THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY DOMAINS AND MENTORING CONTENT IN THE CONTEXT OF STUDENT TEACHING IN MUSIC

by

JOCELYN STEVENS PRENDERGAST

(Under the Direction of Mary Leglar)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between cooperating teacher personality traits and the mentoring content they report delivering within the context of music student teaching. The impact of the perception of similarity between the student and cooperating teacher on the satisfaction with the overall student teaching experience was also explored. Subjects included cooperating teachers (n = 30) and student teachers (*n* = 20*)* from NASM-certified Southeastern Division schools. Data were collected using the International Personality Inventory Pool NEO PI-R, the Mentoring Functions Scale, and the Allen and Eby relationship quality measure. The findings indicate that the personality trait of Conscientiousness significantly predicted cooperating teachers' provision of career support, emotional support, and relationship quality. Perception of similarity between the cooperating teacher and student teacher was not significantly related to satisfaction with the overall experience.

INDEX WORDS: Mentoring, Student Teaching, Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, Personality, Music Teacher Education

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY DOMAINS AND MENTORING CONTENT IN THE CONTEXT OF STUDENT TEACHING IN MUSIC

by

JOCELYN STEVENS PRENDERGAST

Bachelor of Music in Music Education, Butler University, 2000

Master of Music in Wind Conducting, University of Minnesota, 2006

Master of Arts in Music Education, University of Minnesota, 2011

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF MUSICAL ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2014

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY DOMAINS AND MENTORING CONTENT IN THE CONTEXT OF STUDENT TEACHING IN MUSIC

by

JOCELYN STEVENS PRENDERGAST

Major Professor: Mary Leglar

Committee: Michael Robinson
Rebecca Simpson-Litke
Brian Wesolowski

Electronic Version Approved:

Julie Coffield
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2014

Dedication

To my children, Aidan and Katelyn. You have brought immeasurable joy to my life and I feel humbled and blessed to be your mother.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to those people who made this document possible.

Dr. Robinson has offered his quiet assurance that everything would work out for the best, and he has proven to be right. Dr. Wesolowski has offered his expertise in the areas of measurement and statistics which has challenged me and will surely improve my future research. Dr. Simpson-Litke has consistently demonstrated an attention to detail, professionalism, and kindness that I strive to emulate in my own work. Dr. Leglar has been an ardent supporter, teacher, and mentor and I am forever indebted to her.

I would also like to recognize those people who assisted in a less formal capacity, but helped to make this document possible nonetheless. Shanshan Qin was invaluable with her assistance conducting the CFA, Drs. Legette and Love-Myers offered their helpful input with many aspects of the study, and Dr. Eby was generous with her time and expertise in the field of Industrial/Organizational Psychology.

Finally, I would like to thank my partner, Curran. He has made this document possible through his love, patience, and by taking care of well more than his share of the responsibilities at home.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Chapter 1

Introduction

Student teaching is considered the most important experience for those enrolled in teacher education programs (Conway, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Glickman & Bey, 1990; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Harlin, Edwards, & Briers, 2002; Legette, 2013; McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996; Rideout & Feldman, 2002; Ryan et al., 1980). Within the student teaching experience, the cooperating teacher has a tremendous influence on the student teacher (McAulay, 1960; Stegman, 2007; Yee, 1969). Although these findings underscore the importance of mentor selection, many teacher education programs continue to place students in internships based solely on availability and/or convenience (Potthoff & Alley, 1995; Zeichner, 1996).

Factors often considered in the student teaching placement process include selection of culturally diverse sites, satisfactory collaboration between school system and university, expertise of the cooperating teacher, opportunity to challenge student teacher beliefs, and clustering of pre-service teachers (Potthoff & Alley, 1995). However, these do not address the important dynamic that exists between the cooperating teacher and student teacher (Hoffman, Funk, Long, & Keithley, 1982; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Young & Edwards, 2006). Even when students are placed with teachers "with whom they are likely to feel comfortable," this mentor-student matching is often, in effect, an imprecise guess by university supervisor making the match about how successful the relationship will be (Potthoff & Alley, 1995, p. 90).

Research conducted in the field of industrial/organizational psychology indicates that personality impacts the experience for both parties in the mentor/mentee dyad (Afolabi, 2011; George, Kirshnan, & Mampilly, 2013; Morrison, 2009; Niehoff, 2006). Furthermore, perception of personality similarity promotes a feeling of satisfaction with the relationship (Kitchel & Torres, 2007; Sprague, 1997). Beliefs of what constitutes the content of mentoring vary (Abell et al., 1995; Russell & Russell, 2011; Sudzina, Giebelhaus, & Coolican, 1997), but generally relate to career support, emotional support, socialization, and relationship quality (Butler & Cuenca, 2012; Eby et al., 2013).

These findings raise questions that apply to music teacher education programs related to whether personality characteristics of cooperating teachers are associated with distinct mentoring behaviors and whether student teachers with personality traits similar to those of their mentor find the mentoring experience more satisfactory. Research into these areas may inform the processes and practices of placing student teachers in rewarding mentoring environments. Increased understanding of how personality and mentoring style interact and contribute to the success of the student teaching experience is highly relevant and important to teacher educators (Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was: (a) to explore, within the music student teaching experience, the relationships between personality domains of the cooperating teacher and the mentoring content areas of career support, emotional support, and relationship quality; and (b) to determine whether perception of similarity between cooperating teacher and student teacher contributes to overall satisfaction with the relationship.

Because no measure of socialization exists that is appropriate for the student teaching context, and the creation of a measure of socialization falls outside the intent of this study, socialization was not examined.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. Does a cooperating teachers' personality predict the mentoring content they report providing to their student teacher?
2. Does perception of similarity between cooperating teacher and student teacher positively correlate with the quality of the student teaching experience?

Definition of Terms

Cooperating teacher. The public school classroom teacher to whom a student teacher is assigned for all or part of the student teaching experience. Cooperating teachers are sometimes called mentors, mentor teachers, or supervising teachers.

Student teacher. A preservice teacher working under the guidance of a cooperating teacher for part or all of an extended teaching internship. They can also be considered protégés.

Mentoring content. The mentoring practices engaged in by the cooperating teacher, such as career support, emotional support, and professional socialization, and the overall quality of the mentoring relationship.

Career support. Behaviors that encourage professional growth, such as providing challenging assignments, task assistance, coaching, and pedagogical advice (Butler & Cuenca, 2012, Eby et al., 2013).

Emotional support. Behaviors related to psychosocial support, such as providing encouragement, role modeling, developing trust, and engaging in social activities (Butler & Cuenca, 2012, Eby et al., 2013).

Socialization. Modeling teaching-related behaviors that fall outside the purview of instruction, such as fulfilling administrative responsibilities, establishing classroom order, and communicating with parents (Butler & Cuenca, 2012).

Relationship quality. Perception of overall satisfaction with the relationship between mentor and protégé (Eby et al., 2013).

Personality domains.

Openness. "The breadth, depth, originality, and complexity of an individual's *mental and experiential life*" (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008, p. 138).

Conscientiousness. "S*ocial prescribed impulse control* that facilitates task- and goal-directed behavior, such as thinking before acting, delaying gratification, following norms and rules, and planning, organization, and prioritizing tasks" (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008, p. 138).

Extraversion. A tendency toward "an *energetic approach* toward the social and material world [including] traits such as sociability, activity, assertiveness, and positive emotionality" (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008, p. 138).

Agreeableness. "Contrasts a *pro-social and communal orientation* towards others with antagonism"; this domain includes "traits such as altruism, tender-mindedness, trust, and modesty" (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008, p. 138).

Neuroticism. "Contrasts emotional stability and even-temperedness with *negative emotionality*, such as feeling anxious, nervous, sad, and tense" (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008, p. 138).

Delimitations

Subjects were music student teachers and their cooperating teachers. The student teachers were selected from National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) Southeastern region colleges and universities.

Limitations

Given the exploratory nature of the study, the results are not intended to be generalizable beyond the sample. The techniques of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and stepwise regression utilized to assess the measure and analyze the data were appropriate for this introductory study, but do not allow for generalizations to the population.

Organization of the Study

Chapter one includes the introduction to the study, purpose of the study, research questions, definition of terms, delimitations, limitations, and the organization of the study. Chapter two is a review of the literature deemed most relevant to the study. The chapter begins with an overview and contains an overview of frameworks for studying personality, and a review of research on teacher personality, characteristics of music teachers, mentoring roles/content, characteristics of "good" student teaching experiences, and descriptions of the measurement instruments. The third chapter includes a description of the design of the study and methodology, including recruitment of subjects, administration of the survey, and data analysis techniques employed. Chapter four

provides information about the demographic makeup of the sample and results of the data analysis. In the fifth chapter, the study is summarized, the results are discussed, and suggestions for further research are made.

Chapter 2

Related Literature

Overview

Little research has targeted the relationship between the personality of the student teaching mentor and mentoring behavior, and no research on this topic was found in the field of music education. Therefore, the literature informing this study has been gleaned largely from the fields of general education and industrial/organizational psychology. A review of the following categories of literature informed the study: (a) frameworks for studying personality, (b) personality and teaching, (c) personality characteristics of music teachers, (d) mentoring roles, (e) characteristics of successful student teaching placements, and (f) descriptions of the measurement instruments used in the study.

Frameworks for Studying Personality

Various approaches to the study of personality are reported in the psychological literature, including biological, behavioral, and cognitive perspectives, among others. However, two of the most prominent approaches to personality are the Five Factor Model (FFM), a trait theory (lexical or natural language) approach, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a cognitive approach.

Trait theory research dates to the early 1930s, when psychologists, seeking to create a taxonomy for understanding personality, began by combing the dictionary for words relating to personality (Allport & Odbert, 1936, influenced by Klages, 1932, and Baumgarten, 1933) and placing them into independent categories or traits that were

essentially encoded in language (Allport & Odbert, 1936; Cattell, 1943, 1945, 1947; Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981; Norman, 1967; Tupes & Christal, 1981). These traits were eventually organized into domains called the "Big Five" (Goldberg, 1990): "After decades of research, the field has now achieved an initial consensus on a general taxonomy of personality traits, the 'Big Five' personality dimensions" (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008, p. 116). Trait theory, or the FFM, has become the predominant approach to studying personality.

