the research strictly for the purpose it was intended. The following safeguards were utilized in order to protect the informants' rights:

(1) Institutional Review Board permission was obtained for conducting this study (Appendix)
(2) a general purpose for the study was presented to all persons concerned;
(3) permission was obtained from informants to proceed with the study;
(4) the informants were told of all data collection devices and activities;
(5) member checks of transcripts were completed by each informant;
(6) the final document was written in such a way that no individual informant, school, or district was identifiable.

The Absence of Deliberate Triangulation

Triangulation refers to the process where a variety of data sources are compared with one another in order to crosscheck data and interpretations (Denzin, 1978). The four categories of triangulation include data triangulation, investigative triangulation, theory triangulation, and methodological triangulation (Creswell, 1994).

Several factors required me to question the utility of deliberate triangulation in this instance. First, the individualized perceptions of the beginning teachers were not subject to verification. Second, the events that fostered or eroded trust were not observable. Also, I was not interviewing mentors because their behavior was largely the target of the interviews with the beginning teachers and to cause them to think about their behavior would cause them to alter it. In addition, since my primary data source was the
beginning teacher in each case, I could not jeopardize the trust placed in me to keep confidential what was shared with me. Finally, there were no documents or records to review that would bear directly upon any beginning teacher’s interpretation of her mentor’s behavior or attitude.

Data Collection Methods

Evidence indicates that workplace trust rests upon perceptions of character, competence, and judgment (Gabarro, 1978). Additional theory predicts the emergence of three evolutionary levels of trust: conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identity-based trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). The focus of this study was to collect experiential data relative to these theoretical elements.

Data for this study were collected through four interview sessions conducted in August and October of 2000 and in February and May of 2001. The multiple interview approach increased the probability of securing accurate data (Creswell, 1998). Since the first-year teaching experience is limited to a ten-month period, and the mentoring relationship also is limited to this time frame, four interviews over a ten-month period were appropriate for gathering information to investigate the development of a beginning teacher’s trust in her mentor.

Each interview was tape-recorded and notes were taken during each interview in order to facilitate later analysis. The interview approach employed open-ended questions, active listening, careful recording of responses and follow-up through relevant probes. This method of in-depth interviewing allowed me to capture each teacher’s unique perspective (Patton, 1990).
The interview was the most appropriate method of data collection because this study was both exploratory and descriptive. Since I was collecting individual personal perceptions that could not be standardized, no survey instrument was appropriate.

Following Patton's (1990) advice, I developed an interview schedule. An interview schedule is a series of topics or broad interview questions through which the researcher is free to explore and probe with the interviewee. The interview schedule allowed me to discover what was important to the interviewees within the broad boundaries of the interview topics and questions, and to pursue these new discoveries in the interview.

As the four interviews were conducted over the course of the year, the research also relied on Patton's (1990) question typology as a guide. Patton outlines six types of questions that may be asked in an interview:

1. Experience/Behavior Questions ask about what people do or have done.
2. Opinion/Value Questions tap into beliefs and values.
4. Knowledge Questions ask interviewees to tell what they know about a particular topic.
5. Sensory Questions are designed to tap into what the interviewee sees, hears, touches, smells, and tastes, and can provide the researcher with a kind of vicarious experience.
6. Background/Demographic Questions help the researcher characterize each interviewee, as well as the sample that comprises the study.
The first interview took place within two weeks of the mentor and beginning teacher formally working together for the first time. On August 3rd and 4th, 2000, the mentors and beginning teachers spent two full days together in a seminar class. The overriding objectives for the two days were to develop a better understanding of the mentoring relationship and to prepare for the first day and/or week of school. Since the first interview was conducted when the beginning teachers barely knew their mentors, the questions focused on experiences and perceptions that could provide data about the earliest stages of the mentoring relationship. The initial interviews averaged about forty-five minutes in length, because the number of appropriate questions at this point in the mentoring relationship was limited.

I used a standardized structured open-ended interview as described by Patton (1986). This type of interview reduces interviewer bias and judgment, makes analysis less difficult, allows organization around similar concepts, allows future researchers to operate from the same base, and allows readers to see what was and was not asked in the course of the study. The structured interview also creates the consistency necessary for meaningful data analysis and comparison.

The first interviews took place in August, 2000, and subjects were interviewed in their classrooms. The specific questions used in the first interview were as follows:

First Interview Questions

Questions 1-3

Question 1: Do you think that your mentor shows any particular areas of strength? If so, what are they?
Question 2. What is your initial impression of what your mentor knows about (insert specific grade level of Beginning Teacher)? Please explain.

Question 3. Why do you think your mentor was chosen for this position?

Rationale for question 1-3.

Because these questions were asked at the beginning of the mentor-beginning teacher relationship, when there had been a limited opportunity for actual experiences, they represented what Patton (1990) defines as opinion/value questions. According to Mayer, Davis & Schoorman (1995), a person’s value system serve as a guide to interpreting and evaluating experiences and in so doing, determines if they are desirable or undesirable. Since there had been a limited number of interactions between the mentor and the beginning teacher, I had anticipated that the responses to these questions would be based primarily on opinions and values.

According to Gabarro (1978), perceived competence is one of the bases of trust. Within the larger concept of competence, three different areas are significant. The first area, specific competence, refers to specialized knowledge and skills. The second area, interpersonal competence, refers to the ability to work with people. The third area of competence, business sense, refers to a more generalized competence than to expertise in a certain area. This type of competence includes the tacit knowledge and wisdom drawn from a broad experience base.

Questions 1 and 2 targeted specific competence and interpersonal competence. Question 3 specifically targeted business sense. These first three questions were
designed to provide baseline information regarding the beginning teachers’ initial impression of the mentor teachers’ overall competence.

**Questions 4-7**

Question 4. What kinds of things have you and your mentor been doing?

Question 5. What kinds of topics have you and your mentor discussed?

Question 6. Is there anything that you have not done with your mentor that you wish you could have? If so, explain.

Question 7. How many times have you and your mentor met? How long did you meet?

**Rationale for questions 4-7.**

Interview questions 4 through 7 can be categorized as experience/behavior questions (Patton, 1990), and focused on the types and frequency of interactions. Trust develops over time and the nature of this trust becomes more concrete and differentiated, or multi-facted, as people come to know each other better (Gabarro, 1978; Good, 1988; Kramer & Tyler, 1996). Further, how much and in what ways one person comes to trust another are based on an accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems, and events. Shapiro, et al. (1992) determined that communication and spending time together are essential in the development of knowledge-based trust. These questions were designed to collect information about the frequency and duration of interactions, as well as the types of interactions and how they might affect the establishment of trust.

**Questions 8 & 9**

Question 8. Do you think your mentor will be of help to you? If so, how?
Question 9. Does your mentor seem to care about you? If so, what makes you feel this way?

Rationale for questions 8 & 9.

Patton (1990) defines this type of question as a feeling question. Since the beginning teachers were in the earliest stages of coming to know their mentors, these questions sought to determine their initial reaction to the mentor's character. Important components of character include integrity motives, consistency, openness, and discretion (Gabarro, 1978). In addition to gathering information about how the beginning teacher perceived the mentor's character, Question 8 provided additional opinion/value information about the mentor's perceived competence.

A follow-up question was employed in the second set of interviews to determine if their initial feelings of how the mentor would help them held true. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) refer to the initial stage of trust as conditional trust, where continued contact and communication result in people doing what they say they will do. Consistent behavior results in increasing levels of trust.

Question 10

Whom do you trust most and why?

Rationale for question 10.

This question is an experience/behavior question (Patton, 1990). In the process of gathering baseline data, the question was used to probe for the person's own conceptions of trust and how trust is established. Each of the participants was asked to define and interpret trust based on her previous experiences. It was important for me to consider the
possibility that many of the participants had little or no work experience, so their
definition of trust might have been based on experience in social rather than in workplace
relationships.

Several definitions of trust appear in the literature (e.g., Cummings & Bromily,
1996; Mishra, 1996; Schlender, Helm & Tedeschi, 1973). This question provided
information to support or affirm, and perhaps to assess, these definitions. In addition,
beginning teachers' responses provided base-line data to investigate whether there was an
evolution in their definition and interpretation of trust as Lewicki & Bunker (1996)
predicted there would be.

Analysis of First Interview

Each interview was tape recorded, and notes were taken during the interview.
These notes consisted primarily of key phrases, lists of major points and ideas expressed
by the informants, and quotes that captured the specific voice of the informants. To
check for internal validity, member checks were included (Patton, 1986). Following the
interview, the tapes were reviewed and key ideas, quotes, etc. drawn from the notes were
added and/or clarified. The tapes have been stored in a secure location, and are readily
available for review.

After each interview was summarized, I returned the summary and quotations to
each informant, and asked her to check the accuracy of the data collected. I verified with
informants that emerging conclusions were accurate. Emerging categories and themes
became the basis of subsequent interview questions. Summarizing the interviews and
obtaining member checks took place promptly after the interviews, as did the analysis,
since the period of time following an interview is critical in the effectiveness and rigor of this qualitative method (Patton, 1986).

Prior to the development of the second interview schedule, the constant-comparative method of data analysis was employed. Based on what I had found, I began development of the questions for the second round of interviews. The second interviews occurred in October and took place in each of the teachers’ classrooms. The questions I used were:

**Second Interview Questions**

**Questions 1-4**

**Question 1:** Do you think your mentor shows any particular areas of strength? If so, what are they?

**Question 2:** Have you had the opportunity to teach with and/or observe your mentor teaching? If so, tell me about this experience.

**Question 3:** Has your mentor shared stories and/or experiences from her classroom teaching experiences? If so, explain.

**Question 4:** Have you had a situation that was a major challenge? How did you handle the challenge? Did you share this challenge with your mentor? (If no – Why not? If yes – How?)

**Rationale for questions 1-4.**

Gabarro (1978) indicates that there are three significant areas of competence: specific competence, interpersonal competence, and business sense. Questions 1 through 3 were asked to help determine the beginning teacher’s perception of her mentor’s
competence at this point in the relationship. In the initial interviews and analysis, the teachers' responses had focused specifically on interpersonal competence. After the teachers had been working with their mentors for two months, I was interested in finding out if interpersonal competence remained the focus of their responses, or if a perception of specific competence, which rests on recognition of the mentor's knowledge and skills was emerging or had been established. Questions 3 and 4 also helped determine if the teachers perceived their mentors as having business sense, the third area of competence.

Questions 5-8

Question 5: What kinds of things have you and your mentor been doing?

Question 6: What kinds of topics have you and your mentor discussed?

Question 7: Is there anything that you have not done with your mentor that you wish you could? If so, explain?

Question 8: How often are you and your mentor in contact with one another?

How long do you usually meet? Where do you usually meet?

Rationale for questions 5-8.

The foci of questions 5 through 8 were frequency, duration, and types of interaction. Analysis of the first interview responses did not indicate a correlation between time spent together and variation in the types of interaction. At that time, however, little variance had yet emerged in the amount of time teachers spent with their mentors. Since Gabarro (1978) indicates that the development of trust is associated with time spent together, further examination of the frequency and duration of interactions was appropriate. Responses to question 8 also provided information about the whether the
teachers were beginning to develop knowledge-based trust, the second stage in Lewicki & Bunker's (1996) three-stage model of trust.

Responses to these questions also provided information about the teacher's perceptions of her mentor's judgment, an additional source of trust defined by Gabarro.

Questions 9-11

Question 9: Has your mentor been of help to you? If so, how? If not, why do you think she has not been of help?

Question 10: Does your mentor seem to care about how you are doing? If so, what makes you feel this way?

Question 11: Do you think that the classroom teaching experience of your mentor has contributed to the mentoring experience? If so, explain.

Rationale for questions 9 – 11.

Questions 9 through 11 focused on competence and commitment. In the initial analysis of data, the participants were positive, but cautious in their responses to similar questions. Their responses fell into two categories: their perceptions of their mentor's (a) experience, and (b) curriculum knowledge. Since the initial interview had taken place prior to school starting, their responses were based on limited interactions and interactions without students. I wanted to further explore the beginning teachers' perceptions that experience and curriculum knowledge were sources for determining the competence and commitment of their mentors.
Question 11 also addressed the teacher's perception of the mentor's judgment, which is built from an accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems and events (Gabarro, 1978). I wanted to find out if the beginning teachers perceived the mentor's experience as contributing to judgment.

Question 12:

I want you to think of someone that you really trust. Visualize that person. Now I want you to think of some descriptors of that person. Complete this statement:

I trust this person because he/she is...

1.

2.

3.

Rationale for question 12.

In the initial analysis, the teachers had had a difficult time responding to the question, "Whom do you trust most and why?" Most of the participants could not reflect on workplace trust, but only on personal trust. Their responses focused on honesty and confidentiality. References to competence were non-existent. The question was re-framed for the second interview, requiring the beginning teachers to be more specific about the descriptors.

Analysis of Second Interview

Again, each interview was tape recorded, and notes were taken during the interview. I verified my data and did the member checks using the same process earlier described. I then performed the second round of data analysis. Following the constant
comparison protocol, I integrated data from the first set of interviews with those from the second and adjusted my categories and components. Using what I had found, I began development of the questions for the third round of interviews.

Third Interview Questions

Question 1

Do you feel that your mentor has had an influence on you? If so, how? If not, why not?

Rationale for question 1.

Gabarro (1978) suggests that the development of trust is very much a function of: (a) how clearly mutual expectations are been worked out between two people and (b) how well mutual expectations are met. After completion and analysis of the second interview responses, eight out of the ten teachers perceived their mentors as having met their expectations. Similarly, Gabarro (1978) suggests that the degree of influence one person has on another is dependent on how much that person is trusted by the other. This question helped to probe deeper into the development of trust between the teacher and the mentor by exploring the issue of influence, which follows expectations fulfillment in the development of trust.

Question 2

Does your mentor seem to enjoy the mentoring part of her job? Explain.
Rationale for question 2.

A frequently mentioned basis for developing trust is what one perceives as the other’s intentions and/or motives (Gabarro, 1978). This question aimed at finding out what the teachers perceived as the mentor’s intention or motivation.

In addition, this question helped verify Lewicki and Bunker’s (1996) notion that conditional trust requires a perception of a relationship as having “profit potential.” Questions 6 and 9 further explored this notion, also.

Question 3

If you had to identify a major challenge that you have had so far this year, what would it be? How did you handle the challenge? Did you share this challenge with your mentor? If not, why not? If yes, tell me about this.

Rationale for question 3.

Leveling with one another and being honest are an important part of openness, a component of the character-based source of trust identified by Gabarro (1978). The responses to this question also helped to provide information in regard to perceived competence. This question had been asked in the second interview, but few of the teachers then acknowledged having yet encountered a “major challenge.” The question was asked again to determine if an accumulation of additional teaching experiences resulted in more significant responses to this question. This was necessary because important experiences do not occur on any sort of timetable. One teacher may have had a given experience during her first month in the classroom and another may not have had a similar experience until the spring.
Question 4

What kinds of "people skills" have you found most helpful in your role as a classroom teacher? Has your mentor been of help to you in this area? If so, how? If not, why not?

Rationale for question 4.

This question explored the second area of competence-based trust, referred to as interpersonal competence (Gabarro, 1978). Gabarro found that in working relationships, a confidence in the other’s ability to work with people contributed to this level of trust. This area had not been explored in previous interviews. In order for the beginning teachers to respond in an informed manner, the mentor and beginning teacher needed to have worked together long enough to have had opportunities for interactions in a variety of settings.

Question 5

Has your mentor been of help to you? If so, how? If not, why do you think she has not been of help?

Rationale for question 5.