The "Big Five" personality domains are Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Each of these domains contains subscales, or facets. The six facets of the Neuroticism domain include anxiety, anger, depression, self-consciousness, immoderation, and vulnerability. The Extraversion facets are friendliness, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity level, excitement seeking, and cheerfulness. The facets of Openness to experience include imagination, artistic interests, emotionality, adventurousness, intellect, and liberalism. Agreeableness facets are trust, morality, altruism, cooperation, modesty, and sympathy. Finally, Conscientiousness facets are self-efficacy, orderliness, dutifulness, achievement-striving, self-discipline, and cautiousness.

In contrast to the FFM, the MBTI (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) is based on Jungian typological theory, a cognitive approach. The MBTI contains four dichotomous categories representing preferences related to focus of energy (Extraversion/Introversion or E/I), how one takes in and interprets information (Sensing/Intuition or S/I), decision making (Thinking/Feeling or T/F), and life approach (Judging/Perceiving or J/P). The interaction among each of the preferences results in 16 distinctive personality types.

Since the types are regarded as dichotomous, an individual's personality would not be interpreted as "a little bit thinking and a little bit feeling," for example. Instead, a basic premise of the inventory is that an individual displays distinct preferences for a particular personality type.

Personality and Teaching

Research on teacher personality has focused largely on the identification of traits found to be present in most teachers (Decker & Rimm-Kaufman, 2007) or traits judged necessary for success in teaching (Heddendorf, 1971; Krueger, 1976: Rushton, Morgan, & Richard, 2007; Witty, 1947). While a consensus of necessary personality traits has not emerged from the research, many of the identified traits can be related to the FFM and/or MBTI.

In a three-year study of 397 pre-service teachers enrolled in the teacher education program at the University of Virginia, Decker and Rimm-Kaufman (2007) explored the subjects' personality characteristics and beliefs about teaching, without concern for measures of success. They also sought to understand the ways personality factors and other demographics predicted pre-service teachers' beliefs about teaching. Subjects were administered the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), the Teacher Beliefs Q-sort (TBQ, which assesses beliefs and/or priorities in three categories: discipline and behavior management, classroom practices, and children), and a demographic questionnaire.

Comparing the pre-service teachers' responses on the NEO-FFI to the normative sample provided in Costa and McCrae (1992), the researchers found that the pre-service teachers scored higher on all five FFM personality facets: Neuroticism ($t = 12.79$, $p < .001$, $d = .93$), Extraversion ($t = 33.71$, $p < .001$, $d = 2.45$), Openness ($t = 32.98$, $p < .001$,

d = 2.40), Agreeableness (t = 43.23, $p < .001$, d = 3.15), and Conscientiousness (t = 31.38, $p < .001$, d = 2.28. The researchers indicated that they were not surprised by their findings because the students in their sample had SAT scores well above the national average (1279 combined SAT for sample, 1020 for the national average), and they were enrolled in a "top teacher education program with a rigorous selection process" (Decker & Rimm-Kaufman, 2007, p. 58).

A three-step regression analysis was conducted to account for variance in pre-service teacher beliefs. Results indicated that teacher-centered classrooms were favored by male teachers and implicit structures were supported by non-Caucasian males with high Openness and/or low Conscientiousness. Further, teacher-directed instruction was favored by pre-service teachers intending to teach at the secondary level and/or scoring low on Openness. Finally, a negative view of students was attributed to younger pre-service teachers and/or those intending to teach at the secondary level (Decker & Rimm-Kaufman, 2007). Differences in attribution between teachers of lower and upper grades are consistent with the findings of other research (Hargreaves, 2000; Munthe, 2001).

Witty (1947) identified 12 traits of successful teachers, finding most to be referenced within the FFM domains of Agreeableness and Extraversion. The data, gathered through the letters of 4,000 school-age students, identified the following preferred characteristics in rank order: 1) cooperative, democratic attitude, 2) kindliness and consideration for the individual, 3) patience, 4) wide interests, 5) personal appearance and pleasing manner, 6) fairness and impartiality, 7) sense of humor, 8) good disposition and consistent behavior, 9) interest in pupils' problems, 10) flexibility, 11)

use of recognition and praise, and 12) unusual proficiency in teaching a particular subject.

Using Cattell's *Sixteen Personality Factor Inventory* (16PF, a lexical approach and precursor to the FFM), Heddendorf (1971) created two personality profiles: one listing characteristics of successful teachers, the other listing characteristics of a professional. Personality traits (as opposed to intellectual characteristics or vocational aspirations) of successful teachers were found to lie within the FFM domains of Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion. Specifically, successful teachers tended to: (1) be practical and conventional; (2) be dependent on a group, less intelligent, easily upset, and trusting; (3) be a frequent churchgoer; (4) be married and have a high grade-point average in school; (5) have found many of his/her past teachers likeable; (6) demonstrate uncertainty in making decisions and believe that only certain persons can handle discussion methods; and (7) believe that programmed learning and teaching machines can be used only in limited situations. Successful professionals tended to: (1) be heedless and happy-go-lucky; (2) be assertive and independent, more intelligent, and liberal in their attitudes; (3) attend church infrequently; (4) be single and desire to teach in college; (5) have a father who reached a high educational level; (6) be reluctant to specialize in education and to consider the strike an acceptable practice for settling problems.

Rushton, Morgan, and Richard (2007) administered the MBTI and the Beiderman−Sensation Seeking Scale (BSSS), a measure of sensory stimulation preferences, to 58 members of the Florida League of Teachers (FLoT), an organization of teachers considered excellent in their field. These data were compared to MBTI data from

a national sample (n = 804) and a Florida elementary teacher sample (n = 189). The results of the analysis of the BSSS data indicated that none of the FLoT participants were high risk-takers (the majority were moderate risk-takers), but none of the results in this area were statistically significant. Significant differences were discovered when comparing the FLoT participants to both the national and Florida samples on the MBTI, with E, N, and P types being strongly preferred in the FLoT sample ($p < .001$). In addition, the types ENFP ($p < .001$) and ENTP ($p < .05$) appeared more often among the FLoT group than in the national sample. The personality types found more often among the FLoT group of successful teachers fall into the FFM domains of Extraversion, Openness, and Conscientiousness (Rushton, Morgan, & Richard, 2007).

Accepting efficacy as an indicator of success, Roberts, Harlin, and Briers (2007) studied the relationship between personality type and the teaching efficacy of 41 mentors. Results of the study, gleaned through the MBTI and the *Teacher's Sense of Efficacy* instrument, indicated that these cooperating teachers exhibited "quite a bit" of overall efficacy (M = 7.22, SD = .74), and also "quite a bit" of efficacy in student engagement (M = 6.76, SD = .90), instructional strategies (M = 7.38, SD = .79), and classroom management (M = 7.52, SD = .79). The results of the MBTI showed that the study participants were equally divided between preferences for Extraversion and Introversion, mostly preferred Sensing to Intuition, were equally divided between preferences for Thinking and Feeling, and demonstrated a preference for Judging rather than Perceiving. The most prevalent type was ISTJ, followed by ESTJ, ENFJ, and ESFJ. Extraversion was positively related to overall teaching efficacy (r = .58), and to all three subscales (student engagement (r = .49), instructional strategies (r = .52), and classroom

management (r = .54)). Judging was positively related to efficacy in classroom management (r = .39) and Sensing was negatively related to efficacy in student engagement (r = -.33).

In a study of personality and music teaching success (Krueger, 1976), the researcher, using a sample of 209 elementary and secondary music teachers from 16 states, administered the 16PF and the *Motivational Attitudes Test* to study relationships between personality and motivation and music teaching success. Results indicated that the sample of music teachers was heterogeneous with respect to personality. The research did not identify personality characteristics that occurred more or less often with successful teachers, but did conclude that "personality and motivational variables are related to music teaching success in fairly powerful ways," with successful music teachers tending to be "intelligent, less interested in social approval, assertive, interested in their homes and in the opposite sex, enjoy sensual indulgences of all kinds, and are somewhat defensive and pugnacious" (Krueger, 1976, p. 23). The personality findings from this study relate to the Big Five personality domains of Conscientiousness and Openness.

In summary, a single successful teacher personality profile or set of personality traits has not emerged from the research. This may be due, in part, to differences in the various inventories used to measure personality, or because successful teachers may exhibit many personality characteristics. Research has indicated that personality and motivation are positively related to music teaching success (Krueger, 1976) and that a range of personality traits can be observed in successful teachers (Heddendorf, 1971; Witty, 1947). Studies of teacher personality also indicate that pre-service teachers are, as

a whole, different compared to norms, that certain personality characteristics relate to classroom behaviors and/or beliefs (Decker & Rimm-Kaufman, 2007), and that successful teachers exhibit different personality traits compared to other samples of teachers (Rushton, Morgan, & Richard, 2007).

Personality Characteristics of Music Teachers

Research into how the personalities of subgroups of musicians compare to one another are inconclusive (Kemp, 1982; Krueger, 1976; Steele &Young, 2008; Wubbenhorst, 1994). In a groundbreaking series of studies, Anthony Kemp compared the personality traits of subgroups of musicians to one another and to the general population (Kemp, 1981a; 1981b; 1981c; 1982a; 1982b). Employing Cattell's *Sixteen Personality Factor* (16PF) and *High School Personality Questionnaire* inventories, he determined that a group of primary stable characteristics—introversion, pathemia, and intelligence—can be found across all age groups of musicians. Gibbons (1990) also found introversion to be a common trait, in contrast to studies conducted by Cooley (1961) and Lanning (1990). Despite this lack of consensus in the research community on introversion, Kemp's studies (ultimately published as a book, Kemp, 1996) provided a convincing amount of data supporting the theory of personality differences between musicians and the general population. A further analysis of the data supported a comprehensive model of personality for all musicians, but with variation in the polarity of different facets of personality occurring between musical fields. Specifically, it was determined that the second order factors of introversion, independence, subjectivity, and moral upbringing separated the groups, with music educators falling closest to the normal

population, composers farthest away, and performing musicians situated between the two (Kemp, 1982).

Several studies of personality have gleaned results contrary to those found by Kemp. Using the MBTI and the *Bem Sex-Role Inventory* (BSRI), Wubbenhorst (1994) found no significant differences between music educators and performers, with the MBTI type ENFP type emerging as the modal type, and the ENFJ emerging as the "proto-typical" type. The only statistically significant differences that emerged in this study were found in the analysis to determine whether a relationship existed between musicians' personality type and psychological androgyny. Among the educators, there was a significant relationship between intuition and androgyny ($p < .05$). The propensity found for androgyny among musicians was in keeping with the finding of Kemp (1982). Similarly, Steele and Young (2008) also reported no significant differences when comparing personality traits of music education and music therapy majors. Employing the MBTI, the ENFP type emerged as most common for both groups. And, as previously noted, while not associating particular personality traits with success in teaching music, Krueger (1976) did specify that music teachers, considered as a group, demonstrate a heterogeneous collection of personality traits. He also indicated that gender and music teaching specialty "appear to be of sufficient importance that partitioning the sample of music educators and music student teachers into teacher type, sex, or major subgroups appears warranted" (1976, p. 4).

In summary, studies of the personality traits of music teachers have produced mixed results. Some report differences between those music educators as compared to those of other musical professions (Kemp, 1982) while other researchers (Steele &

Young, 2008; Wubbenhorst, 1994) report no differences. Further, the finding that music teachers display heterogeneous personality traits (Krueger, 1976) could help to explain Kemp's (1982) findings that music teachers are different than those in other musical professions.

Mentoring Roles

Two important surveys of the recent literature on mentoring in different contexts served to inform the present study (Butler & Cuenca, 2012; Eby et al., 2013). Inclusion of the key content areas of mentoring relationships—labeled in this study "career support," "emotional support," "socialization," and "relationship quality"—demonstrates the agreement within the literature on the content of mentoring, although naming conventions have not been achieved.

Research on mentoring in the field of industrial/organizational psychology can be categorized into three distinct areas: youth, academic, and workplace. Within these areas the mentoring content falls into three categories: instrumental support (aiding in achieving goals), psychosocial support (leading to increased protégé efficacy and related to personal and emotional growth), and relationship quality (evaluating feelings about the mentor or the relationship as a whole). The bulk of research in this field has been conducted from the viewpoint of the protégé, with very little representing the perspective of the mentor (Eby et al., 2013). In contrast, research on mentoring content within the field of education focuses mentors in the roles of "instructional coach," "emotional support system," and/or "socializing agent" (Butler & Cuenca, 2012).

In a massive meta-analysis of mentoring research (Eby et al., 2013), a team of scholars attempted to provide a meta-analytic interdisciplinary summary of the

"antecedents, correlates, and consequences," from protégé perceptions, of instrumental support, psychosocial support, and relationship quality. Studies conducted from 1985 to 2010 were surveyed and 43,380 articles, dissertations, and reports were initially considered. The inclusion criteria required that the studies: (1) be written in English; (2) provide data using a statistic that could be converted to a product-moment correlation coefficient (or could be obtained by contacting the study authors); (3) involve youth, academic, and/or workplace mentoring; and (4) include perceptions of mentoring from the protégé's perspective. One hundred sixty-five studies met the criteria, including eight studies using multiple samples, providing a total of 173 independent samples for the meta-analysis (Eby et al., 2013).

Many variables were considered in the review process. Potential antecedents included demographics, "human capital," and "relationship attributes." Demographics were limited to the race and gender of the mentor and protégé. Human capital was defined as the result of investment of time, energy, and/or money, such as years of education, amount or breadth of training and experience, grade or level achieved, or "hierarchical position." Relationship attributes included "deep-level similarity" (overall similarity and similarity in attitudes, beliefs, values, or personality), "surface-level similarity" (race or gender), "experiential similarity," and "relationship formality" (assigned versus informal mentoring relationship) (Eby et al., 2013).

Potential correlates included behaviors related to instrumental support, psychosocial support, or relationship quality, but could not be definitively placed in the antecedent or consequent categories. These included frequency with which the dyad interacted, length of the relationship, performance of the protégé (situated as a correlate

because it could be understood as an antecedent and/or a consequence), motivation, and social capital (family/peer/supervisor support, for example) (Eby et al., 2013).

Consequences included attitudinal, behavioral, career-related, and health-related outcomes. Positive attitudinal outcomes involved "situational satisfaction" and "sense of affiliation." Behavioral outcomes referred to a better capacity to learn or socialization as a result of perceived positive motivational, socio-emotional, and/or cognitive resources. Career-related outcomes included those that could be quantifiably measured, including compensation, perceived career success, and career prospects. Health-related outcomes referred to strain and self-efficacy (Eby et al., 2013). Results of the meta-analysis related to this study follow.

Consideration of potential antecedents found that as protégé perceptions of similarity in attitudes, values, beliefs, and personality increase, so too do their perceptions of instrumental support (ρ=.38), psychosocial support (ρ=.56), and relationship quality (ρ=.59), indicating moderate to large effect sizes. Examination of potential correlates revealed that interaction frequency is most strongly associated with psychosocial support (ρ=.25), and social capital is most strongly related to instrumental support (ρ=.35) and relationship quality (ρ=.54). Exploration of potential consequences confirmed that stronger "situational satisfaction" is positively related to instrumental support (ρ=.36) and relationship quality (ρ=.38), while perceptions of psychosocial support are most highly related to sense of affiliation (ρ=.41), all measures indicating moderate effect sizes. Most relevant to the present study is the statement confirming that the "more psychologically substantive variable of deep-level similarity demonstrates some of the strongest effects with all three aspects of mentoring" (Eby et al., 2013, p.466). Given that the examined

mentoring from the perspective of protégés, it is reasonable to suspect that personality may also affect the mentoring style delivered in the relationships.

In the field of teacher education, the meta-analysis conducted by Butler and Cuenca (2012) provided three major conceptions of mentor teachers based on empirical research: "instructional coach," "emotional support system," and "socializing agent" (p. 297). Such roles are often developed on the basis of the mentors' experiences as students and student teachers, or school circumstances and the mentors' own teaching dispositions. Also, the relationship between cooperating teacher and student teacher progresses as a result of varied expectations of the experience.

The mentor as instructional coach involves helping student teachers develop teaching skills. The mentoring time is spent providing advice related to teaching, content, and organization. The results of this type of relationship, according to research findings, are longer-term retention of teaching strategies and the ability to incorporate new teaching styles into classroom methodology. This kind of mentoring is often considered to be the primary responsibility of the cooperating teacher, and providing feedback is considered their primary role. Mentors who assume the role of instructional coach do not typically seek to have the student teacher imitate their own teaching, but rather try to build upon the student teacher's strengths and improve areas of weakness. Coaches tend to use reflection as the primary form of teacher development (Butler & Cuenca, 2012).

The mentor as emotional support system does not focus on evaluation but on being helpful as student teachers adjust to their new role. These mentors focus on developing trust, collaborating, and maintaining consistent communication. Providing

emotional support has been shown to develop the trust needed to positively condition student teachers to learn to teach. Research is conflicted regarding whether mentors believe their role is that of a support system, with some studies finding the role to be secondary (Kwan & Lopez-Real, 2005), and some finding the role of mentor as advisor (related to emotional support) appearing most often (Jones, 2001). It is important to note that student teachers report a preference for emotional support (Butler & Cuenca, 2012).

By definition, the mentor as socializing agent refers to the cooperating teachers' influence on the perspectives and practices of the student teacher, as well as all the non-instructional responsibilities of teaching. While socialization can produce mixed effects, it can often reify the student teacher's views of teaching held prior to entering a teacher education program. The disconnect between theory and practice that is common in teacher education programs may lead pre-service teachers to assume their cooperating teachers' teaching styles/methodologies, especially if the cooperating teacher is in opposition to what is taught in the university. This means that much can be undone in the student teaching experience. When cooperating teachers see themselves as socializing agents, negative reification and/or indoctrination may occur (Butler & Cuenca, 2012).

Many other studies related to mentoring in the disciplines of industrial/organizational psychology (Haggard, Dougherty, Turban, & Wilbanks, 2011; Kahle-Piasecki, 2011; Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese, 2006) and teacher education (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Castillo, 1970; Cohen, 1993; Cooper, 1995; Copas, 1984; Clifford & Green, 1996; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008; Hoffman, Funk, Long, & Keithley, 1982; Russell & Russell, 2011; Schwille, 2008; Swisher, 2011) are not reviewed in the Eby et al. (2013) and Butler and

Cuenca (2012) studies, but confirm the categories established by them, albeit using different identification terminology. Important to this study is that the six named categories appearing in the cited reviews were used to determine the four content categories researched in the present study: career support (a combination of instrumental approach and instructional coach), emotional support (a combination psychosocial approach and emotional support system), socialization, and relationship quality. The fourth category, relationship quality, refers to an overall view of the relationship.

Characteristics of Successful Student Teaching Placements

A large number of studies have been conducted examining the positive and negative aspects of student teaching experiences (Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Becher & Ade, 1982; Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Burstein, 1992; Cooper, 1995; Draves, 2008; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Grothe, 2013; Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008; Hoffman, Funk, Long, & Keithley, 1982; Johnston, 2010; Kahn, 2001; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Sayeski, Paulsen, & Kim, 2012; Sudzina, Geibelhaus, & Coolican, 1997; Torrez & Krebs, 2012; Wilson, 2006). To provide a grasp of the results of these multiple studies, this section of the literature review is organized according to the four mentoring content areas: career support, emotional support, socialization, and relationship quality.

Studies focusing on career support provided by the cooperating teacher during student teaching have produced mixed findings, but all contribute to a fuller understanding of this mentoring content area. The importance of the cooperating teacher as a role model who demonstrates excellent teaching capability, classroom management skills, and/or deep content knowledge is strongly supported by a number of studies (Beck

& Kosnik, 2002; Becher & Ade, 1982; Burstein, 1992; Cooper, 1995; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Sudzina, Giebelhaus, & Coolican, 1997; Torrez & Krebs, 2012). The positive effect generated by constructive feedback has also been enthusiastically confirmed (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Becher & Ade, 1982; Burstein, 1992; Cooper, 1995; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008; Kahn, 2001; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Sayeski, Paulsen, & Kim, 2012; Torrez & Krebs, 2012), and the problematic effect of negative feedback, especially without explanation, has been particularly pointed out by Johnston (2010). Also pertaining to negativity, Applegate & Lasley (1982) found that student teachers clearly held in low esteem by their cooperating teacher had difficulty teaching, could not give clear, precise directions, and were unable to deal with unexpected events in the classroom. Other studies indicate that problems can develop between the dyad when there is methodological and/or philosophical disagreement (Johnston, 2010; LaBoskey & Richert, 2002). In summary, all of these aspects of mentoring—modeling, feedback, classroom instruction comfort, and methodological/philosophical alignment—relate to career support and have implications for student teaching placement.