The question explored the business sense area of competence-based trust. Business sense refers to a more generalized competence than expertise, and includes common sense, wisdom, and an understanding of how business or in this case, schools, work. This question had been asked in the second interview, also. Previous analysis of the data indicated that the teachers perceived their mentors as helpful, but they were not able to clarify how the mentor had been of help. It was important to ask the same
question again to help determine if a perception of business sense was developing. Question 1 and question 3 in the third interviews also contributed data helpful in determining if the beginning teachers perceived their mentors as possessing business sense.

Question 6

Have you experienced any challenges in your mentoring relationship? By that, I mean differing opinion, and ideas, approaches to problem solving, etc. If so, explain.

Rationale for question 6.

This question, as well as question 7 and question 8, focused on the third source of trust, defined by Gabarro as judgment (1978). In order for a perception of judgment to develop, incidents that provide opportunities for each person to test and explore limits of the relationship are necessary. Without this kind of testing, the relationship may evolve somewhat superficially. When tests occur, the nature of trust becomes more “differentiated,” meaning that accumulated experiences have resulted in interactions with the mentor in a variety of roles including classroom teaching, coaching, expert, advisor, friend, etc. This question helped to determine if the mentor/beginning teacher relationships had been tested, and if so, whether these tests contributed to differentiating the relationship.

Question 7

Does your mentor seem to show any specific areas of strength? If so, identify one or two that you feel are the strongest. Tell me about events, discussions, etc. that led you to this conclusion.
Rationale for question 7.

Important to understanding perceptions of judgment as a source of trust is the ability to identify specific areas in which the beginning teachers trusted their mentors and the areas where they may not have trusted the mentors. In Gabarro’s exploration of business relationships, the question became not “How much do I trust him?” but “In what areas and in what ways can I trust him?” When pressed to justify why they trusted a person, Gabarro found respondents tended to refer to specific prior events, discussions, or reports. Question 7 helped determine if this held true in the teacher-mentor relationship. Responses to Questions 1, 3, and 4 were also examined to determine if they contributed information about the analysis of judgment in the relationship.

Question 8

Do you think that the classroom teaching experience of your mentor has contributed to the mentoring relationship? Explain.

Rationale for question 8.

Perceptions of judgment as a source of trust are based on how one person perceives another’s behavior through an accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems and events, mostly involving routine interactions of an everyday nature. This question helped to find out if the teachers perceived the mentors’ classroom teaching experience as contributing an impression of judgment. This question had also been asked in the second interviews. All of the teachers responded positively regarding the mentor’s teaching experience, however they were not able to be specific about what or how the mentors’ teaching experience contributed to the mentoring relationship.
**Question 9**

Is the mentoring what you expected it to be? If so, how? If not, how is it different?

**Rationale for question 9.**

Questions 9 through 14 examined trust in relation to Lewicki and Bunker's (1996) three-stage model. Their model suggests that trust can be described as conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identification-based trust. Each is linked sequentially so that achievement of trust at one level enables the development of trust at the next level. Conditional trust is grounded in the concept that "people will do what they say they will do or there will be a loss of the relationship," (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996, p. 118). This question helped to determine if the teachers perceived such behavior in their mentors and felt a level of conditional trust. Questions 2 and 6 also provided information about this stage of trust. According to Lewicki and Bunker, establishing conditional trust is necessary in order for the next stage of trust to develop. Analysis of the second interview responses revealed that 7 of the 10 teachers indicated that they held conditional trust in their mentors, so the question was retained to monitor any possible developments in the three remaining relationships and to confirm the existence of trust in the others.

**Question 10**

How often are you and your mentor in contact with one another? How long do you usually meet? Where do you usually meet? Has this changed since the beginning of the year? How do you decide what you will do when you are together?
**Rationale for question 10.**

This question had been asked in the second interviews, but was asked again both to confirm previous information and to seek additional clarification and/or elaboration. The question provided information about the establishment of conditional trust, but also provided information about Lewicki & Bunker's second stage of trust, knowledge-based trust. It was useful in determining if a relationship was transitioning from conditional to knowledge-based trust. Knowledge-based trust is dependent on two key processes: regular communication and courtship.

The clarifying question asking what the beginning teacher and mentor did when they were together also provided information about the third stage of trust, identification-based trust. Analysis of data following the third interview indicated that communication and courtship (see definition below) were perceived as well established in 8 out of 10 of the mentor/beginning teacher relationships.

**Questions 11-12**

11. Does your mentor seem to know you well as a teacher? If so, in what way and how has this happened?

12. Does your mentor seem to know you well outside of your role as a teacher? If so, in what way and how has this happened?

**Rationale for questions 11-12.**

These questions were asked for the first time in February. They focused on courtship, which is identified as a key process in the development of knowledge-based trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Courtship is conducted by watching each other perform
in a variety of professional and social situations and helps to provide the trustor with comprehensive information about whether the parties can work well together.

Questions 13-14

13. In what ways would you say that you and your mentor are similar? In what ways would you say you are different? Have your similarities and/or differences affected the way that you work? If so, how?

14. Has working with a mentor affected the way that you think about yourself as a teacher? If so, how?

Rationale for questions 13 & 14.

These two questions explored the development of the third stage of trust, identification-based trust, which is based on identification with the other’s desires and intentions (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Question 10 also provided information about this level of trust. When this type of trust exists, party A comes to learn what “really matters” to party B, and eventually comes to place the same importance on those behaviors as A does. Responses to this question centered on the beginning teachers comparison of their own teaching philosophy with the philosophies of their mentor. In most cases, their philosophies were similar.

Analysis of Third Interview

Once again, notes were taken as each interview was tape recorded. I verified my data and did the member checks using the same process earlier described. The third round of interview data was analyzed. The constant comparison protocol was implemented as I integrated data from the first, second and third set of interviews. I
adjusted my categories and components. Using what I had found, I began development of the questions for the fourth and final round of interviews.

**Fourth Interview Questions**

**Question 1**

Do you feel that your mentor has had an influence on you? If so, how? If not, why not?

*Rationale for question 1.*

This question, which probed into the issues of influence and competence, had been asked in the third interview. It was repeated to help verify, elaborate and determine progress in the beginning teacher's perception of the existence of influence and competence, both of which are essential to the establishment of trust (Gabarro, 1978; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

**Question 2**

Does your mentor seem to enjoy the mentoring part of her job? Explain.

*Rationale for question 2.*

Intentions and/or motives are identified by Gabarro as important sources for the initial base of trust, character, and by Lewicki and Bunker as necessary for verification of the most basic level of trust, conditional trust. This question was asked in the third interview, and repeated in the fourth interview to provide verification of previous responses, and to provide evidence of growth in the beginning teachers’ perception of trust in the mentor relationship.
Question 3

Have there been any surprises in your mentoring relationship? If so, tell me about them.

Rationale for question 3.

Gabarro identifies predictability and consistency as important indicators of character. This question provided information about predictability and consistency. In addition, the third source of trust described by Gabarro is judgment. Perceptions of another's judgment are tested and extended through increasing complexity within the mentoring relationship. This question provided information about this increasing complexity.

Question 4

What kind of interpersonal skills have you found important for successful teaching? Has your mentor been of help to you in this area? If so, how? If not, why not?

Rationale for question 4.

This is a rephrasing of a question asked in the third interview. Gabarro refers to three competence-based sources of trust: specific competence, interpersonal competence, and business sense. Following the third data analysis, it was apparent that all of the teachers perceived their mentors as having specific competence and business competence. This question further explored perceptions of interpersonal competence, something not fully developed in all of the mentoring relationships at that time.
Question 5

Can you think of a specific situation where you have relied on your mentor’s support? If so, please tell me about this? If not, why do you think this has not happened?

Rationale for question 5.

Gabarro argues that perceptions of judgment could be discerned by looking at the specific ways and specific situations in which the co-worker could be trusted. When pressed to justify why they trusted a person, Gabarro’s respondents tended to refer to specific prior events, discussion, or reports. This question helped determine if this held true in the teacher-mentor relationship. Responses also provided additional information about perceptions of specific competence.

Question 6

Can you think of any situations where your mentoring relationship has been challenged? If so, explain.

Rationale for question 6:

This question was repeated from the third interview. Once again, testing and exploring the limits of the relationship were important to the development of the teacher’s perception of her mentor’s judgment in the relationship. It appeared that there had been minimal change in several of the mentor/beginning teacher relationships since the second interview. This question helped to probe into issues that may have resulted in growth and/or change in the relationship, which, in turn, may have affected the development of whatever trust the teacher had in her mentor.
Question 7

Have you found particular mentoring activities to be most valuable? If so, please tell me about these experiences.

Rationale for question 7.

Previous data indicated that all of the teachers were finding mentoring valuable in one way or another. This question helped determine the types of work with the mentor that the beginning teachers’ perceived as most valuable. This helped to assess whether the beginning teachers perceived judgment as existent in their mentoring relationship.

Question 8

Has feedback about your teaching been a part of your mentoring relationship? If so, tell me about this?

Rationale for question 8.

This question provided data about the development of judgment perception by probing into the different types of interactions that were taking place. Responses also provided information about how the teacher perceived the mentor’s interpersonal competence.

In addition, responses to this question provided data in regard to the development of identity-based trust (Lewicki & Bunker). Whether the mentor had provided feedback in regard to the beginner’s teaching, and the teacher’s response to that feedback provided significant information regarding the development of identity-based trust, interpersonal competence, and judgment.
Question 9

How often are you and your mentor in contact with one another? How long do you usually meet? Where do you usually meet? Has this changed since the beginning of the year? How do you decide what you will do when you are together?

Rationale for question 9.

Time together is a highly significant factor in establishing trust in any mentoring relationship. Time is an indicator of consistency in the relationship which is required for the development of character-based trust (Gabarro, 1978). Time is necessary to have an accumulation of interactions, which is essential to judgment. In addition, Lewicki and Bunker’s (1996) three-stage model of trust indicates that knowledge-based trust is dependent upon two key processes: regular communication and courtship. These cannot take place in the absence of time spent together. As the final interview and analysis of data took place, it was important to ask this question, which had also been asked in interviews two and three, to verify findings.

Question 10

Do you think that your mentoring relationship has changed as the year has progressed? If so, explain.

Rationale for question 10.

Increasing complexity in the mentoring relationship, through an accumulation of interactions, leads to the development of perceptions of judgment (Gabarro, 1978). This question helped determine whether or not the mentoring relationship had “evolved.” The question also helped to determine to what extent knowledge-based trust, which depends
on regular communication and courtship, might have developed. This question helped to provide information about courtship.

**Question 11-12**

11. Are there ways in which you and your mentor are similar? Are there ways in which you and your mentor are different? If so, have your similarities and/or differences affected the way that you work together? If so, how?

12. Has working with a mentor affected the way that you think about yourself as a teacher? If so, how?

**Rationale for question 11-12.**

These questions had been asked for the first time in February. Several teachers hesitated in responding, perhaps because they had not given much thought to either of these ideas. By May they had worked with their mentors for a longer period of time, most of the mentor/beginning teacher relationships had increased in complexity, and the teachers had been asked the question once before. Responses to this question helped to determine the extent of differentiation in the relationship, which gave insights into the range of the teachers’ perceptions of their mentors’ judgment, and for Lewicki and Bunker’s knowledge-based and identification-based stages of trust.

**Question 13**

How would you define workplace trust?
Rationale for question 13.

Responses to this question helped determine how beginning teachers define workplace trust. A comparison was made between their definitions of trust and those encapsulated in Gabarro’s (1978) and Lewicki and Bunker’s (1996) theories.

Analysis of the Fourth Interview

Each of the final interviews was tape recorded, and notes were taken during the interview. Following the interview, the tapes were reviewed and key ideas, quotes, etc. drawn from the notes were added and/or clarified. I verified my data and did the member checks using the same process earlier described. Following the constant comparison protocol, I integrated data from the first, second, and third set of interviews and set out to complete my final data analysis.

Data Analysis Procedures

Since the defining variables are not predetermined, one of the defining characteristics of qualitative research is an inductive approach to data analysis. What becomes important to analyze emerges from the data itself through inductive reasoning (Maykut & Morehouse, 1990). The constant comparison method of inductive analysis was used for this study.

Analysis of the data occurred in four stages: (1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, (2) integrating categories and their properties, (3) delimiting the theory, and (4) writing the theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Because this study was rooted in received theory, stage four was not the writing of formal theory, but an elaboration and assessment of the applicability of existing theory in this particular context.
Stage One

In the first stage, analysis began with examination of the data by looking for recurring words, concepts and themes. Through this process, termed "open coding", categories of information began to emerge and incidents were compared for applicability to each category. Lincoln and Guba (1985) refer to this comparing of incidents as the "look/feel-alike" criteria, as I asked myself whether one unit of meaning was very similar to another unit of meaning. As many categories as possible were generated in this phase of data analysis. Open coding was used to assist in the organization of the analysis. This refers to the labeling and categorizing of phenomena as indicated by the data. The initial interview supplied the data that was analyzed in this manner.

Stage Two

The second stage of the constant comparison method was integrating categories and their properties. While coding an incident for a category, comparisons were made with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category. This constant comparison of data generated theoretical properties of the categories. Properties represented multiple perspectives about the categories (Creswell, 1998). This process, where there is interconnecting of the categories, is referred to as axial coding. This process adds depth and structure to developing themes. After the initial interviews and after each subsequent round of interviews, the interview protocol for the succeeding individual interviews was adapted based on the emerging categories achieved through open and axial coding.
**Stage Three**

The third stage of the constant comparative method was delimiting the theory, or in this case the application of theory. The application or applicability solidified as major modifications of categories became fewer and fewer. Nonrelevant properties were removed, elaborating details of properties were moved into interrelated categories, resulting in a reduction of categories. During this stage, major modifications became fewer and fewer as incidents were compared to existing categories and properties. Modifications were mainly clarification of the logic, taking out non-relevant properties, integrating elaborating details of properties, and reduction.

Reduction was a key step. Reduction is the discovery of underlying uniformities in the categories and properties, which resulted in a smaller set of higher-level concepts. This delimited the terminology and text (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Another factor in delimitation is theoretical saturation, which occurs when the marginal value of the new data is minimal. Since this study was by necessity and definition to be completed with a relatively small sample and over the course of a twelve-month period, and because the study was based on received theory rather than aimed at the generation of formal grounded theory, theoretical saturation could not and did not occur.

**Stage Four**

In the final stage of qualitative analysis for this study, the outcome was an elaboration and assessment of received theory. The report was assembled when I completed the analysis of Gabarro’s three bases of workplace trust: character,
competence, and judgment, and examined whether or not the evolution of the beginning teachers' trust in their mentors unfolded as described in Lewicki and Bunker's (1996) three levels of trust model.

I tied the emergent conclusions to existing literature, thus enhancing internal validity. In the context of received theory, I validated derived hypotheses, but only within the limits of the original theoretical framework of Gabarro's three bases of trust and Lewicki and Bunker's stages of trust.

The practical application of received theory requires developing conclusions with four highly inter-related properties (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). First, the findings must correspond closely to the data if they are to be applied in daily situations. This is referred to as "goodness of fit." Second, they must be understandable and believable to the people working in the substantive area so that they become a bridge to the use of the formal theory. Third, they must be general enough to be applicable to multiple and ever-changing situations. Fourth, the findings must be applicable to a variety of situations, making the application worth trying.

**Reporting the Findings**

The purpose for conducting qualitative research is, of course, to produce findings (Patton, 1990). "There are no absolute rules for communicating data except to do the very best with your full intellect to fairly represent the data and communicate what the data reveal given the purpose of the study" (Patton, 1990, p. 372).

Chapter 4 and 5 present the findings of this study in a narrative format that describes, analyzes and interprets the data collected.
CHAPTER IV - FINDINGS

This study provides research data to clarify what occurs in the relationship between mentors and beginning teachers. It sought to identify, categorize and describe the perceptions of experiences beginning teachers shared with their mentors as they developed – or did not develop – trust in their mentors. It is a qualitative study, rooted in the beginning teacher’s perspective, utilizing grounded theory method modified to accommodate received theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The purpose of the study was not to generate new theory, but to see if existing theory regarding the nature and development of trust in the workplace could be extended into the school setting.

The grand tour question for this study was:

What is the beginning teacher’s perspective on trust in the mentor-beginning teacher relationship?

The goal of this study was to explore:

(a) Gabarro’s (1978) theory predicts that the trust one is willing to place in a workplace associate will be affected by her perceptions of the associate’s character, competence, and judgment. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors?

(b) Lewicki and Bunker’s (1996) theory predicts that three levels of trust will emerge in workplace relationships: conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identity-based trust. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors?

(c) Lewicki and Bunker (1996) predict that the three levels of trust develop in an
evolutionary manner. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors?

Presentation of Findings

The findings are presented in two sections, each based on one of the two theories that formed the framework for the study. The first section examines teacher/mentor experiences in light of Gabarro's (1978) three sources model of trust, which are identified as (a) character-based sources of trust, (b) competence-based sources of trust, and (c) judgment. The second section examines teacher/mentor experiences in relation to Lewicki and Bunker's (1996) developmental stages of trust, which are identified as (a) conditional trust, (b) knowledge-based trust, and (c) identity-based trust. Examination of the teacher/mentor experiences in relation to the two theories is based on interviews with the beginning teachers.

Limitations and Cautions

This study was confined to a sample of ten beginning female elementary public school teachers who were being mentored by five different mentors. The sample was limited to teachers and mentors who were participants in the CADRE Project, a combined graduate induction, mentoring, and professional growth and development program. Since this study was an exploratory study aimed at developing an initial understanding of trust development, the results are not generalizable. All of the data were self-reported and are subject to other interpretations.
The Sources of Findings

Data for this study were collected in four interview sessions conducted in August and October of 2000, and in February and May of 2001. Each interview was tape-recorded and field notes were taken during the interview. Interviews were transcribed and copies of the transcripts were mailed to participants for verification of accuracy. The transcripts were analyzed using the constant comparative method of inductive analysis. Analysis occurred in four stages: (a) comparing incidents applicable to each category, (b) integrating categories and their properties, (c) delimiting the conclusions, and (d) writing the application to received theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Because this study was rooted in existing theory, the final product was an elaboration and assessment of the applicability of that existing theory in this setting.

Gabarro’s Three Sources of Trust

Character-Based Sources of Trust

Findings.

1. Character-based sources of trust exist in the beginning teacher/mentor relationships.

2. The trust component that took the longest to establish was consistency and predictability of behavior.

According to Gabarro, character-based sources of trust include the trustor’s perception that the other person possesses appropriate motives, integrity, the ability to be open, is consistency and predictability in behavior, and has the ability to be discreet. This study indicates that these character-based sources of trust exist in the beginning
teacher/mentor relationships (see Figure 1). One beginning teacher commented that her mentor “always makes me feel like I come first. I know how busy she is with [other responsibilities], but she never brings it up when we are working together. I feel like whatever I need or whenever I need it, [my mentor] will be there for me. I even brag about her to my mom!”

All of the new teachers believed that their mentors enjoyed their work and were there to help them in any way they could. One beginning teacher commented, “My mentor gives freely and is willing to help me with anything. It just seems to come naturally to her. She comes into my room and just seems to know what to do. I think it makes her feel good, too. She has so much wisdom and experiences that she’s able to pass on.”

Perceptions that the mentor was consistent and predictable took the longest to develop. The mentor/new teacher pairs needed time and experience to determine how frequently they would meet, the length of these meetings, and whether their meetings would be scheduled get-togethers or drop-in visits. Initially, time spent together ranged from 1½ to 4 hours per week. These encounters ranged from 5-10 minute drop-in visits to one weekly visit for 4 hours. As the year progressed, the majority of mentor/beginning teacher pairs gradually moved to meeting twice a week, at a mutually agreed upon time, for approximately 2 hours. This sense that their mentor was consistent and predictable was very important to the new teachers.

For one mentor and the new teachers she mentored, however, the teachers’ perception of the mentor as consistent and predictable developed especially slowly: “I
know [my mentor] has enjoyed the mentoring part of her job because when she's working with me in the classroom it's obvious. But I think she's felt pulled in different directions and frustrated by the district and the demands they put on her time. I'm glad that she's worked it out and is spending more time with me.”

The new teachers also consistently affirmed that their mentors were discreet and professional in their behavior. Over the course of the interviews, the beginning teachers never indicated a problem or concern about either the discretion or the professionalism of their mentors. One teacher commented, “[My mentor] has been a professional example for me. I know that I can tell her anything. She has definitely influenced the way I interact with other colleagues. You begin to know who you can trust and who you can't.”

Even in relationships that experienced some challenges, the teachers' perceptions that their mentor was a person of character seemed to be well established. Evidence of this can be seen in one beginning teacher who identified her mentor as “my biggest challenge this year.” Despite this, the teacher was very open with her mentor about her concerns. A certain amount of trust, it seems, would be necessary for the beginning teacher to bring concerns to the attention of the mentor.

Gabarro's notion that positive perceptions of character constitute a source of trust seems to be clearly aligned with the beginning teachers' development of trust in the mentoring relationship (see Figure 1).
### Base of Trust: Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: E</td>
<td>#2A: E</td>
<td>#3A: E</td>
<td>#4A: E</td>
<td>#5A: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: E</td>
<td>#2B: E</td>
<td>#3B: E</td>
<td>#4B: E</td>
<td>#5B: E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- BT = Beginning Teacher
- E = Established
- P = Partially Established
- N = Not Established

Figure 1: Presence of Conditions Supporting Gabarro's Theory of the Development of Trust Related to Character
Competence-Based Sources of Trust

Findings:

Gabarro identified three areas of competence as important: (1) specific competence, (2) interpersonal competence, and (3) business sense.

1. The beginning teachers perceived their mentors as having specific competence.
2. Perceptions of interpersonal competence were important in trust development
3. The beginning teachers recognized a business sense competence in their mentors, but (a) this took the longest to develop, and (b) this was the most difficult for them to articulate.

Specific competence. Specific competence refers to the specialized knowledge and skills required to perform a particular job. By the second round of data collection in October, all of the beginning teachers perceived their mentors as having specific competence (see Figure 2). Consider these beginning teachers’ responses when asked, “Does your mentor have any particular areas of strength? If so, what are they?”:

1. “Her expertise has helped me grow, especially in the areas of language arts and assessments. I would probably be sticking pretty much to the text and traditional grading if it weren’t for my mentor.” (#1A)
2. “She’s full of resources and very creative. She’s given me enrichment ideas to help with different ability levels in my classroom.” (#4B)
3. "She came in yesterday and we did a sequencing lesson. We combined whole
group work and small group work. It was great. It was an opportunity to
broaden my vision of teaching." (#2A)

Throughout the data collection process, the beginning teachers consistently
affirmed that their mentors had the specialized knowledge and skills required for
teaching. However, for one of the beginning teachers, #1B, the specific competence that
had appeared to be fully established earlier in the year came into question. When
interviewed in February and asked about the type of feedback she was receiving from her
mentor, she expressed concern about the mentor’s grade level teaching experience:

Sometimes I'm not sure she understands how to deal with the adolescent behavior
that's a big part of my classroom and sometimes a big part of the students’
performance level. My mentor will help out by grading the student’s work and if
they did poorly, then obviously, I've done a bad job. She'll tell me this is what to
do and this is what I should have done. Sometimes it's a struggle to keep the
students on task. They make comments like 'We're not going to be here next year
anyway,' or 'It doesn't matter if we do this because we're moving on.' I'm
dealing with attitude. Sometimes the low test score doesn't reflect my teaching, it
reflects their attitude and effort. I believe the students need to assume some
responsibility when they are [at this grade level]. [My mentor's] experience has
always been with primary students and I guess that's different.

In conclusion, 9 out of 10 of the beginning teachers believed that their mentors
had specific competence, possessing the specialized knowledge and skills required for
teaching (see Figure 2). This finding supports Gabarro’s argument that a perception of specific competence is a factor in the development of trust.

Interpersonal competence. Interpersonal competence refers to an understanding of how to work with people in an organization. The interpersonal skills perceived as important for teaching by the beginning teachers included active listening, a positive attitude, being caring and non-judgmental, and being an effective communicator. By the end of data collection in May, eight out of ten of the beginning teachers reported that their mentors seemed to have strong interpersonal skills, and that these skills had played a valuable role in their ability to work together (see Figure 2).

The importance of listening and of being non-judgmental was illustrated by the teacher who commented,

The ability to listen – which my mentor has modeled for me – has really helped encourage me to stick to my beliefs about teaching. It makes me willing to stand up for what I believe in and communicate [those beliefs] with other staff members who may not agree with me. Just because somebody thinks I should do something a certain way, doesn’t mean that I should automatically change. My mentor has really helped me with this. (#2A)

Similarly, another teacher said,

My mentor has given me advice about handling situations with students and parents who have such different needs than I’ve ever experienced. That’s been a big area of growth for me – developing relationships with the students and parents so that I can be of more help when it comes to academic needs. [My mentor] has
helped with this by listening to my perspective of the situation, and then asking me questions and giving me advice and feedback about how I've handled situations. She's made me more aware of the importance of good communication, especially the ability to listen without judging or jumping to conclusions. (#4A)

The mentors helped the beginning teachers stay positive about the first year teaching experience. The teachers frequently mentioned the mentors' positive attitudes as an important element in establishing relationships. Typical was teacher #4B's comment that, "I can be having a really bad day. Sometimes I just wonder what I think I'm doing trying to be a teacher. Feeling so unprepared for everything that's expected of me. My mentor will come in and remind me of all the good things that I'm doing. She's helped me to stay positive about teaching. She's given me confidence."

When asked about the interpersonal skills required for teaching, the beginning teachers had a difficult time articulating their understanding. Probably the best summation of the influence a mentor's interpersonal skills can have on the beginning teacher was teacher #2B, who said that, "She really models professionalism. She never lets me know how much work she has. She knows what she needs to do and she does it. It's also the way she carries herself. She's confident, she's organized, and she treats people with kindness and sincerity. I see characteristics in her that I would like to match."

Conversely, it was strikingly apparent when a mentor's interpersonal skills were lacking. The relationship was challenged. A good example of this came from teacher #1B who continued to question her mentor's interpersonal competence. She explained by
saying, "Listening and a caring attitude are interpersonal skills that I think are important to teaching. My mentor has not really been helpful in this area. When it comes to listening, she seems to take in what I say, but doesn’t really hear me. So, I’m not really comfortable sharing things with her."

The same teacher commented,

When it comes to communication listening and making an attempt to understand both sides of a situation – she’s not effective. She likes certain things her way and it’s got to be that way. If it’s not, you’re wrong. I guess working with her has helped me learn what I don’t want to do when I’m communicating with others. Sometimes I’ve just said, ‘let’s agree to disagree,’” but that’s backfired as well.

A diminished beginning teacher’s willingness to share “things,” presumably events and feelings, severely limited the mentor’s ability to assist the teacher as she confronted the unfamiliar aspects of her new job. In some cases, the teacher’s perception of the mentor’s lack of interpersonal competence became clearly problematic in the mentoring relationship.

In conclusion, as indicated by Gabarro, the importance of perceiving the mentor as possessing effective interpersonal skills seems to be a significant factor in the development of trust in the mentoring relationship (see Figure 2).

Business sense. The third area of competence is business sense, which Gabarro refers to as experience and/or wisdom. Early on, all ten of the new teachers perceived their mentors as wise and experienced and this contributed to their perceptions of their
mentors' competence (see Figure 2). It's interesting that most of the year passed before the teachers were able to provide specific feedback in regard to business sense. After working with their mentors for several months, all of the beginning teachers agreed that the mentors were helpful, but the descriptions of how they had been helpful were very vague. Responses from the teachers in October included:

1. "She just knows what she's doing." (#1A)

2. "She's put her life into teaching. I can tell through the ideas and experiences that she shares." (#4A)

3. "Teaching comes so naturally to my mentor." (#5B)

As the year progressed, the teachers came to recognize and value the business sense of their mentors. This recognition was convergent with Gabarro's definition of business sense being a combination of technical and systems expertise. The beginning teachers defined "technical expertise" as the specific knowledge that helps a teacher be successful in the classroom, such as management techniques, an array of curriculum ideas, instructional strategies, and successful experiences with parents. The beginning teachers defined "systems expertise" as knowledge of district and building routines, policies and procedures. By the third round of interviews in February, all ten teachers had come to feel that their mentors had wisdom and experience resulting in business sense. In articulating their own definitions of business sense, the beginning teachers said such things as:

1. "She's always on top of things. She thinks ahead about curriculum ideas and organization. She stays one step ahead of me." (technical expertise) (#3B)
2. "She knows where to get answers and track down district things that I have no idea about. She’s like a cushion that protects me from all that ‘stuff’ that can be a real hassle.” (systems expertise) \(#5B\)

3. "There are things that as a first year teacher I really want to do and I want my students to do. But surviving the first year is really my goal. [She] comes in and helps my students and I do some of the other things because she knows the curriculum, and she knows the district expectations. I see her helping my students and me – we’re all benefiting from her experience.” (technical and systems expertise) \(#2A\)

4. "We do have our frustrations and disagreements, but when it comes right down to it, she’s been a tremendous source of help for me. She knows everything about this district!” (systems expertise) \(#1B\)

Helping to confirm the perception of business sense, is the following comment made by one of the teachers in May: “[My mentor] has so much experience and I’ve been able to take advantage of that. She’s taught me to use a variety of assessment tools, she has strategies for meeting the needs of all kids, and she has given me lots of information to be effective in dealing with parents. I ask her for suggestions and ideas and she has lots of them that she [emphasis added] has used successfully.” \(#4B\)

The mentor’s experience seemed to be significant in helping assure that the beginning teacher’s initial teaching experience was a successful one, as illustrated by this comment, which supports the notion of technical and systems expertise:
"It would have been a difficult year without [my mentor]. I didn’t think of all the other things that go along with teaching. All of the paperwork, monitoring behavior, assessment. I’ve been very fortunate to have someone like [my mentor] to go to. She’s very competent, very knowledgeable about the district, about teaching. If I had a question, she was always there. If she didn’t know the answer, she’d find it out. We might have had our disagreements over the course of the year, but I would not have wanted to not have her there." (#1B)

The mix of technical and systems expertise perceived in the mentors is clearly aligned with the components of business sense as described by Gabarro, and is evident in each of the mentor/new teacher relationships (see Figure 2).
### Base of Trust: Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: E</td>
<td>#2A: E</td>
<td>#3A: E</td>
<td>#4A: E</td>
<td>#5A: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: P</td>
<td>#2B: E</td>
<td>#3B: E</td>
<td>#4B: E</td>
<td>#5B: E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Specific Competence

- **BT**
  - #1A: E
  - #2A: E
  - #3A: E
  - #4A: E
  - #5A: E

- **BT**
  - #1B: P
  - #2B: E
  - #3B: E
  - #4B: E
  - #5B: E

#### Interpersonal Competence

- **BT**
  - #1A: P
  - #2A: E
  - #3A: E
  - #4A: E
  - #5A: E

- **BT**
  - #1B: N
  - #2B: E
  - #3B: E
  - #4B: E
  - #5B: E

#### Business Sense

- **BT**
  - #1A: E
  - #2A: E
  - #3A: E
  - #4A: E
  - #5A: E

- **BT**
  - #1B: E
  - #2B: E
  - #3B: E
  - #4B: E
  - #5B: E

### KEY:

- **BT** = Beginning Teacher
- **E** = Established
- **P** = Partially Established
- **N** = Not Established

---

**Figure 2:** Presence of Conditions Supporting Gabarro’s Theory of the Development of Trust Related to Competence

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Judgment

The third base of trust, as defined by Gabarro (1978), is judgment. Gabarro's theoretical definition of judgment is a perception that the person seeking to be trusted displays good judgment. This perception develops out of an accumulation, or on the cumulative effects of the accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems, and events. Testing and exploring the limits of the relationship are important to the development of a perception that the person had good judgment. Gabarro also indicates that judgment transcends character and competence in importance. As the teachers' perception of their mentors' judgment were analyzed in the school setting with mentors and beginning teachers, the accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems, and events, that produced a sense of the mentor's judgment could be categorized as follows:

1. Time spent working together (accumulation of interactions)
2. Modeling (specific incidents and problem solving)
3. Coaching (specific incidents, events, problems)
4. Differentiating the relationship (accumulation of interactions, complexity)

Consistency and quantity of time spent working together leads to an accumulation of interactions that are necessary for the development of judgment.