Positive student teaching experiences have been identified as those in which the cooperating teacher supports the student teacher emotionally and/or demonstrates sensitivity to the student teacher's concerns (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Burstein, 1992; Grothe, 2013; Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008; Hoffman, Funk, Long, & Keithley, 1982; Johnston, 2012; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Sayeski, Paulsen, & Kim, 2012; Sudzina, Giebelhaus, & Coolican, 1997; Torrez & Krebs, 2012). Problematic in this

research is that what constitutes emotional support varies greatly and is largely dependent on individual perceptions.

Investigations targeting socialization within the student teaching experience have yielded varied conclusions. Applegate and Lasley (1982) found that unsuccessful student teachers lacked interest in interacting with other teachers in the building, were rarely prepared before coming to class, and were not professional when interacting with students. The importance of interaction with other staff/faculty has been reinforced by others (Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Johnston, 2010). Grimmett & Ratzlaff (1986) found that good cooperating teachers provided student teachers with a place for their personal materials, conducted orientations, and thoroughly explained the responsibilities of the student teaching experience. Finally, the importance of regularly scheduled conferences emerged as a theme in many research studies (Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Grothe, 2013; Torrez & Krebs, 2012).

Much of the research conducted regarding the student teaching experience found that many things contribute to what can be considered the relationship quality mentoring content area. A number of studies have cited the importance of collaboration (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Burstein, 1992; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Kahn, 2001; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Sayeski, Paulsen, & Kim, 2012). Also frequently referenced are issues related to power structures in the student teaching experience, with some concluding that a peer relationship and shared power is preferable (Burstein, 1992; Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007), and others indicating a range of preferences, including equal or subservient power structures (Draves, 2008; Sudzina, Giebelhaus, & Coolican, 1997). A preference for

flexibility in allowing student teachers to try new approaches to content or methodology has been confirmed in several investigations (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Becher & Ade, 1982; Kahn, 2001). Finally, a substantial amount of research confirms the importance of "turning the class over" to the student teacher (Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Johnston, 2010; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Torrez & Krebs, 2012).

Given the importance of student teaching and the impact cooperating teachers can have on the success of the experience, the effect of matching student teachers and cooperating teachers, based on selected factors, has attracted research attention for a number of decades. In an early study, Hill (1969), examining the relationship between personality (measured by labeling student and cooperating teachers as "turbulent," "self-controlling,"or "fearful" personality types) and an objective measure of student teacher performance, found no relationship between similarity of personality types and student teacher performance. Similarly, Easterly (1972) found no relationship between congruency and success by studying the relationship between teacher attitudes, age, and sex and an objective measure of student teacher success.

An examination of the interaction of personality (measured by the 16PF) and attitudes (measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory) in the student teaching experience was conducted by Gewinner in 1967. Significant differences, regardless of similarity or dissimilarity of personality, were found in student teacher attitudes across most groups, indicating the influence of the cooperating teacher. However, with one exception (those dyads showing an average amount of similarity), changes in student

teacher attitude did not appear to be associated with similarity or dissimilarity of personality.

In research related to aspects of this study, Kitchel and Torres (2007) found that, among agricultural education students and cooperating teachers, overall similarity was positively related to satisfaction for both student teachers (r = .85) and cooperating teachers (r = .76). However, because significance and effect sizes were not reported, these results cannot be generalized beyond the sample studied. A study conducted by Sprague (1997) established support for the belief that personality similarity may have a positive effect on the student teaching experience. In particular, subjects for the study included 27 students enrolled in a practicum experience just prior to study teaching (level 2) and a group of 17 student teachers (level 3). Both groups were administered the MBTI, and a Pearson product-moment correlation was used to analyze the data on the basis of cooperating-teacher ratings. A significant positive correlation was determined between personality similarity of level 2 students and their cooperating teachers and evaluation scores (r = .25, p = .03). A positive correlation was also determined for the student teaching group, but it did not rise to the level of significance (r = .26, p = .16). It was posited that the lack of significance for the student teaching group was due to the smaller sample size.

Considering the research reviewed in this section, it is evident that a good student teaching experience depends on no one configuration of experiences, mentoring content, or relationship characteristics. To date, the desire for good feedback and/or emotional support in the experience appear, without contradiction, to have garnered the strongest support (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Becher & Ade, 1982; Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Burstein,

1992; Cooper, 1995; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Grothe, 2013; Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008; Hoffman, Funk, Long, & Keithley, 1982; Johnston, 2012; Kahn, 2001; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Kasperbauer & Roberts, 2007; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Sayeski, Paulsen, & Kim, 2012; Sudzina, Giebelhaus, & Coolican, 1997; Torrez & Krebs, 2012). It has also been suggested that similarity in personality between cooperating teacher and student teacher positively correlates to satisfaction with the student teaching experience (Kitchel & Torres, 2007) or positive cooperating teacher evaluations (Sprague, 1997).

Measurement Instruments

The three instruments used in the study, the *Mentoring Functions Scale for the Mentor* (Wilson, 2006), the Allen and Eby Relationship Quality measure (Allen & Eby, 2003), and the 100-item International Personality Inventory Pool NEO PI-R (IPIP NEO PI-R, Goldberg et. al, 2006), are reviewed and presented in this section.

Mentoring Functions Scale

The Mentoring Functions Scale for the Mentor (Wilson, 2006), adapted from Noe's (1988) widely used Mentoring Functions Scale for the Protégé, was used to measure the mentoring content areas of career and emotional support. Noe's scale was designed to be used by protégés in formal mentoring settings to assess the degree to which their mentors engaged in particular behaviors. The original 32-item instrument contained questions gleaned from descriptive and qualitative research on mentoring. The protégés were asked, via five-point Likert-style statements, to indicate the extent to which a particular item described their mentoring relationship (i.e., ranging from "A very slight

extent (1)," to "A very large extent (5)." A neutral response was allowed, which was treated as a missing response in the analyses.

Noe (1988) performed exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the scale as a first attempt to measure mentoring functions. After eliminating the items for which 50% of the sample selected the neutral response, principal factor analysis and subsequent varimax rotation was performed on the remaining 29 items. The author reported using two rules to determine which items defined the rotated factors: (1) an item had to have a factor loading of .30 or higher, and (2) an item had to clearly load onto one of those factors. Cross-loaded items were discarded. This process resulted in 21 items loading clearly onto one of two factors, which Noe termed psychosocial functions (emotional) and career functions. These two factors explained 82% of the variance in the mentoring function items. To determine the stability of the factor loadings for this study, the 21 items that originally defined the rotate factors were analyzed again and were found to be identical to the first.

Noe (1988) then calculated the average of the sum of the items with the highest loadings for the two factors and created scale scores based on the factor analysis results. Good internal consistency reliability estimates were reported for both the career functions scale ($\alpha = .89$) and the psychosocial functions scale ($\alpha = .92$). The intercorrelation between the scales was .49, indicating that the scales are related but distinct.

Wilson (2006) adapted the Noe (1988) scale for use in studying the perceived performance of mentoring functions of National Board-Certified and non-National Board-Certified teachers and their protégés. Subjects for the survey were teachers with at least 3 years of experience who had served as mentors within the two years prior to the

start of the study and their protégés, who were either new teachers or teachers involved in alternative certification program. Noe's scale for the protégé was also adapted to make it more appropriate for a population of teachers.

The adaptation process was identical for each scale and included the following steps: (1) modification of the language to make it appropriate for the intended audience of teachers and from the perspective of either the mentor or the protégé; (2) review by a panel of school administrators for clarity of items and directions, consistency, ease of completion, appropriateness and time required for administration; (3) revisions and second validation review by a panel of university researchers; (4) revision followed by third review, including examination of the adaptations made throughout the process, by a panel of experienced higher education faculty members and experts in mentoring from the fields of business or education; (5) revisions and review by a panel of experts including Noe, author of the original instrument, and Kram (1983, 1985, 1988), who conducted several studies from which Noe drew some of his items; (6) revisions and subsequent review by a panel of mentor-teachers, protégés, and administrators, of an information packet containing test instructions, the mentor and protégé versions of the instrument, and a demographic questionnaire appropriate to the instrument; (7) revisions and a pilot test of the instruments conducted by 10 mentor teachers and their protégés; (8) revisions and review by a panel of university faculty members with expertise in mentoring; (9) revisions and finalization of the instruments. No subsequent analyses were conducted to examine the instruments.

The original demographic questions section from the Mentoring Functions Scale for the Mentor were modified for the present study, with some omitted due to lack of

relevance and others included, such as the specialty area within music for which the cooperating teacher was responsible. Questions related to perception of similarity and satisfaction with the overall experience, were also added, including optional open-ended items intended to aid in the interpretation of the results (See Appendix C).

Allen and Eby Relationship Quality Measure

A five-item measure (Allen & Eby, 2003) was used to investigate relationship quality. In the original study, 10 questions were used to examine the factors of relationship effectiveness for mentors related to learning and quality. For the purpose of the study, only the items related to relationship quality were used.

Because these measures were newly developed, with some items drawn from other studies and some items developed by the researchers, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to evaluate construct validity. CFA was considered to be more appropriate than exploratory factor analysis because the items used in the measure reflected a priori constructs. Using five goodness-of-fit indices – chi-square, the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), root mean square residual (RMSR), the normed-fit index (NFI), and the comparative fit index (CFI) – the two-factor model of relationship quality and relationship learning indicated good data fit (chi square (df, 34) = 193.83, $p < .05$; RMSR = .04; GFI = .91; NFI = .91; CFI = .92). Further, all items significantly loaded onto their respective constructs (t-values > 13.21, mean lambda value = .59).

IPIP NEO PI-R

Over the past 40 years, a consensus has emerged that individual differences in the personality characteristics of adults can be organized into five broad traits: Openness to Experience (Openness), Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and

Neuroticism (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). These five traits, called the Big Five or the Five-Factor Model of personality (FFM), allow for a common language in the study of personality. Many instruments have been created to measure these five factors, but the collection of NEO instruments (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2004) are the most widely used (Boyle, 2008). The inventory used to measure personality for the present study was the 100-item IPIP NEO PI-R (Goldberg et. al, 2006), which is a 100-item measure based on Costa and McCrae's (1992) NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R).

Costa and McCrae's instrument was developed as a result of personality researchers' interest in creating a shared taxonomy and using natural language as a starting place for its development. Called the lexical approach, it began with researchers working through dictionaries and pulling out all words relevant to personality. Allport and Odbert's (1936) work resulted in almost 18,000 terms placed into four categories: personality traits, temporary states or moods, highly evaluative judgments, and physical characteristics. Cattell (1943) used Allport and Odbert's trait category, consisting of 4,500 terms, as a starting point, reducing them to only 35 terms. These 35 terms subsequently became 12 factors, which in turn were a part of his *Sixteen Personality Factors* (16PF) questionnaire. Successive researchers identified five factors, which eventually became known as the "Big Five." Costa and McCrae developed and refined an inventory based on these Big Five traits labeled the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI) (1985), and further revised the inventory to create the NEO PI-R (1992) (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008).

The IPIP NEO PI-R 100-item measure is highly correlated with the Costa and McCrae (1992) instrument (Goldberg, 2006), with domain subscale correlations ranging from .88 to .93 (Goldberg, 1999). It is also reported to have high reliability, with mean internal consistencies of .90 (Goldberg, 1999). Furthermore each of the five domains of the IPIP NEO PI-R have high reported alpha levels: Openness (α = .89), Conscientiousness (α = .90), Extraversion (α = .91), Agreeableness (α = .85), and Neuroticism (α = .91).

Summary

The literature pertinent to this study supports the possibility of a relationship between some personality domains and aspects of mentoring content. It also indicates the possibility that subjects who perceive themselves to be similar to the other member of their dyad may experience more overall satisfaction with the student teaching experience. The literature also provides strong support for use of a personality inventory according to the FFM, rather than the MBTI or other inventories available.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore, within the music student teaching experience, the relationships between personality domains of the cooperating teacher and the mentoring content areas of career support, emotional support, and relationship quality, and to determine whether perception of similarity between cooperating teacher and student teacher contributes to overall satisfaction with the relationship. This chapter presents the research methodology and procedures used to conduct the study.

Design of the Study

The study was designed as a quantitative survey employing computer-based instruments to collect self-reported data on the personality traits of cooperating teachers and the mentoring content they provide. The following questions guided the study:

1. Does a cooperating teachers' personality predict the mentoring content they report providing to their student teacher?
2. Does perception of similarity between both members of the student teacher and cooperating teacher dyad positively correlate with the quality of the student teaching experience?

Subjects

Subjects for the study were solicited from colleges and universities located in NASM Region 7 (i.e., Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, and

Virginia). The music education department chairs and/or the professors responsible for supervising student teachers were solicited, via email, if they would, in turn, solicit presently enrolled student teachers and their mentors to participate (Appendix A). Those who agreed forwarded an invitation to each student teacher and cooperating teacher (Appendix B).

Subjects were assigned a confidential code by the university professor to identify the university and members of the dyad. Of the 68 institutions contacted, 24 responded and eleven agreed to forward the invitation, producing a total of 65 student teachers and 65 cooperating teachers who were invited to participate.

Thirty-two cooperating teachers responded (49.2% return rate), submitting 30 fully completed surveys and 31 surveys with completed demographic information. The process also yielded 21 student teacher responses (32.3% return rate), with 19 fully completed student teacher surveys and 20 surveys with completed demographic information. Subjects were administered a 100-question personality inventory and a questionnaire including demographic and mentoring content questions (Appendix C). One additional participant completed the demographic portion of the questionnaire for both the student teacher and cooperating teacher groups. This allowed for analysis of the data of 31 cooperating teachers and 20 student teachers for the second research question.

Analysis of Instrument and Data

Descriptive statistics were calculated in order to provide a profile of the sample. Using the software program *M-Plus*, the measures were assessed with CFA. Subsequent stepwise regression analyses were conducted with the factor scores attained from the CFA. Because previous research was insufficient to provide a determination of which

predictors to enter into the model before others, stepwise regression was selected for the method of regression analysis rather than a hierarchical or forced entry approach.

The second research question was answered by examining responses two Likert-style items in the demographic portion of the questionnaire: “My student teacher/cooperating teacher is similar to me” and “This has been a good student teaching experience.” In order to examine the relationship between these two variables, the nonparametric gamma statistic was calculated. The gamma statistic is most appropriate when data are ordinal and there is a very high rate of tied observations (Siegel & Castellan, 1988).

Chapter 4

Findings

The purpose of this study was to explore, within the music student teaching experience, the relationships between personality domains of the cooperating teacher and the mentoring content areas of career support, emotional support, and relationship quality. The purpose was also to determine whether perception of similarity between cooperating teacher and student teacher contributes to overall satisfaction with the relationship. The specific research questions which guided the study were:

1. Does a cooperating teachers' personality predict the mentoring content they report providing to their student teacher?
2. Does perception of similarity between cooperating teacher and student teacher positively correlate with the quality of the student teaching experience?

Subjects

Subjects were student teachers from NASM Southeastern-Division colleges and universities and their cooperating teachers.

Sample of Student Teachers

The sample consisted of 21 student teachers (32.3% return rate), 20 of which fully completed the demographic portion of the questionnaire. Detailed demographic information can be found in Table 1. The gender makeup of the sample was roughly evenly split, with 9 females (45%) and 11 males (55%). The sample consisted mainly of

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Characteristics	Cooperating Teacher (n = 31)		Student Teacher (n = 20)	
Gender	*n*	%	*n*	%
Male	16	51.6	11	55
Female	15	48.4	9	45
Race/Ethnicity				
African American/Black	2	6.5	3	15
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	9.7	---	---
Hispanic/Latin American	---	---	---	---
Native American/Indian	---	---	---	---
Caucasian/White	26	83.9	15	75
Other	---	---	2	10
Served as mentor teacher before				
Yes	24	77.4	---	---
No	7	22.6	---	---
Level (teach/desire to teach)				
Elementary	8	25.8	2	10
Middle School	20	66.7	3	15
High School	3	9.7	3	15
Middle/High School	---	---	6	30
Elementary/Middle School	---	---	1	5
Middle School/College	---	---	1	5
High School/College	---	---	1	5
Any	---	---	3	15
Specialty (teach/desire to teach)				
Elementary/General	5	16.1	2	10
Elementary/Chorus	2	6.5	4	20
Choir/Chorus	2	6.5	1	5
Band	20	64.5	10	50
Band/Chorus	---	---	1	5
Band/Orchestra	---	---	1	5
General/Chorus/Orchestra	1	3.2	---	---
Band/Chorus/General Music	1	3.2	---	---
Studio Teaching	---	---	1	5

Caucasian student teachers (*n* = 15, 75%), with three (15%) identifying as African American/Black, and two (10%) choosing "Other." The desire to teach middle/high school represented the mode of the sample (*n* = 6, 30%), and the remainder of the sample had more flexible aspirations for the level at which they hoped to teach (see Table 1). Half of the sample desired to teach band (*n* = 10, 50%), with the remaining half selecting other specialties (see Table 1).

Sample of Cooperating Teachers

This sample consisted of 32 subjects (49.2% return rate), 31 of which fully completed the demographic portion of the questionnaire. Detailed demographic information can be found in Table 1. The gender makeup of the sample was roughly evenly split, with 15 females (48.4%) and 16 males (51.6%). The sample consisted mainly of Caucasian cooperating teachers (*n* = 26, 83.9%), with African American/Black (n =2, 6.5%) and Asian/Pacific Islander (*n* = 3, 9.7%) teachers constituting the rest of the sample. Twenty-four subjects (77.4% of the sample) had served as a cooperating teacher before and 7 (22.6%) had not. The majority of the sample taught at the middle school level (*n* = 20, 64.5%). Eight cooperating teachers taught at the elementary level (25.8%) and 3 taught at the high school level (9.7%). Most of the sample indicated that they taught band (*n* = 20, 64.5%), 5 taught elementary/general (16.1%), 2 taught elementary/chorus (6.5%), 2 taught choir (6.5%), 1 taught general/chorus/orchestra (3.2%), and 1 taught band, chorus, and general music (3.2%).

Assessment of Measures

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to analyze the measure used to answer the first research question, which consisted of the 100-item IPIP personality

inventory (twenty items for each personality domain), the 30-item Mentoring Functions Scale (16 items measuring career support and 14 items measuring emotional support), and the five-item relationship quality questionnaire (Appendix C).

Using all items associated with the personality domains and mentoring functions, the first item of each domain/function served as the anchor item. The loading of the anchor item was fixed to 1 in order to determine the variance of the latent variable (Brown, 2006). If an item demonstrated that the anchor was not good (a low percentage of its variance was explained by the factor and/or if there were too many insignificant loadings of other items) an item with significantly moderate percentages of variance explained by the factor (e.g., 40%, 50%, 60%) was selected to see whether more loadings were significant as a result. This was attempted several times for each factor until the best anchor item was determined ("CFA using MPLUS," 2014). (Items designated with an asterisk in Table 3 indicate anchor items.)

If the model fit was not good with the best anchor item, the following types of items were removed one at a time: items with low percentages of explained variances, starting with the lowest (usually improving the model greatly), and insignificant percentages of explained variances (p-value > .05), starting with the item with the biggest p-value. After each item was removed, the CFA was run again and the results were examined. If the model fit was still bad, another item was removed. In some cases, a previously removed item was added back into the model in order to change the removing order (Gatignon, 2013; Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Modification indices were consulted to determine if the model fit was good. Given that this CFA was within a single factor, modification indices usually suggest

allowing the residuals of one item to correlate with that of another item. Starting with the pair of items with the biggest modification index value, their residuals were correlated and the CFA was run again. This process was repeated until the model fit was good (Gatignon, 2013).

Insignificant loadings were removed until model fit was determined. The final step involved making sure that major model fit criteria were all acceptable to good, and that no items had insignificant loadings or *p*-values of explained variance less than .05 (Gatignon, 2013). Goodness-of-fit Indices can be found in Table 2. All items and the factor loadings for the items in the final model can be found in Table 3.