Modeling refers to the mentor teacher successfully demonstrating effective practice in the presence of the beginning teacher. Modeling may include teaching strategies, management techniques, problem solving techniques, parent-teacher
interactions, etc. Modeling contributes to the beginning teachers’ perception of the mentors’ competence.

Coaching, for the purposes of this study, means to “convey a valued colleague from where he or she is to where he or she wants to be,” (Costa & Garmston, 1994). Coaching includes active listening, problem solving, observation, feedback and reflection on teaching, serving as a resource broker, and providing emotional support.

Differentiation in the mentoring relationship is defined as interaction with the mentor in a variety of roles. These roles include classroom teacher, coach, expert, advisor, friend, etc. Differentiation in the mentoring relationship contributes to opportunities to explore and test the limits of the relationship, because it offers the trustor an important component of judgment: The opportunity to see the trustee’s exercise of judgment in a variety of contexts.

Findings:

1. The beginning teachers perceived time, modeling, coaching, and differentiation as comprising the interactions, incidents, problems, and events that led to conclusions regarding the quality of their mentor’s judgment.

2. Consistent commitment of time proved to be a foundation for the establishment of a positive judgment perception.

3. The process by which such perceptions are developed is very individualized and varied significantly among the five mentors and the teachers they mentored.
4. Only two of ten beginning teachers developed fully trusting perceptions of their mentors’ judgment.

Analysis of the data indicates that with all ten of the teachers, at least some of the above listed interactions (time, modeling, coaching, differentiating the relationship) were consistently evident. Because the development of judgment perceptions is complex, each of the mentors and the two teachers that they worked with will be discussed separately:

Mentor #1 and Teacher #1A and Teacher #1B.

The importance of a substantial commitment of time was a consistently evident factor since the beginning of the mentor/teacher relationships. Scheduled visits were twice a week for one to four hours, depending on the activities planned. In addition, e-mail was an ongoing form of communication. Each of the teachers commented that once a routine had been established, their mentors’ commitment of time necessary to provide support had been consistent throughout the year.

Model teaching was frequently a part of the mentor teachers’ visits. Teacher #1A commented that, “She likes sharing experiences and her expertise – with me and with the kids. She enjoys modeling good teaching in our classroom.” Teacher #1B indicated, “I like watching her and listening to her work with the kids. Having her teach my class has definitely helped me.”

Coaching was evident in each of the relationships, however the outcomes of the coaching were perceived differently by Teacher #1A and Teacher #1B. Discussions about student growth and strategies for providing support, two components of coaching,
were parts of both mentoring relationships. However, in regard to feedback about teaching, an additional component of coaching, Teacher #1B indicated.

"The challenge has been her not being open to my ideas. We don’t always see eye-to-eye. We’re both stubborn, and I think that’s what it basically comes down to. I like to try different things and she’s not always encouraging. I’m O.K. with things that may not work because I expect to learn something from the mistakes I make."

It is evident that there were challenges to coaching that existed in this mentoring relationship. By the time this same teacher was interviewed in May, limited coaching interactions were a part of their work together. Teacher #1B continued to value her mentor’s ideas and creative approaches to teaching, but observation and feedback were not parts of their work together.

Teacher #1A, on the other hand, commented that,

I think my personality works well with hers. I tend to sit back and listen to what she says, and then I use what applies to me. [My mentor’s] very opinionated, but I don’t really challenge her. If I hadn’t responded this way, I think there would have been conflicts and struggles, but I’m comfortable with our relationship. I see her as an expert and I’m able to draw from her knowledge and experience.

Differentiation in the relationship had taken place. That is, the relationship had become multi-faceted. They had come to see their mentor in the role of a classroom teacher because model teaching had consistently been a part of the mentoring. Coaching had taken place, so they had seen their mentor function in the role of coach. The mentor
had consistently supported their graduate coursework, so they had seen their mentor in this role, also. They had had interaction with their mentor outside the professional educator role. In regard to testing and exploring the limits of the relationship, each of the teachers indicated that working with their mentor’s strong personality had been challenging.

Based on analysis of the data, it was apparent that Teacher #1B had established a belief in the mentor’s judgment. Data indicate that time, modeling, and coaching were evident (see Figure 3).

For Teacher #1A, time and modeling were perceived as evident. Coaching had consistently been a part of the beginning teacher and mentor’s work together early in the year, however, the teacher did not perceived the mentor’s feedback as helpful. Because of this, observation and feedback, important elements of coaching, were no longer a part of the relationship. Consequently, Teacher #1A had partially established a belief in the mentor’s judgment.

Mentor #2 and Teacher #2A and Teacher #2B.

Teachers #2A and #2B consistently sensed their mentor’s time commitment. She had scheduled weekly visits of two to four hours since the beginning of the year. In February, one of the teachers commented, “I talk with [my mentor] almost daily! We e-mail, sometimes we talk on the phone in the evening, and [my mentor] regularly comes to my classroom. She’s available to me anytime.” When asked if the time spent together had changed over the course of the year, the teacher said, “I don’t think the amount of time we spend together has changed, but I’m willing to just get right to the point when
I'm working with her.” This comment seemed to indicate an increased comfort level in working with the mentor.

Modeling professional performance was part of the mentor’s work with each of the teachers in a variety of ways: formally teaching lessons, assisting with small groups, implementing special units of study in the classroom, oral reading, classroom management strategies, and substitute teaching. Teacher #2A indicated that she “really appreciated the curriculum support. [My mentor] has modeled lessons in the classroom that have been especially helpful. Right now [my mentor’s] teaching a unit that I look forward to doing next year.” The other teacher working with this mentor, Teacher #2B, also found the mentor’s curriculum expertise to be especially beneficial: “She models math strategies for teaching problem solving. She’s also very good at integrating literature into all areas of the curriculum, and I’ve benefited from watching her do that.”

Coaching behaviors also were clearly evident, and included active listening, reflective conversations, oral and written feedback, and encouragement. “She’s given me feedback that’s usually positive and makes me eager to try new things,” commented Teacher #2B. “My mentor gives me suggestions and ideas, and has also written me notes about what [the mentor] has observed in the classroom,” indicated Teacher #2A. In addition, when asked if working with a mentor had affected the way she thought about herself as a teacher, Teacher #2A said,

“Working with my mentor means I’m always reflecting. I constantly ask myself how I could have done things better. [My mentor] helps me see the good in my teaching, but then she also sets a very high standard for me to work toward.”
Differentiation in the relationship had become evident by the fourth interview. By May they had come to see their mentor as an accomplished teacher through extensive modeling within the classroom, as a coach through ongoing implementation of a wide range of coaching behaviors, and as an expert in the support provided for their graduate coursework requirements. They had also become quite acquainted with their mentor on a personal level, although it took a considerable amount of time for the relationships to expand into the personal realm. Evidence of this began to emerge in February when each of the teachers talked about how much personal information they were willing to share with their mentor. It was important to the teachers that their mentor also share personal information with them. When interviewed in February and asked about any challenges to the mentoring relationship, Teacher #2A said,

    The only challenge I’ve had is getting to know the other side of her...not just the school side. But as the year has gone on, we’ve gotten to know each other more and more on a personal level. It’s taken some time – I think she’s much more private than I am – but it’s been important for me to know her in another way than as an teacher.

    The teachers working with this mentor were dealing with personal issues outside of work that seemed to distract them from their work. Offering clear evidence of relationship differentiation, they both mentioned they had shared their experiences and asked their mentor’s advice about coping with these major issues. Teacher #2B commented,
Our relationship has grown as we’ve gotten to know each other better. We’ve really been pretty organized in the way we’ve approached the year, so the kinds of things we do together haven’t changed so much. More of the change has been personal rather than professional. I’ve been going through a lot this year, personally, so I’ve needed to be able to share that with her. She’s been great. She’s always there for me.

An additional component contributing to the development of judgment perceptions, according to Gabarro, is testing and exploring the limits of the relationship. Toward the end of the school year, this mentor was assigned to a new position in her district, and each of the teachers expressed concern that the assignment might affect their relationship. Their fears, however, proved groundless:

Teacher #2A: “It really hasn’t changed anything for us. She still makes me feel like a priority. I don’t need her as much as I did at the beginning of the year, but I still know that she is totally available to me.”

Teacher #2B: “I know she is really needed (in her other assignment). It’s probably a good way to wean me off her support. I also know that if there’s anything I need, she’s there for me.”

The teachers also talked about how well qualified they thought their mentor was for the new position, and how extremely proud of her they were. In an interesting role reversal, they also mentioned how they were willing to do what they could to support their mentor in her new position.
Time, modeling, coaching and differentiation were evident in this relationship. It is apparent that trust in the mentor’s judgment was fully established in this mentoring relationship with Teacher #2A and Teacher #2B.

Mentor #3 and Teacher #3A and Teacher #3B.

The teachers in this relationship were clearly and consistently aware of their mentor’s willingness to commit time to their support. The mentor came at a specific time and frequently completed specific tasks when she was there. “When she schedules time to come, she’s really committed to it. She seems like she wants to be here, and she’s willing to help with anything,” commented Teacher #3A.

In regard to modeling, the teachers commented that they “were able to pick up tips and ideas” when they saw their mentor teaching their classes. Teacher #3A indicated that she “had learned some good strategies for managing the class while they were working in small groups” by observing her mentor teacher. The mentor took over their classes for them on a regular basis so that the teachers could complete other work, such as checking papers, lesson planning, completing university coursework assignments, preparing for parent-teacher conferences, etc. However, no specific lessons modeled by the mentor were followed by discussion of the lesson.

In regard to coaching, the teachers commented that their mentor was always very positive with informal, verbal comments. Both of the teachers indicated that this was very helpful because it continually encouraged them to stay positive and helped to build their confidence. They also appreciated her emotional support throughout the year. “Sometimes it’s nice to have her here when I have a break and we can just talk,” Teacher
Teacher #3B said, "I can confide in her and I know she won't tell anyone else. That's been helpful." When asked if feedback about their teaching had been a part of their mentoring relationship, an important component of coaching, Teacher #3A simply replied, "No." Teacher #3B indicated that, "She gives a lot of verbal feedback. She stays with the positive. We also e-mail a little bit, so I get feedback that way. I've never had her sit down and observe and give feedback about my teaching." Some indicators of coaching were evident, including emotional support, listening, and providing some resources. Observation, feedback and reflection on teaching, as well as problem solving were somewhat limited.

Differentiation also was evident in the relationship. Teacher #3B commented that as the year has progressed, their relationship "has become more personal. At first we just discussed the classroom and UNO requirements. As time has gone on, we talk more about what's going on in each other's lives." Teacher #3A indicated that as the year progressed,

I know what [my mentor] expects or would like to do [when she comes in the classroom]. In the beginning, I felt like I needed to have something ready for her to do. Something planned, like a stack of papers or something. Now when she comes, she knows what needs to be done. She stuffs Friday folders, helps the kids complete their assignments, or just helps out with whatever.

Teacher #3B's comment indicated that the mentoring relationship had differentiated somewhat toward a friendship. Teacher #3A's indicated that the relationship had not really grown as much or differentiated into a variety of roles such as...
coach, friend, expert, and/or advisor. Rather, the mentoring role seemed to have become a routine of providing support with task completion within the classroom. The positive emotional support, however, provided by this mentor was considered very valuable by both of the teachers.

Analysis of the relationship with Mentor #3 and Teacher #3A and Teacher #3B indicates a perception of judgment was partially developed in each case, although the form was unique in each relationship.

Analysis of the relationship Mentor #3 had with Teacher #3A indicates that time was clearly evident in this relationship. Modeling and coaching were limited to the extent that they occurred coincidentally. The relationship showed no evidence of differentiation; however, this teacher expressed no concerns about the mentoring relationship and indicated that she felt that it had sufficiently met her needs. "The mentoring has been what I expected," she said. "She's always available to help me, and she knows my classroom and the routines very well. I think she knows my teaching style and what works for the kids and me."

Analysis of the relationship between Mentor #3 and Teacher #3B indicates the teacher's perceptions of her mentor's time commitment were also clearly evident in this relationship. Evidence that she perceived her mentor as a model and coach were only partially evident. However, #3B indicated that verbal feedback and e-mail conversations were an ongoing and valued part of their relationship. In addition, Teacher #3B talked of the importance of being able to "just talk," indicating some differentiation toward friendship within the relationship.
Mentor #4 and Teacher #4A and Teacher #4B.

The time commitment on the part of the mentor was clearly evident to the beginning teachers since the beginning of the year, with weekly visits that totaled three to five hours. In addition, the mentor made it clear that she was always available. Teacher #4A commented that “she gave me her home phone number and I know I can call when I need to talk to her, get advice, ask questions. She’s always available and willing to help.”

The teacher’s trust in the mentor’s modeling was strongly evident. Teacher #4B indicated,

“It’s important to commit to spending time together. You get to know each other and really establish strong communication. For me, that’s led to teaching lessons together, feedback about my teaching and clarification about student expectations. Our teaching together has been very beneficial for me and the kids.”

Teacher #4A indicated that she especially had been influenced by her mentor’s curriculum ideas. “After watching and learning from her, I’ve been able to incorporate a lot of her ideas into my teaching. She’s definitely influenced what I do in the classroom.”

Acceptance of coaching behaviors clearly existed in each of these mentoring relationships. Teacher #4B commented that, “She inspires me to stay motivated and to try new ideas. She reassures me that I should try a variety of things to find out what works for me. I’ve had a really positive experience with my mentor!” Coaching requires going beyond support, to initiating reflection, as well as providing feedback about teaching. This clearly took place in the relationship. Teacher #4A, when interviewed in February, said:
“I had a student act out with some serious behavior when (my mentor) was here. She witnessed everything with another set of eyes – the students’ behavior and my behavior. Afterwards we talked through the whole incident, and I felt reassured that I had handled the situation appropriately.”

And again in February when Teacher #4B said, “(My mentor) gives me feedback about student performance and appropriate expectations. Her support and advice with assessment has helped me and my students.”

Differentiation in both mentoring relationships developed as the year progressed. The mentor and teachers worked together through model teaching and coaching. From the outset, the teachers clearly perceived their mentor as an expert and advisor. The professional relationship was firmly established. However, there was limited development of a personal relationship. All of Teacher #4A’s responses addressed the mentoring relationship on a professional basis. There were no comments of a personal nature, leading to the conclusion that the teacher and mentor rarely discussed their personal lives with one another. Teacher #4B commented that, “Our teaching philosophy and teaching style are very similar, so we have a lot in common when it comes to the classroom. Our personal lives are very different, so we don’t really share or talk about that. I think we work together as teachers great! I think maybe if we had more similar lifestyles we might be a little closer – more personal. We’re pretty much on a professional basis.”