Table 2
Goodness-of-fit Indices

Model	χ^2	*df*	*p*	CFI	TLI	RSMEA
Openness	12.812	13	.462	1.000	1.002	< .001
Conscientiousness	58.464	54	.315	.993	.991	.052
Extraversion	35.379	34	.403	.998	.997	.037
Agreeableness	65.076	65	.474	1.000	1.000	.006
Neuroticism	20.032	19	.393	.997	.996	.043
Career Support	25.995	27	.519	1.000	1.004	< .001
Emotional Support	46.551	44	.368	.993	.992	.044
Relationship Quality	3.178	3	.365	1.000	.999	.045

Note. CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RSMEA = root-mean-square error of approximation

Table 3
Original Items and CFA Factor Loadings of Items Retained for Analysis

Item #	Item	Factor	Factor Loading
1*	I often feel blue	N	1.000
2	I dislike myself	N	.806
3	I am often down in the dumps	N	
4	I have frequent mood swings	N	
5	I panic easily	N	
6	I am filled with doubts about things	N	1.045
7	I feel threatened easily	N	1.016
8	I get stressed out easily	N	.904
9	I fear for the worst	N	.948
10	I worry about things	N	.813
11	I seldom feel blue	N	.984
12	I feel comfortable with myself	N	
13	I rarely get irritated	N	
14	I am not easily bothered by things	N	
15	I am very pleased with myself	N	
16	I am relaxed most of the time	N	
17	I seldom get mad	N	
18	I am not easily frustrated	N	
19	I remain calm under pressure	N	
20	I rarely lose my composure	N	
21*	I feel comfortable around people	E	1.000
22	I make friends easily	E	.956
23	I am skilled at handling social situations	E	
24	I am the life of the party	E	
25	I know how to captivate people	E	
26	I start conversations	E	1.049
27	I warm up quickly to others	E	1.086
28	I talk to a lot of different people at parties	E	.956
29	I don’t mind being the center of attention	E	
30	I cheer people up	E	
31	I have little to say	E	
32	I keep in the background	E	
33	I would describe my experiences as somewhat dull	E	
34	I don’t like to draw attention to myself	E	
35	I don’t talk a lot	E	
36	I avoid contact with others	E	1.204
37	I am hard to get to know	E	1.059
38	I retreat from others	E	1.109
39	I find it difficult to approach others	E	.974
40	I keep others at a distance	E	1.019
41	I believe in the importance of art	O	
42	I have a vivid imagination	O	

Table 3 Continued

Item #	Item	Factor	Factor Loading
43	I tend to vote for liberal political candidates	O	
44	I carry the conversation to a higher level	O	.798
45*	I enjoy hearing new ideas	O	1.000
46	I enjoy thinking about things	O	.833
47	I can say things beautifully	O	
48	I enjoy wild flights of fancy	O	
49	I get excited by new ideas	O	.763
50	I have a rich vocabulary	O	
51	I am not interested in abstract ideas	O	
52	I do not like art	O	
53	I avoid philosophical conversations	O	
54	I do not enjoy going to art museums	O	
55	I tend to vote for conservative political candidates	O	
56	I do not like poetry	O	
57	I rarely look for a deeper meaning in things	O	.663
58	I believe that too much tax money goes to support artists	O	
59	I am not interested in theoretical discussions	O	.716
60	I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas	O	.983
61*	I have a good word for everyone	A	1.000
62	I believe that others have good intentions	A	.720
63	I respect others	A	.980
64	I accept people as they are	A	.900
65	I make people feel at ease	A	.613
66	I am concerned about others	A	.953
67	I trust what people say	A	
68	I sympathize with others' feelings	A	.741
69	I am easy to satisfy	A	
70	I treat all people equally	A	.992
71	I have a sharp tongue	A	
72	I cut others to pieces	A	.703
73	I suspect hidden motives in others	A	.864
74	I get back at others	A	.672
75	I insult people	A	1.012
76	I believe that I am better than others	A	
77	I contradict others	A	
78	I make demands on others	A	
79	I hold a grudge	A	.867
80	I am out for my own personal gain	A	
81*	I am always prepared	C	1.000
82	I pay attention to details	C	
83	I get chores done right away	C	.896
84	I carry out my plans	C	.964
85	I make plans and stick to them	C	.894

Table 3 Continued

Item #	Item	Factor	Factor Loading
86	I complete tasks successfully	C	1.004
87	I do things according to a plan	C	.796
88	I am exacting in my work	C	
89	I finish what I start	C	.989
90	I follow through with my plans	C	1.043
91	I waste my time	C	1.050
92	I find it difficult to get down to work	C	.803
93	I do just enough work to get by	C	
94	I don't see things through	C	
95	I shirk my duties	C	
96	I mess things up	C	
97	I leave things unfinished	C	1.057
98	I don't put my mind on the task at hand	C	
99	I make a mess of things	C	.730
100	I need a push to get started	C	
101*	The mentoring relationship between my student teacher and I was very effective	RQ	1.000
102	I am satisfied with the mentoring relationship my student teacher and I developed	RQ	1.142
103	I was effectively utilized as a mentor by my student teacher	RQ	.980
104	My student teacher and I enjoyed a high-quality relationship	RQ	1.106
105	Both my student teacher and I benefitted from the mentoring relationship	RQ	1.071
106	I have shared my career history with my student teacher	CS	
107	I have encouraged my student teacher to participate in professional development/growth activities	CS	.977
108	I have suggested specific strategies to my student teacher for achieving career goals	CS	
109	I have shared professional ideas with my student teacher	CS	1.253
110	I have suggested specific strategies to my student teacher for accomplishing teaching objectives	CS	
111	I have given my student teacher feedback regarding performance in his/her present position	CS	.956
112*	I have encouraged my student teacher to try new approaches or methods of teaching and interacting with students at school	ES	1.000
113	I have conveyed feelings of respect for my student teacher as an individual and as a professional	ES	
114	I have asked my student teacher for suggestions concerning problems I have encountered at school	ES	
115	I have modeled my teaching style for my student teacher	ES	
116	I have modeled my attitudes and values regarding education for my student teacher	ES	1.008

Table 3 Continued

Item #	Item	Factor	Factor Loading
117	I have tried to earn the respect and admiration of my student teacher	ES	1.097
118	I have encouraged my student teacher to strive for the same level of expertise upon reaching my similar career position	ES	1.148
119	I have demonstrated good listening skills in our conversations	ES	1.247
120	I have addressed my student teacher's questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence	ES	1.245
121	I have addressed my student teacher's concerns regarding relationships with peers, supervisors, and/or work/family conflicts	ES	.896
122	I have shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to my student teacher's problems or concerns	ES	
123	I have encouraged my student teacher to talk openly about anxiety and fears that cause work distractions	ES	1.039
124	I have conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings my student teacher has discussed with me	ES	
125	I have kept feelings and doubts my student teacher shared with me in strict confidence	ES	
126	I have helped my student teacher with problems that could threaten the possibility of him/her obtaining their desired positions/assignments	CS	
127*	I have helped my student teacher complete projects/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete	CS	1.000
128	I have helped my student teacher meet new colleagues	CS	1.238
129	I have given my student teacher projects that increased written and personal contact with colleagues	CS	.789
130	I have encouraged my student teacher to assume responsibilities that increase personal contact with people in the district who may influence his/her future career development	CS	
131	I have given my student teacher projects or work tasks that prepare him/her for new teaching assignments, professional growth, or administrative positions if desired	CS	1.028
132	I have given my student teacher projects that present opportunities to learn new skills	CS	.879
133	I have provided my student teacher with critical feedback regarding completion of challenging teaching assignments and work performance	CS	1.095
134	I have invited my student teacher to join me for lunch (or another function) at work	ES	
135	I have interacted with my student teacher socially outside of work	ES	

Note. * = Factor anchor item, N = Neuroticism, E = Extraversion, O = Openness, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, CS = Career Support, ES = Emotional Support, RQ = Relationship Quality

Cronbach alphas were calculated to measure the reliability of the subscales within the survey instrument. The internal consistency for each subscale was moderate to high, with alphas ranging from .78 to .92 (see Table 4 for each alpha coefficient).

Table 4
Cronbach Alpha Estimates of Reliability for Each Subscale

Subscale	Number of Items	Cronbach Alpha
Openness	7	.78
Conscientiousness	12	.90
Extraversion	10	.92
Agreeableness	13	.90
Neuroticism	8	.87
Career Support	9	.84
Emotional Support	11	.84
Relationship Quality	5	.89

Results

Research Question 1

The data for the first research question were analyzed using stepwise regression (see Table 5 for Pearson Correlations and Table 6 for Descriptive Statistics). After exploring the data and determining that the regression assumptions were met, a separate stepwise regression for each of the three mentoring content areas was conducted. The stepwise regression analysis model summary for the Career Support variable indicated R = .493, R Square = .243, Adjusted R Square = .216, and Durbin-Watson = 2.167. The stepwise regression analysis model summary for the Emotional Support variable indicated R = .654, R Square = .428, Adjusted R Square = .385, and Durbin-Watson = 1.616. The stepwise regression analysis model summary for the Relationship Quality variable indicated R = .501, R Square = .251, Adjusted R Square = .225, and Durbin-Watson = 2.379.

Table 5
Pearson Correlations

	O	C	E	A	N	CS	ES	RQ
O	1	.475	.176	.340	-.059	.390	.550	.281
C	.475	1	.469	.586	-.425	.493	.573	.501
E	.176	.469	1	.438	-.525	.321	.294	.267
A	.340	.586	.438	1	-.371	.439	.469	.497
N	-.059	-.425	-.525	-.371	1	-.292	-.188	-.202
CS	.390	.493	.321	.439	-.292	1	.689	.667
ES	.550	.573	.294	.469	-.188	.689	1	.511
RQ	.281	.501	.267	.497	-.202	.667	.511	1

Note. O = Openness, C = Conscientiousness, E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, N = Neuroticism, CS = Career Support, ES = Emotional Support, RQ = Relationship Quality

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
Openness	1.99	.773
Conscientiousness	2.00	.809
Extraversion	1.99	.747
Agreeableness	1.97	.794
Neuroticism	2.02	.766
Career Support	2.03	.675
Emotional Support	2.05	.652
Relationship Quality	2.08	.664

The results of the stepwise regressions indicated that Conscientiousness significantly predicted career support, $b = .41$ [.13, .69], $p = .006$ and relationship quality, $b = .41$ [.14, .69], $p = .005$. Conscientiousness also significantly predicted emotional support, $b = .33$ [.05, .60], $p = .022$, as did Openness, $b = .30$ [.02, .59], $p = .039$ (coefficients for each regression model can be found in Tables 7, 8, and 9).