Evident in these mentoring relationships was the establishment of time, modeling and coaching. Differentiation was partially established.
Mentor #5 and Teacher #5A and Teacher #5B.

Since the beginning of the year, each of these teachers had expressed concern about the limited amount of time the mentor seemed to have available for them. Early in the year, when asked about the amount of time spent working with the mentor, Teacher #5A replied, “I see her almost daily, but usually in passing for about five minutes. Some days she’ll stop by for a half an hour. We never spend more time than that together. But she always says to let her know if I need anything. I know she’s busy.” Teacher #5B concurred, saying, “I see her in passing every few days. We don’t work together in two or three hour blocks of time. We’ve had an hour together after school a couple of times, but I would like larger blocks of time to spend together.”

As the year progressed, Teacher #5A remained concerned about the limited amount of time spent with her mentor. In February, she commented that, “Sometimes I feel like I never get to see her and never get to talk to her. Even though I may see her in passing, we usually don’t have an adequate amount of time to sit down and talk about things.” Teacher #5B felt that the time commitment on the part of the mentor was increasing, and said, “She’s been coming into the class more during the second semester, and it’s really been great.”

By the final interview in May, both teachers indicated that the amount of time the mentor spent with them had increased significantly, and they seemed to be a bit puzzled by the change:
Teacher #5A: “I guess I’m kind of surprised that at the end of the year she’s spending so much more time with me. She seems to have more of an interest in helping me. I didn’t expect more time to come from her at the end of the year.”

Teacher #5B: “I’ve seen her so much lately. The last couple of weeks she comes into the classroom an hour and a half to two hours every week. Maybe it’s because so much is being expected of us right now and she really wants to be there for us.”

Because the time commitment had not been consistent for an extended period of time, this element of trust only partially developed.

Modeling and coaching appeared to be partially evident in one teacher/mentor relationship, and strongly evident in the other. Teacher #5A indicated that, “When we talk and plan lessons, we do problem solve. I suppose that’s a way of providing feedback about my teaching. But we never do it directly. She hasn’t provided me with any direct feedback, but I’ve never really asked for it either.” However, Teacher #5B talked about how she and her mentor had worked together to improve her teaching skills:

I don’t get much feedback about my teaching from my administrator, so my mentor has been wonderful in providing the feedback I need. She comes into my classroom, watches, and then we talk about what took place. She really makes me reflect. Just recently, she encouraged me to sit down and write all the things I like about my classroom and all the things that I’d like to change. She helped me to set goals for next year. She’s really been valuable in helping me grow as a teacher.
Within these mentoring relationships, Teacher #5A perceived the mentor less as coach and model than did Teacher #5B.

The lack of consistency in the amount of time spent mentoring limited the amount of differentiation possible in the relationship with Teacher #5A. Still, she indicated that much of their work together had revolved around talking about teaching: “She knows my philosophy and style of teaching, but mostly because we’ve talked about it. She hasn’t observed me teaching a whole lot...but, she [knows me well outside my roles as a teacher] because we talk about all kinds of things.”

Teacher #5B perceived the relationship with her mentor to be differentiated. In addition to the coaching and modeling that had taken place, she said, “I really consider [my mentor] a friend of mine. We hit it off instantly, and we’ve kept a great relationship all year. I think she’ll always be a mentor to me – even next year.” Comments such as these indicate that Teacher #5B seemed to have developed a personal as well as a professional relationship with her mentor. Teacher #5B also commented that,

I don’t feel like her equal, and I don’t know that I ever will. She’s taught me so much, and I don’t think I could ever teach her as much as she’s taught me. But we have moved more toward a collegial relationship. I was taking more from her at the beginning of the year, and now I think we work more collegially.

Conclusions regarding the establishment of judgment.

The establishment of judgment, the third and final base of trust, varied significantly among the five mentors and the teachers they mentored (see Figure 3).
### Base of Trust: Judgment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: E</td>
<td>#2A: E</td>
<td>#3A: E</td>
<td>#4A: E</td>
<td>#5A: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: E</td>
<td>#2B: E</td>
<td>#3B: E</td>
<td>#4B: E</td>
<td>#5B: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: E</td>
<td>#2A: E</td>
<td>#3A: P</td>
<td>#4A: E</td>
<td>#5A: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: E</td>
<td>#2B: E</td>
<td>#3B: P</td>
<td>#4B: E</td>
<td>#5B: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: E</td>
<td>#2A: E</td>
<td>#3A: P</td>
<td>#4A: E</td>
<td>#5A: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: E</td>
<td>#2B: E</td>
<td>#3B: P</td>
<td>#4B: E</td>
<td>#5B: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: E</td>
<td>#2A: E</td>
<td>#3A: N</td>
<td>#4A: P</td>
<td>#5A: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: E</td>
<td>#2B: E</td>
<td>#3B: P</td>
<td>#4B: P</td>
<td>#5B: E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Analysis of Judgment:

- #1A: Time, Modeling and Coaching behaviors are perceived as established. #1B Time and Modeling are perceived as established, and coaching behaviors are perceived as partially established. Differentiation in the relationship is perceived by both teachers established.
- #2: Time, Modeling, Coaching, and Differentiation are perceived as established.
- #3: Time is established. Modeling, Coaching, and Differentiation in the relationship are perceived as partially established.
- #4: Time, modeling, and coaching are perceived as established. Differentiation in the relationship is perceived as partially established.
- #5: Time has not been consistently established. Modeling is perceived as strongly established by Teacher #5B, but perceived as only partially established by Teacher #5A. Coaching is perceived as strongly established by Teacher #5A. Coaching is perceived as only partially established by Teacher #5B. Differentiation is perceived as strongly established by Teacher #5B. Differentiation is perceived as partially established by Teacher #5A.

### KEY:
- BT = Beginning Teacher
- E = Established
- P = Partially Established
- N = Not Established

---

Figure 3: Presence of Conditions Supporting Gabarro’s Theory of the Development of Trust Regarding Judgment

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Lewicki and Bunker's Developmental Stages of Trust

The findings did not confirm Lewicki and Bunker's developmental stages of trust: (a) conditional trust, (b) knowledge-based trust, and (c) identity-based trust. While this study found each of these types of trust to be significant, each type of trust was interactive and linear rather than occurring in stages.

Conditional Trust

The subjects in this study chose to begin their teaching profession as participants in the CADRE Project. Each mentor was assigned to work with two beginning teachers for approximately five hours a week per teacher. Because the project was grounded in the idea of the veteran teacher serving as a mentor to the beginning teacher, there seemed to be a presupposition of conditional trust as defined by Lewicki and Bunker (1978), "people will do what they say they will do or there will be a loss of the relationship" (p. 118). Lewicki and Bunker also referred to this level of trust as "calculus-based," because if the participants do not calculate their investment of time and efforts to be worthwhile, the relationship does not continue to develop.

Because all of the participants in this study were part of the CADRE Project, it seemed reasonable to assume that the beginning teachers were prepared to trust their mentors at some level. It seemed likely that the beginning teachers might have automatically assumed that their mentors would be available and the relationship would be rewarding because all of the persons involved had chosen participation in the CADRE Project. Based on these perceptions, their mental calculus may have told them that it was reasonable to trust the mentor to a certain extent. The data indicated that this trust,
conditional trust, developed as Lewicki and Bunker predicted it would. But it is also important to understand that this type of trust is not constructed at a conscious level.

Findings.

1. A consistent time commitment was important in the establishment of conditional trust.

2. It was necessary for the beginning teachers to perceive the mentoring relationship as rewarding for the establishment of conditional trust.

The determination that conditional trust existed in these studied relationships was based on the beginning teachers’ perceptions of (1) time committed to mentoring, and (2) their perceptions that mentoring was rewarding.

The beginning teachers in this study entered the mentoring experience with the belief that their mentors would spend the “assigned” amount of time providing mentoring support, and that that support would be rewarding. When the teachers were interviewed in August, it was clearly evident that they all looked forward to spending time working with their mentors. They talked about the mentors helping them set up their rooms, identifying routines and procedures, and planning schedules. One teacher commented. “[My mentor’s] already been a big help! She’s a great resource for supplies, ideas, and feedback. I look forward to her sharing experiences she’s already had.”

By the October interview, however, the time commitment on the part of Mentor #5 had emerged as a concern. Teacher #5A said, “I thought she was a lot of help when we first met, but now I’m kind of worried. Sometimes I feel like I’m not making the best use of my time without having her to bounce ideas off of and help me get resources.”
For the majority of the beginning teachers, seven out of ten, conditional trust seemed to be fully established by February. Their mentors consistently spent five or more hours per week with them, and the teachers saw the time with the mentor as rewarding. "I didn't realize how valuable her time and information would be for me and my students. She's not only helping my teaching, but she's helping me stay one step ahead with all the responsibilities that come with teaching," said one teacher.

Again, however, the effects were striking when such perceptions were absent. In Teacher #5A and #5B's perceptions, their mentor had not delivered on the amount of time promised for mentoring until the last quarter of the school year. This challenged the existence of conditional trust in both relationships.

"I expected we'd have more time to really sit down and go over things - reflect more on what I'm doing, or what I should be doing. But we haven't. It's been really hard," said Teacher #5A in February. Teacher #5B seemed to have the same concern in October as she commented, "I'm confident that she has the abilities to be of great help, but the time commitment just hasn't been what I had hoped. Otherwise, everything is great! When she does spend time with me, I couldn't ask for a better mentor." By February, Teacher #5B suggested that regular communication had improved, saying,

We're in contact with each other daily now, but she didn't start spending much time with me until recently. Before that, I maybe spent twenty minutes a week with her. Now she spends at least a couple of hours a week with me and in between we talk almost daily. I think our relationship is much stronger now that we're spending more time together. I think it's also helped her understand my
frustrations and challenges. I’m not sure why the change, except that she knows that we have a lot of stress right now. It’s great! I hope it continues. (#5B)

When Teacher #5A was interviewed in May, she indicated a significant change in the amount of time the mentor was spending with her. She expressed surprise, and was very pleased with the additional support, but unclear as to why such a change had taken place.

Conditional trust appeared to never fully develop for Teacher #5A because of her perception of the mentor’s lack of consistent time commitment over an extended period. However, a willingness to extend conditional trust seemed to be fully evident for Teacher #5B.

While time together and shared experiences were clearly important, the benefits of interacting with the mentors were drawn from more than simple volume. The beginning teachers perceived the mentor’s ability to help students in the classroom, to provide teaching ideas, and to offer emotional support as significant relationship rewards. If the beginning teachers did not perceive “rewards” in mentoring, then conditional trust was not fully established. This was evident in the comments of one of the beginning teachers who had not perceived mentoring as consistently being rewarding:

It’s not really what I expected it to be. I thought feedback would be more constructive. I’ve left school in tears. Some of the things she’s said have really hurt me. It’s my first year. I’m trying really hard to do my best. Rarely does [mentor] say that I did a good thing. (#1B)
For the majority of teachers, however, the perceived rewards of working with a mentor were significant. Comments included:

1. "She's shared so many ideas. We've been able to do lots of activities and projects that enrich the basic curriculum. She's not just a person in the back of the room, but someone that's involved in teaching and learning in our classroom." (Teacher #1A)

2. "Her creativity has been great for me and for the students. She constantly generates ideas to help make our classroom an exciting place." (Teacher #4B)

3. "She's a great pep talker. She builds my confidence. She helps me know if I'm making the right decisions." (Teacher #3B)

4. "It feels good to have her to bounce ideas off of. Her perspective has been important because it's based on experiences." (Teacher #2B)

In summary, by the end of the year eight of the ten beginning teachers had fully developed conditional trust in their mentoring relationship. Teacher #1A found time and rewards to be consistently evident. Teacher #1B felt that her mentor consistently met the time commitment, but she did not feel that the mentoring support offered in all that time was consistently rewarding. In fact, the teacher's comments suggested that the type of feedback that she had received from her mentor had resulted in stress and frustration, which seemed to be an obstacle to further development of trust in the relationship. Teachers #2A, #2B, #3A, #3B, #4A, #4B, and teacher #5B found both time and rewards to be consistently evident, indicating the presence of conditional trust as defined by
Lewicki and Bunker. While Teacher #5A had found the mentoring support to be very rewarding, she expressed concern about the commitment of time on a consistent and long-term basis over the course of the year. In short, she was hungry for more (see Figure 4).
# Level of Trust: Conditional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: October E</td>
<td>#2A: October E</td>
<td>#3A: October E</td>
<td>#4A: October E</td>
<td>#5A: October N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1B: October E</td>
<td>#2A: October E</td>
<td>#3A: October E</td>
<td>#4A: October E</td>
<td>#5B: October P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: February E</td>
<td>#2A: February E</td>
<td>#3A: February E</td>
<td>#4A: February E</td>
<td>#5A: February E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1B: February E</td>
<td>#2A: February E</td>
<td>#3A: February E</td>
<td>#4A: February E</td>
<td>#5A: February E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: May E</td>
<td>#2A: May E</td>
<td>#3A: May E</td>
<td>#4A: May E</td>
<td>#5A: May E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1B: May E</td>
<td>#2A: May E</td>
<td>#3A: May E</td>
<td>#4A: May E</td>
<td>#5A: May E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rewards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BT</strong></td>
<td>#1A:</td>
<td>#2A:</td>
<td>#3A:</td>
<td>#4A:</td>
<td>#5A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1B:</td>
<td>#2A:</td>
<td>#3A:</td>
<td>#4A:</td>
<td>#5B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1A:</td>
<td>#2B:</td>
<td>#3B:</td>
<td>#4B:</td>
<td>#5B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1B:</td>
<td>#2B:</td>
<td>#3B:</td>
<td>#4B:</td>
<td>#5B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1A:</td>
<td>#2B:</td>
<td>#3B:</td>
<td>#4B:</td>
<td>#5B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1B:</td>
<td>#2B:</td>
<td>#3B:</td>
<td>#4B:</td>
<td>#5B:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Analysis of Conditional Trust:**

- #1 - Time has been consistently established. Rewards are consistently established for Teacher #1A, and partially established for Teacher #1B.
- #2 - Time and rewards have been consistently established for Teacher #2A and Teacher #2B.
- #3 - Time and rewards have been consistently established for Teacher #3A and Teacher #3B.
- #4 - Time and rewards have been consistently established for Teacher #4A and Teacher #4B.
- #5 - Time has not been consistent. Rewards are consistently established.

**KEY:**

- BT = Beginning Teacher
- E = Established
- P = Partially Established
- N = Not Established

---

**Figure 4: Presence of Conditions Supporting Lewicki and Bunker's Theory of Developmental Stages of Trust Related to Conditional**
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Knowledge-Based Trust

The main factors contributing to knowledge-based trust in the mentoring relationship were regular communication, differentiation in the relationship, and testing the relationship (see Figure 5). These factors were closely aligned with Lewicki and Bunker's (1996) description of knowledge-based behavior "which depends upon knowing the other sufficiently well so that the other's behavior is anticipated" (p. 121).

The teachers defined regular communication in terms of frequency and duration of contact between the mentor and themselves. The majority of the mentors and new teachers spent two to four hours at a time working together at least once a week.

Differentiation in the relationship was examined in the analysis of the data in regard to Gabarro's (1996) theory of judgment being essential to fully established trust, (see pages 92-107) of this study. Differentiation is defined as interactions with the mentor in a variety of roles. These roles include classroom teacher, coach, expert, friend, colleague, etc.

Finally, challenging and testing the limits of the relationship are an additional indicator of the development of knowledge-based trust. Lewicki and Bunker contend that, depending on the outcome of these challenges and/or tests, the relationship can be strengthened or weakened.

Findings

1. Behaviors generating the establishment of knowledge-based trust between beginning teachers and mentors emerge sequentially and can be defined as
regular communication, differentiation in the relationship, and testing/challenging the limits of the relationship.