Table 7

Coefficients for the Career Support Stepwise Multiple Regression Model

	Unstandardized Coefficients				
Included Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Conscientiousness	.412	.137	.493	3.0	.006
Excluded Variables			Beta in	t	Sig.
Openness			.201	1.077	.291
Extraversion			.115	.613	.545
Agreeableness			.228	1.129	.269
Neuroticism			-.100	-.545	.590

Table 8

Coefficients for the Emotional Support Stepwise Multiple Regression Model

	Unstandardized Coefficients				
Included Variables	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Conscientiousness	.325	.134	.402	2.433	.022
Openness	.303	.140	.359	2.168	.039
Excluded Variables			Beta in	t	Sig.
Extraversion			.055	.325	.748
Agreeableness			.170	.940	.356
Neuroticism			.005	.031	.976

Table 9

Coefficients for the Relationship Quality Stepwise Multiple Regression Model

	Unstandardized Coefficients				
Included Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Conscientiousness	.412	.134	.501	3.065	.005
Excluded Variables			Beta in	t	Sig.
Openness			.055	.293	.772
Extraversion			.041	.216	.830
Agreeableness			.310	1.575	.127
Neuroticism			.014	.076	.940

Research Question 2

Analysis of the data for the second research question also involved examining the Likert-style responses with respect to agreement/disagreement with two statements in the demographic portion of the questionnaire: "My student teacher/cooperating teacher is similar to me" and "This has been a good student teaching experience." Frequencies for these items for both cooperating teachers and student teachers can be found in Tables 10 and 11. In order to examine the relationship between these two variables, the nonparametric gamma statistic was calculated. The gamma statistic is most appropriate when data are ordinal and there is a very high rate of tied observations (Siegel & Castellan, 1988), as is the case with these data. The results of the analysis of the cooperating teacher data indicated an extremely weak, negative correlation lacking significance between the two variables, $\gamma = -.13$, 95% BCa CI [-.951, .833], $p = .78$. The data from the student teachers were examined in the same manner yielding similar results, $\gamma = -.10$, 95% BCa CI [-1.00, .687], $p = .81$.

Table 10
Frequencies for "My student teacher/cooperating teacher is similar to me"

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Cooperating Teachers	4	21	5	1
Student Teachers	6	10	2	2

Table 11
Frequencies for "This has been a good student teaching experience"

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Cooperating Teachers	25	6	---	---
Student Teachers	15	4	1	---

Summary

This chapter detailed the demographic characteristics of the sample, the results of the assessments of the measures, including CFA, and consistency reliability estimates for the subscales; and the findings. Results indicate that Conscientiousness significantly predicted the mentoring content areas of career support and relationship quality, and Conscientiousness and Openness significantly predicted emotional support. Further, no significant relationship was observed between the perception of similarity and overall satisfaction with the student teaching experience.

Chapter 5

Summary, Discussion, and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between personality traits and the content of mentoring within the context of the music student teaching experience. Further, the purpose was to determine if the perception of similarity to the other member of the dyad was related to the degree to which they believed it was a good student teaching experience. The specific research questions were:

1. Does a cooperating teachers' personality predict the mentoring content they report providing to their student teacher?
2. Does perception of similarity between cooperating teacher and student teacher positively correlate with the quality of the student teaching experience?

Participants included student teachers (n = 20) and cooperating teachers (n = 30) from 11 NASM Southeastern Division colleges and universities. To address the first research question, subjects were administered the 100-item IPIP NEO PI-R (Goldberg, 1999), which measures the five personality traits of Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism; the 30-item *Mentoring Functions Scale* (Wilson, 2006), which measured career support and emotional support; and a five-item measure of relationship quality (Allen & Eby, 2003). To address the second research question, subjects completed a questionnaire about race, level and specialty area, and

additional items assessing the satisfaction of the experience, and the similarity perceived between themselves and their cooperating/student teacher.

The results of the stepwise regression indicated that the personality trait of Conscientiousness significantly predicted the degree to which cooperating teachers reported providing career support and relationship quality. Conscientiousness and Openness was also found to significantly predict the provision of emotional support. However, although the majority of student teachers and cooperating teachers reported that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statements "My student teacher/cooperating teacher is similar to me" and "This has been a good student teaching experience," perception of similarity did not significantly relate to satisfaction with the overall experience.

Discussion

Based on the findings of this study, Conscientiousness appears to be an important and desirable trait in mentors. Openness also appears to be important with respect to Emotional Support. These findings are not entirely unexpected; previous research reports that the traits of Conscientiousness, Openness, and Extraversion are positively correlated with participation in mentorship (Niehoff, 2006). Given that Conscientiousness is associated with goal-oriented behavior, sense of duty, self-discipline, and competence (Costa & McCrae, 1992), it is also not unexpected that those who agree to serve as mentors would possess this trait, and, further, that it would be positively related to the content of mentoring.

Previous research reports that mentors have indicated that they gain new ideas and perspective through their work and that each relationship provides opportunities to learn

(Allen et al., 1997). The personality trait of Openness is displayed though creativity, intellect, and open-mindedness (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Thus, it is reasonable to expect that those who score high in the trait of Openness would be more inclined to enjoy, if not seek out, new ideas and perspectives. Furthermore, given that studies have demonstrated that the personality trait of Openness is positively correlated to participation as a mentor (Niehoff, 2006), it is also reasonable to assume that Openness would be related to aspects of mentoring content.

Individuals displaying high Conscientiousness may appear to be good candidates for mentorship, as they usually display a strong work ethic and sense of responsibility. However, it is interesting to note that a study related Conscientiousness to prosocial (helping) behavior only when coupled with high Agreeableness, Extraversion, and Emotional Stability (low Neuroticism) (King, George, & Hebl, 2005). These findings suggest that Conscientiousness alone may not be sufficient for the interpersonal behavior of helping. This may be especially true for mentors who do not believe it is their role to offer emotional support to their student teacher.

That a significant relationship was not found between perception of similarity and the degree to which the members of the dyad felt they had a good relationship was not anticipated, because past research has found that perception of similarity led to overall satisfaction with the experience (Kitchel & Torres, 2003, 2007; Sprague, 1997). In the current sample, every cooperating teacher, and all but one student teacher, agreed or strongly agreed that the student teaching experience was good. The majority of the subjects also agreed or strongly agreed that they were similar to the other member of the dyad. Kemp (1981a; 1982b; 1996) and Krueger (1976) have indicated that music

education majors and music teachers, as a group, display different personality traits compared to the general population, but within the group share certain characteristics. The fact that significant results were not obtained is perhaps due, in part, to the fact that there was so much agreement among the sample about their personality similarity and the degree to which they believed the experience was good.

While the results of the second research question are not in agreement with past research, the consensus of the majority of the sample was that they had a good experience. After the subjects indicated their level of agreement with "This has been a good experience," they were asked to explain their response. Most answers related to the quality of the cooperating teacher's modeling, the willingness of the cooperating teacher to allow the student teacher to try new techniques, the mutual trust that was developed, and the quality of the program in which they were teaching. The most common cooperating teacher comments related to learning from one another, mutual trust and respect, and the enjoyment of watching the growth of the student teacher.

In open-ended responses following the item "My student/cooperating teacher is similar to me," the subjects were again asked to explain their responses. Both the student teachers and the cooperating teachers most often mentioned similarity of teaching style and/or philosophy. Both groups also identified factors related to personality (e.g., laid-back attitude, strong work ethic). The subjects' open-ended responses following each question appear to relate to aspects of mentoring content measured in this study. Despite the observation that socialization is an aspect of mentoring content (Butler & Cuenca, 2012), none of the subjects in the sample made statements related to this aspect.

Conclusions

While the examination of the measures used in this study offers some justification for their continued use, much more thorough analyses of the instruments are necessary to determine if they are appropriate to use on a broad scale. Creating standardized measures using modern measurement models would improve conciseness and permit generalizations to be drawn beyond the sample. The research necessary to meet this ideal would require much larger samples.

That comments related to socialization were not made by any of the subjects should not be interpreted to mean that this is an unimportant aspect of mentoring in the student teaching context. Such a conclusion should not be reached without further research in which this is explicitly studied. However, for this sample, it appears not to have been an important part of the experience. Researchers interested in studying socialization in student teaching should create a measure of socialization appropriate for this context. Unlike the other three areas of mentoring, a measure of socialization developed for another field cannot be easily adapted to student teaching in music.

The results of the data analysis indicate that the traits of Conscientiousness and Openness relate to aspects of mentoring content. Although these conclusions are limited to the sample, they offer direction for further research in this area. Given the small sample and the measures used, it is suggested that similar research be conducted using larger samples to determine if the results can be replicated. It is also recommended that similar research be conducted with a population beyond music student teaching. Further, as prior research has indicated that the perception of similarity positively affects the

quality of the relationship between mentor and student teacher (Eby et al., 2013), it is recommended that more rigorous measures be developed to examine that issue.

References

Afolabi, O.A. (2011). Personality and gender type as factors in mentor-protégé relationship: A psychologist's insight. *IFE PsychologIA, Supplement* (1/2), 448-469.

Applegate, J. H., & Lasley, T. J. (1982). Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *33*(2), 15–18.

Allport, G.W., & Odbert, H.S. (1936). Trait names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs, 47*(1), i-171.

Allen, T.D., & Eby, L.T. (2003). Relationship effectiveness for mentors: Factors associated with learning and quality. *Journal of Management, 29*(4), 469-486.

Allen, T.D., Poteet, M.L., Russell, J.E.A., & Dobbins, G.H. (1997). A field study of factors related to supervisors' willingness to mentor others. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*(1), 1-22.

Becher, R. M., & Ade, W. E. (1982). The relationship of field placement characteristics and students' potential field performance abilities to clinical experience performance ratings. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *33*(2), 24–30.

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: Student teacher perceptions. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *29*(2), 81–98.

Borko, H., & Mayfield, V. (1995). The roles of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor in learning to teach. *Teaching*, *11*(5), 501–518.

Boyle, G. J. (2008). Critique of the five-factor model of personality. In G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment; Vol.1 Personality theories and models* (pp. 295-312). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brown, T.A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New Yor: The Guilford Press.

Burstein, N. D. (1992). The transitions into teaching and supervision of student teachers: Implications for enhancing student teaching experiences. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *19*(4), 5–18.