2. The experiences that lead a person to extend knowledge-based trust to another are very individual in nature, and varying levels of knowledge-based trust have been established in the beginning teacher/mentor relationships.

**Mentor #1 and Teacher #1A and Teacher #1B.**

The pattern of communication that Mentor #1 established with Teacher #1A differed somewhat from what she established with Teacher #1B. By October, Teacher #1A indicated that a pattern of time spent together and the use of this time for communication had been clearly established, and at the May interview contended that “it has been pretty consistent [throughout the year].”

It took the mentor longer to establish a pattern of communication with Teacher #1B. Teacher #1B commented that, “At the beginning of the year she would come into the building at our scheduled time, but then she would visit with the colleagues in the building that she knew. By the time she got to my classroom, a lot of our time together would be used up. I visited with her about it, and it got better.” By February, this teacher commented, “She’s been more consistent with her time and support. She’s usually here twice a week for about two hours, and we also e-mail regularly.” This pattern of communication was constant for the remainder of the year.

When asked about the types of differing interactions (differentiation) that took place with their mentor early in the year, each of the teachers indicated that the focus of support was primarily on routines, procedures and resource support.
By February, many additional types of activities had become a part of each
teacher/mentor interaction. Teacher #1A cited team teaching, modeling, and coaching as
ongoing activities within her classroom. By May she was prepared to say that “I think
we’ve gotten closer on a personal and professional level (as the year has progressed). I
think because of that, I feel more comfortable having her here.”

Teacher #1B commented in May that the mentor has provided support in “lots of
different ways, and I know I wouldn’t have been as successful without her.”

Teacher #1A and Teacher #1B confirmed that differentiation of their relationship
had been established over the course of the year.

Challenges in the mentoring relationship had occurred with Teacher #1A and
Teacher #1B. Each of the teachers indicated that the strong opinions and ideas of their
mentor had, at times, been challenging.

For Teacher #1A, the challenges had served to strengthen the relationship. She
commented in February that,

She’s more outspoken than me. She’s very opinionated, so I’ve decided I don’t
really want to challenge her. At first I wasn’t sure how to handle that, but she’s
never been negative about the work I do in the classroom. But this has really
made me think about what I do in the classroom. I think more about my teaching
– more deeply.

Teacher #1B also contended that the strong personality of her mentor had tested
the relationship. She said.
(We) do not see eye to eye. I think what it basically comes down to, is that we are both stubborn people. I've gotten so I don't push my ideas with her anymore. It was just too much for me to have to always justify what I was doing. As I've gotten to know her better, I know what makes her tick. I know that I just have to pick my battles. I didn't know that in the beginning because I didn't know her well personally.

By May, the same teacher indicated that “I'm o.k. with her thinking I'm not doing it right; I just don't always agree with her.”

In conclusion, knowledge-based trust, as defined by Lewicki and Bunker, “knowing the other sufficiently well so that the other's behavior is anticipated” had been established for each of the teachers, but with differing results. For Teacher #1A it had served to strengthen the relationship, but that was not necessarily so for Teacher #1B. It's interesting to observe that knowledge of the other person does not necessarily result in a higher trust level. Knowing the other well enough to know how one thinks, being able to predict how they will behave, and perceiving this thinking and behavior as less than positive, did not contribute to the level of trust for Teacher #1B. The mentor had fulfilled the criteria of being known and predictable, however, there appears to be a distinct difference between trust and predictability.

Mentor #2 and Teacher #2A and Teacher #2B.

From August until February, Mentor #2's communication had been consistent with Teacher #2A and #2B. Between February and May, the frequency and duration of interaction had begun to vary. The mentor had assumed a new district responsibility that
made flexibility in scheduling time together more difficult. The teachers were understanding and supportive of this, however, because the teachers did not feel that they needed as much of the mentor’s support as they had earlier in the year, and they wanted to be supportive of their mentor’s new district assignment.

Differentiation in the relationship with each of the teachers became evident by February, as is indicated by the data analysis discussed previously on page 98 of this study. Modeling, coaching, and various other professional aspects of their relationship were evident by the October interview.

Two challenges to the mentoring relationship were identified with Teacher #2A and Teacher #2B. The first challenge was getting to know their mentor on a personal level. In October, each of the teachers mentioned that she would like to get to know her mentor more as a person, not just as a teacher. By February, Teacher #2A and Teacher #2B commented that this change had taken place (see quotes on page 98-99 of this study).

It is interesting to note that the mentor and teachers periodically worked together as a triad, problem-solving and sharing ideas. On occasion, they also met for weekend breakfasts or lunches together. In addition, each of the teachers were planning weddings and buying houses at the same time. It seems likely that the similarities of the development of their mentoring relationship may have been due, at least in part, to the similar experiences of the teachers.

The second challenge was the mentor’s assignment to a new job in the district. Each of the teachers revealed initial concerns about how this would affect their work
together. However, when they were interviewed in May, the concerns had proven groundless. This is confirmed by the quotes on page 98 of this study. In fact, this particular challenge to the mentoring relationships actually served to strengthen the relationships in the long run.

Trust at the level identified by Lewicki and Bunker as knowledge-based, appears to have developed very much the same for Teacher #2A and Teacher #2B as they worked with Mentor #2.

Mentor #3 and Teacher #3A and Teacher #3B.

When Mentor #3 began working with her teachers in August, they determined that Friday afternoons would be committed to providing in classroom support for the teachers. Additional communication would take place by e-mail or telephone, and the mentor would be happy to adjust her schedule to provide other support as needed. This agreement remained constant with each of the teachers throughout the year, and they seemed comfortable with the amount of time the mentor was providing. Each teacher indicated appreciation for how committed her mentor was to fulfilling the scheduled visitation times.

As incidents were reported in subsequent interviews, minimal emergence of growth and differentiation occurred within the relationship, according to Teacher #3A. "Each Friday she stuffs the weekly folders. Sometimes she helps with individual students who need help or guidance, or she does whole group discussion with Scholastic so that I can get things done for the next week," commented Teacher #3A in October. When asked at the end of the year if the routine of support had changed, or if modeling or
feedback about teaching had been a part of the mentoring over the course of the year, the teacher indicated, “No.”

Incidents reported and comments made by Teacher #3B indicated that her mentoring relationship had grown and differentiated somewhat. Her mentor, she said in October, “was very encouraging and always positive.” In February she said that, “[My mentor] gives me a lot of verbal feedback. She stays with the positive. But she’s never sat down and observed and given feedback about my teaching.” These comments support the changing nature of the relationship as the mentor and teacher worked together, with mentor input becoming increasingly specific and more oriented toward coaching. An additional indicator that partial establishment of differentiation had occurred is supported by the teacher’s comment in May that their relationship “has become more personal. As time has gone on, we talk more about what’s going on in each other’s lives.”

Neither Teacher #3A nor Teacher #3B identified any challenges or tests within their mentoring relationships.

Communication with Mentor #3 was fully established with Teacher #3A and #3B early in each relationship. Differentiation in each relationship, however, was unique. Teacher #3A perceived no significant growth or change in the work they did together, while Teacher #3B perceived partial differentiation (see Figure #5).

**Mentor #4 and Teacher #4A and Teacher #4B.**

The commitment to ongoing communication was clearly evident from the time that Mentor #4 and Teacher #4A and Teacher #4B began working together. In August, each teacher and her mentor agreed to scheduled weekly visits of three to five hours.
This remained constant throughout the year. In addition, each of the teachers indicated that her mentor was always available by phone or e-mail.

When asked about the types of professional and personal interactions in which she engaged with her mentor, Teacher #4A commented that at the beginning of the year most of the support was organizational. "She helps me know what paperwork is important and when it's due; she's helped with grading papers and organizing my record keeping," commented the teacher in October. By February, the mentoring support had shifted to curriculum oriented support, and the teacher explained that, "She's helped me work toward teaching thematic units and integrating more creative ideas into my teaching." In May, this teacher verified curriculum support, especially providing resources and helping to implement creative ideas into lesson plans, was an important part of their work together. Also valued by the teacher was "Getting to know [my mentor's] philosophies about teaching, and seeing that she lives by them." The teacher suggested that this really, "helped me implement [my philosophy] through the way I plan for instruction and the way I carry things out in my classroom." Specific feedback about teaching was not evident in the mentoring relationship. In addition, there was no evidence of the mentoring relationship differentiating into a personal relationship. Analysis of the data indicated that Teacher #4A perceived partial evidence of differentiation in the mentoring relationship.

When Teacher #4B was interviewed in October and asked about mentoring interactions, incidents, and problem solving experiences, she enthusiastically shared a variety of things she and her mentor were doing: team teaching, long-range planning,
thematic unit planning, classroom management problem solving, and reflective conversations. "She's taught my class three times," she said, "and a couple of other times we have team taught together. I've learned a lot from watching her and working with her." Subsequent interviews in February and May continued to confirm a mentoring relationship that strongly supported classroom instruction in a variety of ways. In February, the teacher reflected,

> Just having her involved in my teaching has made me really think about what I do. I know that if I didn't have her, I wouldn't be anywhere near where I am now. She's helped me grow. She's given me so much knowledge and information that I've been able to use to help my students. I would not be anywhere near where I am right now in terms of delivering instruction.

While the data clearly defined a mentoring relationship that provided significant professional support, Teacher #4B did not specify that the relationship differentiated into a personal friendship. In May, the teacher commented,

> I think we're different personally. We have different interests outside of teaching, so we don't end up talking about personal things. But that's ok. It's certainly not been a problem in our relationship. I admire her other interests and talents, but sometimes I think maybe if we had more similar lifestyles we might be a little closer – more personal. We're pretty much on a professional basis.

Neither of the teachers working with Mentor #4 identified any tests or challenges to the mentoring relationship over the course of the year. Teacher #4A commented that, "We've developed a really positive relationship and we communicate well with each
other. We took the time to really talk about our expectations and get things started in the right direction at the beginning of the year.”

In conclusion, Teacher #4A and Teacher #4B perceived the presence of communication and differentiation as evident in their mentoring relationships. It’s interesting to note that the Teacher #4B’s comments indicate a stronger relationship of mentoring support than Teacher #4A’s. Differentiation was partially developed, encompassing a variety of professional roles, but lacking the development of a personal relationship. (see Figure 5)

**Mentor #5 and Teacher #5A and Teacher #5B.**

Since the initial interview in August, Teacher #5A and Teacher #5B had expressed consistently, concern about the mentor’s limited commitment of time and support (previously discussed on page 105 of this study). However, February interviews provided evidence that a change was occurring in the amount of time and the type of support afforded to Teacher #5B, who commented that she’d seen much more of her mentor during the second semester. It wasn’t until May that Teacher #5A indicated any a change in the amount of time and support.

Consequently, Teacher #5B also revealed that with the increased communication through regular visits that lasted at least an hour, came an increase in model teaching, feedback about teaching, and reflection (See quote, p. 106 of this study). In addition, Teacher #5 B began to perceive her mentor as a friend, and talked about anticipating a mentoring relationship that would go well beyond the first year of teaching. It was apparent in the analysis of this relationship that differentiation of the relationship had
occurred. However, the differentiation did not begin to develop until February, when the
time commitment on the part of the mentor became increasingly evident. By the
interview in May, differentiation was fully established.

For Teacher #5A, however, the lack of time commitment on the part of the mentor
allowed limited emotional support, and did not allow opportunities for model teaching,
feedback about teaching, or reflection for most of the year. In October, Teacher #5A
commented that, “I don’t really know what I expected, but I did think she’d be around
more. I know she has so many commitments, and I’m doing ok, so it makes me feel a bit
selfish to expect more. It’s just that when she is available, she’s great! Talking to her
makes me feel more confident about what I’m doing, and I need that.”

Little had changed by February when she said, “Sometimes I’d just like to have
the time to talk with my mentor about what’s going on in the classroom.” Because of the
ongoing lack of commitment of time, differentiation in the relationship had limited
opportunity to take place. In May, however, Teacher #5A commented that she was
“surprised” about the additional support at the end of the year (entire quote on p. 106).
However, she was extremely pleased and eager to make the most of the support, saying,
“I think our relationship is much stronger now that we’re spending more time together.”
She also commented that, “Recently we’ve been talking and planning lessons together.
When we do this we problem solve, and she gives me feedback about my ideas.”
Analysis of the May interview indicated that partial differentiation was taking place in
the mentoring relationship.
The mentoring relationships of both Teacher #5A and Teacher #5B were challenged by the mentor's lack of time commitment. Because of the length of this study, it was not possible to determine what the long-range effects of this challenge were on each of the relationships.

The development of knowledge-based trust was different for each of the teachers working with Mentor #5. Teacher #5A continued to be concerned about the mentor's consistent commitment of time. Because of the limited amount of contact time, differentiation in the relationship was limited. With Teacher #5B, the time issue began to be resolved in February, and by May, the mentor's commitment was evident. Increased time working together led to differentiation within the relationship.

In summary, communication and differentiation of the relationship appear to be important factors for establishing knowledge-based trust, which Lewicki and Bunker suggest "depends upon knowing the other sufficiently well so that the other's behavior is anticipated" (p. 121). Lewicki and Bunker also suggest that challenges and/or tests in a relationship can serve to strengthen or weaken that relationship. Each of these three factors, as they relate to the ten teachers and five mentors in this study, are discussed below.

In regard to the time commitment necessary for the emergence of regular communication, when the mentor and the new teacher had been together for two to five hours at a time, and at least once a week, it became more likely that the following was more likely to have occurred:
(a) the work they did together moved from task-oriented work, to curriculum planning, and for some teacher/mentors, to observation, feedback, and reflection on classroom instruction, and

(b) they had an opportunity to develop a relationship where they knew each other on a personal, as well as professional level.

Eight out of ten of the teachers perceived their mentors as committed to consistently spending time with them, which was essential for ongoing communication.

While the trust levels described by Lewicki and Bunker: (1) conditional trust, (2) knowledge-based trust, and (3) identity-based trust, were not found to develop sequentially in this study, each type of trust played a significant role in the mentoring relationship. Evidence of the types of trust emerged simultaneously and interactively. However, the behaviors that generated them and determined their nature were constant. For example, the time commitment perceptions at earlier stages in the mentoring relationship became a factor in the emergence or non-emergence of another factor, regular communication, which was essential for the development of knowledge-based trust. Regular communication was necessary for an accumulation of interactions in order for the emergence or non-emergence of an additional factor contributing to knowledge-based trust, differentiation. Differentiation in the relationship provided additional opportunities for challenges and/or tests within the relationship to emerge, and these challenges and/or tests served to strengthen or weaken the development of knowledge-based trust.
Lewicki and Bunker (1996) contend that challenging and testing the limits of the relationship can serve to strengthen or weaken the relationship. Of the ten teachers and five mentors who participated in this study, only six of the teachers working with three of the mentors seemed to have experienced challenges to the mentoring relationship. For three of the teachers, #1A, #2A and #2B, the challenges served to strengthen their relationship. For Teacher #1B, the challenges weakened the relationship. Analysis of information for the challenges faced by Teacher #5A and Teacher #5B were inconclusive at the time this study was completed. Analysis of the data in this study also was inconclusive in regard to Lewicki and Bunker's notion that tests and/or challenges affect trust development in relationships.

In the comprehensive analysis of Knowledge-Based Trust, Mentor #1 and Teacher #1, Mentor #2 and Teachers #2A and Teacher #2B, and Mentor #5 and Teacher #5B seem to have fully established this level of trust. The remaining mentors and teachers, at the conclusion of this study, were at varying levels in the establishment of Knowledge-Based Trust (see Figure 5)
### Level of Trust: Knowledge Based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: Oct.: E</td>
<td>#2A: Feb.: E</td>
<td>#3A: May: E</td>
<td>#4A: May: E</td>
<td>#5A: May: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: Oct.: E</td>
<td>#2B: Feb.: E</td>
<td>#3B: May: E</td>
<td>#4B: May: E</td>
<td>#5B: May: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differentiation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: Oct.: N</td>
<td>#2A: Feb.: E</td>
<td>#3A: May: E</td>
<td>#4A: May: E</td>
<td>#5A: May: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: N</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: N</td>
<td>May: N</td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: Oct.: E</td>
<td>#2B: Feb.: P</td>
<td>#3B: May: P</td>
<td>#4B: May: P</td>
<td>#5B: May: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb.: E</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: P</td>
<td>May: P</td>
<td>May: P</td>
<td>May: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Testing / Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: Oct.: P</td>
<td>#2A: Feb.: E</td>
<td>#3A: May: E</td>
<td>#4A: May: E</td>
<td>#5A: May: N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: N</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: N</td>
<td>May: N</td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: Oct.: P</td>
<td>#2B: Feb.: P</td>
<td>#3B: May: N</td>
<td>#4B: May: N</td>
<td>#5B: May: N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
<td>Feb.: N</td>
<td>Feb.: N</td>
<td>Feb.: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May: E</td>
<td>May: N</td>
<td>May: N</td>
<td>May: N</td>
<td>May: E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- BT = Beginning Teacher
- E = Established
- P = Partially Established
- N = Not Established

Figure 5: Presence of Conditions Supporting Lewicki and Bunker's Theory of Developmental Stages of Trust Related to Knowledge-Based Trust
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Identity-Based Trust

Lewicki and Bunker's (1996) stage model predicts identity-based trust as the final stage of trust development. This level of trust is characterized by complete empathy with the other party's desires and intentions, and develops as each comes to know, share, and be able to predict the other's needs, choices, preferences and also shares some of those same needs, choices, and preferences as one's own. According to Lewicki and Bunker, as conditional trust and knowledge-based trust are established, they become the foundation for the development of identity-based trust. Shapiro et al. (1992) suggest four types of activities that accelerate and sustain the development of identification-based trust: (1) developing a collective identity, such as a name, title, logo, etc. (2) creating joint products or goals, (3) co-location, and (4) committing to commonly shared values.

Identification-based trust develops only through time and frequent interaction. Since data were collected for only ten months of the mentoring relationship, it was not possible to fully examine this level of trust. However, since all of the subjects of this study were participants in the CADRE Project, several activities that may have contributed to identification-based trust were in existence.

**Collective identity.** Teachers and mentors in the CADRE Project shared a logo and an acronym.

**Joint products or goals.** The mentors and teachers in this study had joint goals, such as graduating in 15 months, completing portfolio comprehensive exams, and the successful completion of the beginning teachers' first-year of teaching. The mentors'
role was to provide support for attainment of these goals. It is important to note that it is atypical for beginning teachers to have this experience and these connections.

Co-location. Activities that may have contributed to the development of identity-based trust in this study include co-location. Co-location did not seem to contribute to the development of identity-based trust. Only Mentor #5 was assigned to the same site as the two teachers that she mentored. The location did not seem to be perceived by the teachers as an advantage. In fact, comments indicated a feeling that same site location was detrimental:

1. "We’re in the same building, so I see her in passing every few days. She’s busy…I can see that. But I’d really like enough time to sit down and really talk, plan for modeling and team teaching, things like that." (#5A)

The teachers also said:

2. "At the beginning of the year it seemed like I wasn’t getting as much help as [the other teacher that she was mentoring.]" (#5A)

3. "I see [my mentor] daily in passing. Sometimes she stops for 4 or 5 minutes, other days up to half an hour. We never work together for a couple of hours at a time, but I know she’s available if I need anything. She’s busy, and I’m not clear about what all is expected of her, but I know the district expects a lot." (#5B)

Each of the teachers mentioned her perception that the mentor was “busy.” One of the teachers expressed concern about equitable mentoring time. In this particular study, co-location seemed to lead the affected teachers to think that the mentor had many
other important things to do besides supporting them. Co-location did not contribute to
the development of identity-based trust. However, since co-location was a factor in only
one of the five participant sets, no conclusion could be drawn. The result may have been
more a function of that individual school’s structure and culture, or that particular
mentor’s characteristics and/or district job responsibilities than a function of general co-
location dynamics.

**Shared values.** One of the things that the mentors and teachers focused on as part
of the CADRE Project was teaching philosophy. The teachers and their mentors shared
their philosophies when they first met in August, and each teacher continued to develop
and refine her philosophy as she implemented it into practice. Because of this ongoing
activity, the teachers and mentors may have been in a unique position to comment about
mutual goals and beliefs about teaching, thus providing an opportunity for examination of
commonly shared values in regard to the classroom, an opportunity not available to most
beginning teachers. Most of the teachers saw themselves closely aligned with their
mentors in teaching philosophy and in the methods of implementing that philosophy.
Several of the teachers described it as follows:

1. “I think [my mentor] would like her classroom to be like mine.” (#2A)
2. “I see my teaching growing in a similar direction to the way she teaches.”
   (#5B)
3. “I look at her and I see that she’s been teaching for 20 years and she loves
   it. She helps me see that it’s possible. I like teaching now and I probably
   will for a long time.” (#4B)
One of the teachers, #1B, felt that she was in alignment with her mentor philosophically, but recognized substantial implementation differences.

We both feel student ownership and decision-making is important in the classroom. But I like it quiet, and it’s important for my room to stay nice and neat most of the time. I also expect the students to take a little more responsibility for their own success. I know I’m mostly responsible for their learning, but I expect them to assume a lot of the responsibility, too.

Since the program fosters the sharing and understanding of teaching philosophies, participants in this study seemed to have a foundation for understanding the other party’s desires and intentions. Although there is no way to verify it, in this study it may even be that pre-existing similar values led both teachers and mentors to participate in CADRE.

Based on the evidence that all of the mentors and teachers had a collective identity and joint goals, and there seemed to be a strong indication of similar values, identity-based trust was partially established for each of the new teachers and their mentors (see Figure 6). It’s important to note that in this study, not all of the teachers had established conditional trust or knowledge-based trust. This leads to the following questions in regard to applying the Lewicki and Bunker stage model of trust to the mentor/beginning teacher relationship: (a) does conditional trust have to be fully developed before knowledge-based trust can develop? (b) does knowledge-based trust have to fully develop before identity-based trust can develop?
### Level of Trust: Identity-Based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: P</td>
<td>#2A: P</td>
<td>#3A: P</td>
<td>#4A: P</td>
<td>#5A: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: P</td>
<td>#2B: P</td>
<td>#3B: P</td>
<td>#4B: P</td>
<td>#5B: P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collective Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: E</td>
<td>#2A: E</td>
<td>#3A: E</td>
<td>#4A: E</td>
<td>#5A: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: E</td>
<td>#2B: E</td>
<td>#3B: E</td>
<td>#4B: E</td>
<td>#5B: E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Join Product &/or Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: N</td>
<td>#2A: N</td>
<td>#3A: N</td>
<td>#4A: N</td>
<td>#5A: E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: N</td>
<td>#2B: N</td>
<td>#3B: N</td>
<td>#4B: N</td>
<td>#5B: E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Co-location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: P</td>
<td>#2A: P</td>
<td>#3A: P</td>
<td>#4A: P</td>
<td>#5A: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: P</td>
<td>#2B: P</td>
<td>#3B: P</td>
<td>#4B: P</td>
<td>#5B: P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Committing to Commonly Shared Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1A: P</td>
<td>#2A: P</td>
<td>#3A: P</td>
<td>#4A: P</td>
<td>#5A: P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>#1B: P</td>
<td>#2B: P</td>
<td>#3B: P</td>
<td>#4B: P</td>
<td>#5B: P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Analysis of Identity-Based Trust:**

Identity-based trust is partially established among all of the teachers in this study.

**KEY:**

- **BT** - Beginning Teacher
- **E** = Established
- **P** = Partially Established
- **N** = Not Established

---

Figure 6: Presence of Conditions Supporting Lewicki and Bunker's Theory of Development of Trust Related to Identity-Based Trust
Summary

The findings of this study indicate that trust rests upon teacher perceptions of the mentor’s character, competence, and judgment (Gabarro, 1978).

Levels of trust, described by Lewicki and Bunker (1996) as conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identity-based trust were evident in the beginning teacher’s perception of the establishment of trust in the mentoring relationship. This study did not confirm, however, that the levels of trust developed in an evolutionary, stage-model fashion. In fact, analysis indicates that there is a possibility that conditional trust, knowledge-based trust and identity-based trust develop simultaneously and perhaps even interactively.
CHAPTER V  
Summary and Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the beginning teacher’s perspective on trust in the mentor-beginning teacher relationship. This was a qualitative study utilizing the grounded theory method modified to accommodate received theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

The summary and discussion of findings are presented in two sections. Each section is based on one of the two received theories that formed the framework for the study. The first section examines teacher/mentor experiences in relation to Gabarro’s (1978) three sources model of trust, which are identified as (a) character-based sources of trust, (b) competence-based sources of trust, and (c) judgment. The second section examines teacher/mentor experiences in relation to Lewicki and Bunker’s (1996) developmental stages of trust, which are identified as (a) conditional trust, (b) knowledge-based trust, and (c) identity-based trust.

**Gabarro’s Three Sources of Trust**

**Question 1**

The first received theory (Gabarro, 1978) predicts that the trust one is willing to place in a workplace associate will be affected by her perceptions of the associate’s character, competence, and judgment. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors? Answer: Yes.
Character-based.

Character-based sources of trust include motives, integrity, consistency and predictability of behavior, the ability to be open, and the ability to be discreet. That the beginning teachers perceived these attributes in their mentors was evident in all of the relationships studied. The consistency and predictability of behavior trust component took the longest to establish.

Competence-based.

Gabarro (1978) identifies three perceptual areas as important in the establishment of competence-based trust: (1) specific competence, (2) interpersonal competence, and (3) business sense. The beginning teachers perceived their mentors as having specific competence as early as the second interview in October. A sense that the mentors possessed interpersonal competence took longer to emerge, but was perceived by the teachers as important in trust development. A perception that their mentor possessed business sense, which encompasses wisdom and experience, as one might expect, took the longest to develop and was the most difficult for the beginning teachers to articulate.

Judgment-based.

A sense that the other person has good judgment is the third source of trust. The development of this perception depends on the accumulation, or on the cumulative effects of an accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems, and events. Time with the mentor is one of the critical elements in whether or not the teacher develops a sense that the mentor possesses some high level of judgment. Time together is essential because the teacher must have the opportunity to see examples of how the mentor applies
her judgment to different problems and situations. But in addition to the amount of time, the judgment displayed in that time must be good. The beginning teachers' perceptions of their mentors' judgment were influenced by (a) the amount of time they spent together, (b) if, when, and how the mentors modeled teaching behaviors, (c) the efforts made to coach the beginning teachers, and (d) how many different dimensions developed in the relationship.

The ability to promote perceptions of quality judgment varied significantly among the five mentors. Only two of the ten beginning teachers ever developed full confidence in their mentor's judgment. These two teachers were working with the same mentor, which suggests the mentor displayed the same quality judgment to both of the teachers, and the judgment was perceived similarly by each of the teachers.

Lewicki and Bunker's Developmental Stages of Trust

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) identify three developmental stages of trust: (a) conditional trust, (b) knowledge-based trust, and (c) identity-based trust. While this study found that each of these types of trust did develop and were significant, it did not confirm that they occurred in stages. Although each type of trust came to exist to some degree in each of the relationships, in each case their emergence was parallel and interactive rather than sequential.

Interestingly, the results of this study indicated that while the three stages of trust did not develop in sequence, there was a discernible sequence within the development of each type of trust.
**Question 2**

The second received theory (Lewicki and Bunker, 1996) predicts that three levels of trust will emerge in workplace relationships: conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identity-based trust. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors? Answer: Yes

**Question 3**

Lewicki and Bunker’s theory also predicts that the three levels of trust will develop in an evolutionary manner. Is this true in the case of beginning teachers as they do or do not develop trust in their mentors? Answer: No. The levels of trust develop and emerge, but they don’t evolve sequentially.

**Conditional trust.**

The results of this study supported Lewicki and Bunker’s theory that the development of conditional trust depends on whether the beginning teacher perceives her mentor as available and willing to help, and feels that the time they spend together is rewarding. In each relationship where the teacher developed conditional trust in her mentor, the mentor had made a substantial time commitment and the teacher had perceived the relationship as rewarding.

Trust development was a two-step sequence. First, the teacher had to feel that the mentor had made herself available and then the teacher had to feel that it was rewarding to take advantage of that availability.
Knowledge-based trust.

This study produces evidence that the establishment of knowledge-based trust is influenced by (1) regular communication, (2) the extent of differentiation, and (3) the amount and the manner in which a relationship is tested. These three elements emerged sequentially. That is to say, regular communication resulted in the mentoring relationship becoming increasingly differentiated, which led to situations where the relationship experienced tests and/or challenges. Because of the differences in individual personalities and situations, differentiation took different shapes in each relationship and there were variations in both the nature of the tests and challenges and the teacher’s reactions to them. As a result, varying levels of knowledge-based trust were established among the beginning teacher/mentor relationships.

Identity-based trust.

Identity-based trust is characterized by complete empathy with the other party’s desires and intentions. It develops as each person comes to know, share, and be able to predict the other’s needs, choices, preferences and also comes to share some of those same needs, choices, and preferences as her own. Identity-based trust partially developed in all of the teacher/mentor relationships examined in this study. However, the full establishment of this type of trust probably requires a relationship that extends beyond the ten-month duration of this study. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) contend that identification-based trust may not be fully established in work relationships because one or both of the parties lack the time or energy to invest beyond the knowledge-based trust.
level, or they may have no desire for a closer relationship. Some evidence of both appeared among some of the teachers and mentors in this study.

The findings of this study confirm the difficulty of fully establishing identity-based trust in work relationships; however, evidence is provided that program structures can contribute to some elements of establishing this type of trust. Certain elements of the structure of the CADRE Project seemed to promote the emergence of identity-based trust. These include (1) developing a collective identity, such as a name, title, logo, etc., (2) creating a joint product or goal, such as a portfolio, growth plan, philosophy statement, etc., and (3) committing to commonly shared values, which may include aligning the mentor program with the district and building mission statement.

Discussion of the Findings

The evidence produced by this study strongly supports the idea that it is essential that substantial amounts of time be spent together if trust is to develop. The study also clearly indicates that trust only develops through an accumulation of interactions, which leads to differentiation in the relationship. Differentiation, which is defined as interactions with the mentor in a variety of roles, increases the complexity in the mentor/new teacher relationship. As relationships become increasingly complex, the likelihood of challenges or tests to the limits of the relationship increases. The result is a mentor/teacher relationship that is likely to provide opportunities for interactions that will lead to beginning teacher growth and development (Gabarro, 1978; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).
The findings from this study posed a challenge to Lewicki and Bunker's stage theory of trust development. Elements of conditional trust, knowledge-based trust, and identification-based trust existed in all of the mentor/beginning teacher relationships, but they did not occur sequentially. In fact, evidence indicated that the types of trust often existed simultaneously and were interactive. For example, while three of the new teachers did not perceive conditional trust as fully developed, there still were indicators of knowledge-based trust in their relationships. Similarly, all of the teachers showed some level of identification-based trust in their mentors, even though not all of the teachers perceived knowledge-based trust to be completely developed.

Certain factors contributed to accelerating or enhancing the development of each type of trust. First, this study provides clear evidence that the time commitment on the part of the mentor contributes to trust being accelerated. Second, a variety of activities such as model teaching and coaching behaviors accelerate or enhance the development of trust, because when a clear commitment of time is combined with a variety of interactions with the new teacher, the development of trust is enhanced.

It is important to recognize, however, that though these types of activities may accelerate or enhance trust development under certain conditions, their presence does not necessarily ensure that a teacher will come to fully trust her mentor. For example, Teacher #1B indicated partial, rather than fully developed conditional trust in her mentor because she was not sure that the relationship was rewarding even though model teaching and coaching, two indicators of knowledge-based trust, were clearly evident in the mentoring relationship. Teacher #1B showed that she felt some level of identity-based
trust in her mentor, but that could have been a result of certain shared elements within the structure of the CADRE program in which they were both participants.

Additional evidence of this finding is supported by how Teacher #5A and #5B each perceived her relationship with their shared mentor. They both felt some measure of conditional trust in their mentor, even though she would not or could not commit as much time to working with either of them as the other mentors committed to their beginning teachers. The importance of mentors having a substantial amount of time to spend with the teacher in each of these relationships was offset by the teachers’ perceived value of the time they did spend together. The teachers found that the time together was extremely rewarding. This helps to explain why the mentor’s apparent lack of time commitment did not prevent either of the teachers from developing knowledge-based trust in her. It seems likely that this would happen only if she displayed such high quality knowledge and skill when they were together that they didn’t need massive exposure to believe that she knew what she was doing.

A third challenge to the theory of sequential trust development appears in the relationship between Mentor #3 and Teacher #3A. Although conditional trust quickly and fully developed in this relationship, differentiation and its subsequent challenges to the relationship never occurred. Consequently, the mentor shared very little personal knowledge of herself, and she and the teacher did not interact personally outside the limits of the formal relationship. Consequently, the teacher did not have the widest possible opportunity to observe or to share experiences with her mentor in which the mentor might have displayed more of her knowledge and skill. As a result, knowledge-
based trust was never fully established. Interestingly, however, even though there was little or no growth of knowledge-based trust, the teacher still came to identify with her mentor, and some factors in the establishment of identity-based trust were evident.

It appears that each of these relationships were able to “skip over” some of the factors contributing to one level of trust before elements of the next level emerged, supporting the notion that relationships are multi-faceted; therefore, trust in the mentoring relationship may not necessarily develop in a sequential manner.

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran’s (1999) study involving teachers and principals arrived at a similar conclusion. Through factor analysis, they found that a variety of aspects of trust carried significant importance depending upon the nature and dynamics of the relationship and the specific situation.

Any mentoring relationship is complex because the mentors and beginning teachers bring their individual sets of beliefs, concerns, assumptions, and challenges to the mentoring process (Wildman et al., 1992). These factors result in wide variations in practice. The results of this study confirm this notion, providing evidence that the same mentor mentoring two different teachers may interact differently with each them and consequently draw differing types and levels of trust from each.

Additional Observations

Several items are discussed in this section that are related to this study, but not necessarily tied to a specific type or level of trust. The ideas do not necessarily flow from what the beginning teachers told me, rather, they are ideas and observations that help put what they told me into a larger context. These observations begin with a discussion of
support and challenge in the mentoring relationship, followed by a discussion of typical first-year teacher concerns, and conclude with observations about the importance of mentoring.

Support and Challenge in the Mentoring Relationship

Significant to these findings is Daloz's (1986) theory that support and challenge can be combined to enhance learning. Daloz describes support as an affirming activity in which the beginning teacher feels supported and cared for. This study provides evidence that, as Gabarro's theory predicted, a consistent commitment of time, and the teacher's perception that this time was rewarding, led to the belief that the mentor exhibited character. Similarly, as Lewicki and Bunker's theory predicted, the teacher's perception that the mentor was committed to helping her and that the help carried rewards for the teacher, led to the development of conditional trust.

Challenge, however, goes beyond supportive interactions to activities and experiences that generate discussions, questions, and problem solving. While the function of support is to bring personal and professional boundaries together, challenge peels them apart. Challenge generates dissonance through questioning, problem solving, challenging, etc., creating opportunities for the learner to grow and make progress (Daloz, 1986).

It is essential that the teacher develop some type of trust at a significant level before the mentor really begins to challenge her. Trust anchors the mentoring as a process that not only provides support, but has the potential for beginning teacher growth and development. Without a well-established sense of basic trust, it is difficult to move
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the relationship ahead (Daloz, 1986). Without challenge, the mentoring relationship remains “feel-good,” but does not lead to teacher development. As Evans (1996) has observed, pressure (or challenge, in this case) without support leads to errors and alienation, but support without pressure leads to drift and a waste of resources.

The results of this study showed “challenge” to be an important factor in mentoring relationships that resulted in the establishment of increasingly complex elements of trust. According to Gabarro (1978), the competence and judgment sources of trust incorporate elements of challenge. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) refer to knowledge-based trust and identity-based trust as levels of trust that incorporate Daloz’s (1986) definition of challenge.

Typical First-Year Teacher Concerns

It is interesting to note that the respondents in this study did not report experiencing some of the concerns that are typical to first-year teachers. They did not indicate significant feelings of isolation, nor difficulties leading to intense strain, which, in turn, leads to fatigue, or depression (Broadbent & Cruickshank, 1965; Bullough, 1987; Dropkin & Taylor, 1963; Elias, Fisher, & Simon, 1980; Huberman, 1988; Lortie, 1975; Ryan, 1970; Smith, 1950; Stout, 1952; Veenman, 1984; Wey, 1951). Two explanations are possible: 1) they chose not to share this information in the interviews, or (2) the structure of the CADRE Project, which included coursework, mentoring, and a cohort group, minimized or eliminated these common problems.
Importance of Mentoring

The results of this study underline two interrelated concepts important in school improvement efforts: the importance of interpersonal professional trust as a general characteristic of school culture and the possibility that mentoring programs may be important tools in injecting or "funneling" trust into relationships among teachers in a given school. Studies have revealed that teachers in high trust schools are pleased to share professional secrets, successful teaching strategies, materials, and equipment in the interest of helping students learn (Kratzer, 1997; Short & Greer, 1997). This leads to the logical assumption that a high level of trust has potential for school improvement. Mentoring relationships may be key in "funneling" trust to relationships between teachers.

Mentoring has been proven to be an effective method of supporting new teachers (Chapman, 1983, 1984; Freiberg, et al., 1994; Huling-Austin, 1990; Sandefur, 1982; Stone, 1987), and the results of this study confirm that trust is important in the mentoring relationship. With nearly 2 million teachers entering U.S. schools in the next decade (U.S. Department of Education, 1999), supporting these new teachers with successful mentoring holds tremendous potential. Central to all efforts to improve schools is the improvement of teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1997), and supporting new teachers through mentoring holds promise for school improvement. The role of the mentor provides the opportunity to serve as teacher, advisor, sponsor, guide, coach and confidante (Daloz, 1986; Kram, 1983; Ostroff & Kozlowksi, 1993). This study supports the importance of establishing trust in the mentor/beginning teacher relationship. A
firmly established foundation of trust provides opportunities for mentoring that goes beyond support, to growth and development.

Existing theories provide evidence that trust becomes increasingly complex as relationships are established (Gabarro, 1978; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). If school districts have an interest in mentoring programs that go beyond emotional support to include model teaching and coaching, the activities credited with teacher growth and development, significant amounts of time for the mentors and beginning teachers to work together is essential. Time together allows the beginning teachers to perceive their mentors as competent, and creates opportunities for the relationship to become differentiated as the mentor and beginning teacher interact in a variety of roles, including classroom teacher, coach, expert, advisor, and friend. The principal can help to create these conditions. Bryk and Schneider (1996) determined that the principal’s behavior is a key factor in promoting trusting school communities.

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) also identify co-location as a factor that specifically contributes to identity-based trust. Although this study was inconclusive about the effects of co-location, districts should consider the potential benefits of pairing mentor teachers with beginning teachers in the same building, subject area, and grade level.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study confirmed other research regarding the difficulties of studying trust. It is a complex, multi-dimensional and dynamic construct (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). The multiple bases and different sources that inform the
establishment of trust make it a challenging concept to grasp and measure. However, this study provides the following implications for practice:

- Mentors and beginning teachers should engage in a variety of activities to enhance and accelerate trust in the relationship, and administrators should structure programs to facilitate the opportunity.

The teachers in this study who came to trust their mentors in the most broadly based ways were those in relationships that had multiple dimensions. It would be a good idea for program administrators to build the capacity for multiple dimensions (i.e., model teaching, curriculum planning and instructional delivery strategies, observation and feedback, etc.) into school district program plans.

- Mentor training should incorporate appropriate information about the needs of the beginning teacher, and mentoring strategies to support these needs.

The teachers in this study indicated that when time spent with the mentor was rewarding, it led to the development of trust. The likelihood that time spent together will be rewarding is increased when mentors receive appropriate training.

- As school districts select and train mentors, attention should be given to three types of competence: (1) specific competence, (2) interpersonal competence, (3) and business sense.

The teachers in this study indicated that they must perceive their mentor as competent in these three areas in order for trust to be established in the relationship. Specific competence referred to the knowledge and skills required for successful classroom teaching; interpersonal competence referred to an understanding of how to
work with people in the school and district context, and business sense referred to the experience and wisdom of their mentor.

- Consideration should be given to modifying teaching assignments and extra-duty responsibilities for those serving in mentoring roles.

The teachers in this study identified the amount of time the mentor and beginning teacher spent together as critical to the establishment of trust in the mentoring relationship. This implies that mentoring programs should assure that the mentor's schedule allows adequate time for the mentor and beginning teacher to work together.

- School districts should consider mentoring programs that last two or three years.

It may be that so few of the teachers in this study developed identity-based trust in their mentors, and that a substantial portion of the teachers also did not fully develop knowledge-based trust in their mentors because they simply could not spend enough time together in one year. The importance of having the time to observe one's mentor and to share experiences with her was a continuing theme in these teachers' experience. Programs that continue beyond the initial year of teaching may result in a mentoring relationship where trust is fully developed.

- School districts should consider having veteran teachers serve in the mentoring role for several years. Consideration should be given to designating "professional" mentors, also.

This study indicated that because of the complex dynamics of the mentoring relationship, wide variations in practice are expected. Mentor training and experience, however, can help assure that the goals and objectives of mentoring programs are
achieved. Mentors serving in this role for several years will increase the likelihood of attaining these goals.

- Those responsible for mentoring programs should consider developing a collective identity and identifying joint goals for the teacher and mentor.

Since the findings of this study produced some evidence to support Lewicki and Bunker's theory that a collective identity and working toward a common goal may contribute to trust in the mentoring relationship, policymakers might consider ideas such as the use of an acronym, title, or logo for their mentoring programs. Having a joint goal or project for the teachers and mentors to work toward may also contribute to trust in the relationship. Joint goals or projects may include mentoring plans, professional growth plans, teacher portfolios, etc.

**Implications for Further Research**

With both greater emphasis on school collaboration and school-wide accountability (Pounder, 1998), schools have a need to continue to research and develop a clear understanding of trust. Research on trust is just beginning in the school context, and quantitative and qualitative studies are needed (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

This dissertation implies that the following areas are deserving of further research:

**Primary Implications**

- What is the mentor's perception of the development of trust in the mentoring relationship?

This study examined only the teacher's perspective on trust, but all trusting relationships involve at least two people. To develop a better picture of how trust
develops in mentoring relationships, we need to gain insights into how mentors perceive the interactions. The most effective study, but certainly a complicated one to conduct, would be to simultaneously investigate how both mentor and beginning teacher experienced their relationship.

- What is the secondary beginning teacher’s perspective of trust in the mentoring relationship?

This study examined only the elementary teacher’s perspective on trust. The literature review pointed to the fact that context affects the dynamics of trust. Middle schools and high schools and the people who work in them differ significantly from elementary schools. It would be useful to examine trust development in a larger departmentalized setting where specific subject matter knowledge plays a larger role in teaching.

- Does gender or race of the mentor and beginning teacher affect the perception of trust in the mentoring relationship?

This study examined trust between Caucasian females. The literature review suggests that “likeness” contributes to trust development (Jones & George, 1998). A study to examine how similarities and differences affect trust development between mentors and beginning teachers would be worthwhile.

- Does the establishment of trust in the mentoring relationship affect stages of teacher development?

This study suggested that mentoring relationships that had the potential for beginning teacher growth and development also had more highly developed levels of
trust. Determining how this trust affects stages that teachers typically go through in their professional development (Berline, 1987; Fuller, 1969; Kagan, 1992) would be worthy of study.

Additional Implications

- Does the development of trust lead to mentoring relationships that extend beyond the first year, second year, and so on? If so, does the mentoring role change and/or evolve over time?

This study was only able to follow the beginning teacher and her mentor for the initial teaching/mentoring year. It would be worthwhile to continue to follow these teachers and mentors to see if the teachers and mentors who developed a high level of trust continued their work together, and if so, what did their work together and their relationship look like?

- Does co-location affect trust development? If so, how?

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) identify co-location as a factor that specifically contributes to identity-based trust. This study was inconclusive about the effects of co-location. School districts usually assign mentors who are in the same building as the beginning teacher. However, some school districts assign mentors to teachers who are not located in their same building. It would be worthwhile to study the effects of location on the development of trust in the mentoring relationship.

- Is mentoring rooted in a professional relationship, or is mentoring more effective when a professional and personal relationship are established?
This study indicated that some mentor/beginning teacher pairs developed professional and personal relationships, while other mentor/beginning teacher pairs developed only a professional relationship. The development of both a professional and personal relationship indicated a more fully developed level of trust. Further research examining mentoring rooted in a professional and/or personal relationship would provide additional information about factors that do or do not contribute to successful mentoring.

- To what extent does training affect the mentor’s ability to establish trust in the mentoring relationship?

The review of literature indicates that wide variations in mentoring practice and mentor training persist (Hawkeye, 1997; Wilman, et al., 1992). Further examination of types of training that affect trust development would be useful.

- What is the impact of a school’s culture of trust on the mentoring relationship?

The review of literature concludes that teacher trust is closely linked to how individual teachers of a school treat each other (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1986; Hoy, Tarter, & Witknoziek, 1992; Moran & Hoy, 1997; Tarter, Sabo & Hoy, 1995). It would be useful to examine how the school’s culture, which includes how the teachers treat each other, is or is not related to the development of trust with a mentor.

- What can principals do to cultivate trust in the mentoring relationship?

Previous research determined that trust in the principal is positively correlated to faculty trust (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1986). It would be worthwhile to examine the principal’s role in trust development between the mentor and beginning teacher.
• What kinds of school structures facilitate trust between mentors and beginning teachers?

As school reform efforts work toward facilities and teaching schedules that foster opportunities for collaboration, it would be worthwhile to determine if these efforts contribute to the development of trust among colleagues, and more specifically to the development of trust between mentors and beginning teachers.

• As mentoring becomes increasingly common, what communication and conflict resolution skills are needed to nurture greater trust in one another?

This study indicated that interpersonal skills are essential for the beginning teacher to perceive the mentor as competent. A better understanding of communication and conflict resolution skills that help establish trust would provide valuable information to program directors as they select and train mentors.

These and other questions concerning how trust functions in the mentoring relationship are important as schools invest time and resources in mentoring as a means of providing support and development, as well as increasing the retention of beginning teachers.

**Specific Considerations**

One must be cautious in applying the results of this study (a) because qualitative research does not support broad applications of the findings of a single study, but more importantly (b) because the mentors in this study are in many ways different from the mentors in most school programs. All of the mentors in this study complete an extensive application and interview process, participate in ongoing training, and have at least one
year of prior mentoring experience. In addition, all of the beginning teachers chose to
begin their career in a program where mentoring was a significant part of their first-year
experience. It is possible that it would be more difficult for beginning teachers in a
typical school mentoring program to come to fully trust their mentor.
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