Butler, B., & Cuenca, A. (2012). Conceptualizing the roles of mentor teachers during student teaching. *Action in Teacher Education, 34*(4), 296-308.

Cattell, R. B. (1943). The description of personality: Basic traits resolved into clusters. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 38*(4), 476-506.

CFA using MPLUS. (2014). Retrieved April 30, 2014, from http://rt.uits.iu.edu/visualization/analytics/docs/cfa-docs/cfa5.php

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (1993). Shattered images: Understanding expectations and realities of field experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 9*(5/6), 457-471.

Cooper, J. M. (1995). Supervision in teacher education. In L. G. Anderson (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 593–598). Tarrytown, NY: Pergamon.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Draves, T. J. (2008). "Firecrackers" and "duds": Cooperating music teachers' perspectives on their relationships with student teachers. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *18*(1), 6–15. doi:10.1177/1057083708323140

Eby, L. T. D. T., Allen, T. D., Hoffman, B. J., Baranik, L. E., Sauer, J. B., Baldwin, S., … Evans, S. C. (2013). An interdisciplinary meta-analysis of the potential antecedents, correlates, and consequences of protégé perceptions of mentoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, *139*(2), 441–76. doi:10.1037/a0029279

Gatignon, H. (2014). *Statistical analysis of management data.* New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

George, M. P., Kirshnan, S. S., & Mampilly, S. R. (2013). Personality fit between mentor and protégé dyads and its influence on the effectiveness of formal mentoring in a PCMM level 4/5 certified IT company in Channai, India. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business, 10*(3), 27-42.

Gewinner, M. N. (1967). *A study of the results of the interaction of student teachers with their supervising teachers during the student teaching period*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database. (UMI No. 6809413)

Glickman, C., & Bey, T. (1990). Supervision. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 549-566). New York: Macmillan.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of personality traits: Vertical and horizontal aspects. In D.C. Funder, R.D. Parke, C. Tomlinson-Keasey, & K. Widamen (Eds.),

Studying lives through time: Personality and development (pp. 169-188). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Goldberg, L. R. (2001). *International Personality Item Pool*. Retreived from http://ipip.ori.org/newNEO_DomainsTable.htm

Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40***,** 84-96.

Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40***,** 84-96.

Grimmett, P.P. & Ratzlaff, H.C. (1986). Expectations for the cooperating teacher role. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(6), 41-49.

Grothe, K. (2013). *Dynamics of the relationship between student teachers and master teachers within the co-teaching model*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Biola University, La Mirada, CA.

Guyton, E. & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 514-534). New York: Macmillan.

Hall, K. M., Draper, R. J., Smith, K., & Bullough, R. (2008). More than a place to teach: Exploring the perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of mentor teachers. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16*(3), 328-345.

Harlin, J. F., Edwards, M. C., & Briers, G. E. (2002). A comparison of student teachers' perceptions of important elements of the student teaching experience before and after an 11-week field experience. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 43*(3), 72-83.

Heddendorf, R. (1971). Professionalism and personality types among student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *22*(3), 310–313.

Hill, N. J. (1969). *A comparative study of student teaching performance resulting from matching student teacher with supervising teacher*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses Database. (UMI No. 6919031)

Hoffman, J. L., Funk, F. F., Long, B., & Keithley, A. M. (1982). The cooperating teacher as most significant other: A competent Humanist. *Action in Teacher Education, 4*(2), 57–64.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes on covariance structure analysis: Conventional critera versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1-55.

John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114-158). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Johnston, D. H. (2010). "Losing the joy": Student teachers' experiences of problematic relations with host teachers on school placement. *Teacher Development*, *14*(3), 307-320. doi:10.1080/13664530.2010.504012

Kahn, B. (2001). Portrait of success: Cooperating teachers and the student teaching experience. *Action in Teacher Education*, *22*(4), 48–58.

Karmos, A. H., & Jacko, C. M. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(5), 51-55.

Kasperbauer, H.J., & Roberts, T.G. (2007). Changes in student teacher perceptions of the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship throughout the student teaching semester. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 48*(1), 31-41.

Kemp, A. (1981a). The personality structure of the musician I. Identifying a profile of traits for the performer. *Psychology of Music, 9(1),* 3-14.

Kemp, A. (1981b). Personality differences between the players of string, woodwind, brass and keyboard instruments, and singers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 66/67*, 33-38.

Kemp, A. (1981c). The personality structure of the musician II. Identifying a profile of traits for the composer. *Psychology of Music, 9(2),* 3-14.

Kemp, A. (1982a). The personality structure of the musician III. The significance of sex differences. *Psychology of Music, 10*(1), 48-58.

Kemp, A. (1982b). The personality structure of the musician IV. Incorporating group profiles into a comprehensive model. *Psychology of Music, 10(2),* 3-6.

Kemp, A. (1996). *The musical temperament.* New York: Oxford.

Kitchel, T., & Torres, R. (2007). Possible factors in matching student teachers with cooperating teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 48*(3), 13-24.

Koerner, M., Rust, F. O., & Baumgartner, F. (2002). Exploring roles in student teaching placements. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 29*(2), 35-58.

LaBoskey, V. K., & Richert, A. E. (2002). Identifying good student teaching placements: A programmatic perspective. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *29*(2), 7-34.

McAulay, J.D. (1960). How much influence has a co-operating teacher? *Journal of Teacher Education, 11*(1), 79-83.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2004). A contemplated revision of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 587-596.

McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M., & Foxx, S. M. (1996). Field and laboratory experiences. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 171-193). New York: Macmillan.

Morrison, M. A. (2009). *Do mentor and protégé personality interact to predict quality of mentoring?* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Georgia.

Niehoff, B. P. (2006). Personality predictors of participation as a mentor. *Career Development International, 2*(4), 321-333.

Potthoff, D., & Alley, R. (1995). Selecting placement sites for student teachers. *Education Canada, 35*(2), 55-59.

Rushton, S., Morgan, J., & Richard, M. (2007). Teachers' Myers-Briggs personality profiles: Identifying effective teacher personality traits. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *23*(4), 432–441. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.12.011

Ryan, K., Newman, K. K., Mager, G., Applegate, J., Lasley, T., Flora, R., & Johnston, J. (1980). *Biting the apple: Accounts of first year teachers*. New York: Longman.

Sayeski, B. K. L., Paulsen, K. J., & Kim, J. (2012). Student teacher evaluations of cooperating teachers as indices of effective mentoring. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *39*(2), 117-130.

Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J., Jr. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences,* 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sprague, M. M. (1997). Personality Type Matching and Student Teacher Evaluation. *Contemporary Education*, *69*(7), 54-57.

Stegman, S.F. (2007). An exploration of reflective dialogue between student teachers and their cooperating teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 55*(1), 65-82.

Sudzina, M., Giebelhaus, C., & Coolican, M. (1997). Mentor or tormentor: The role of the cooperating teacher in student teacher success or failure. *Action in Teacher Education*, *18*(4), 23–35.

Torrez, C. A. F., & Krebs, M. M. (2012). Expert voices: What cooperating teachers and teacher candidates say about quality student teaching placements and experiences. *Action in Teacher Education*, *34*(5-6), 485-499.

Wilson, A. J. S. (2006). A comparison of the perceived performance of mentoring functions of National Board-Certified and non-National Board-Certified teachers with their protégés. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3248319)

Witty, P. (1947). An analysis of the personality traits of the effective teacher. *Journal of Educational Research*, *40*(9), 662-671.

Young, R. B., & Edwards, M. C. (2006). A comparison of student teachers' perceptions of important elements of the student teaching experience before and after a 12-week field experience. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 47*(3), 45-57.

Zeichner, K. (1996). Designing educative practicum experiences. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, and M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 215-34). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Appendix A: *Invitation to University Professor to Participate*

Greetings! You are being contacted because your school is a member of NASM's Southeastern Division and you are most likely to know about the music student teaching placements on behalf of your institution.

I am conducting a research study (my doctoral dissertation) examining how personality relates to mentoring in student teaching. More specifically, I am seeking to examine if/how the personality traits of the cooperating and student teachers relate to mentoring and effect the student teaching experience as perceived by those two people. It will involve asking subjects to complete a personality inventory and a questionnaire, which will include demographic data along with questions about the student teaching experience.

If you are not the best person to contact about this, please reply and let me know whom I should contact. If you can answer questions about the student teaching arrangements at your school, and you are willing, please reply and let me know:
1. The details of the student teaching placement(s) (how many schools they are placed in, how long at each placement, including dates, and any other pertinent information you deem necessary).
2. When your student teaching experiences begin and end in the spring semester.
3. How many music student teachers you have in the spring semester.
4. If you would be willing to assign numbers I provide to each dyad and forward an email to both the student teachers and their cooperating teachers in a week or two to invite them to participate in this study.

If you indicate that you would be willing to assign a code for each student/cooperating teacher dyad (supplied by the researcher) and forward the invitation email to your student teachers and their cooperating teachers, I will also need to know how many people you sent the invitation to. This is necessary for me to know the rate of return.

While no incentives or rewards will be offered for participation, this study has the potential to offer rich information about student teaching and possibly to aid in considerations of successful matching of student teachers and cooperating teachers. I hope you will seriously consider aiding me in the study of this topic as your participation is necessary in order for me to invite people to participate in this study.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this study. Please do not hesitate to contact me, or my advisor and the Principal Investigator, Dr. Mary Leglar, with any questions or concerns you may have.

Jocelyn Stevens Prendergast, Co-Principal Investigator
Graduate Teaching Assistant, DMA Music Education candidate
University of Georgia
jprend@uga.edu

Mary Leglar, Principal Investigator
Professor and Head of Music Education
University of Georgia
mleglar@uga.edu

Appendix B: *Invitation Email to Forward to Student and Cooperating Teachers*

Greetings! Recently you replied to an email from me with information about your student teaching placements. You indicated that you would be willing to assign a code to each student/cooperating teacher dyad and forward an invitation to participate in my research study to your student teachers and their cooperating teachers. Thank you!

Below is the body of that email. Please take a few moments to enter the names of the student teachers and their cooperating teachers next to each of the codes (found towards the bottom of the email). Thank you for agreeing to help in the data collection of this study!

Body of the email:

Greetings, student/cooperating teachers! This email is an invitation to participate in a research study conducted by Jocelyn Stevens Prendergast, a graduate student at the University of Georgia. Your information was attained by contacting the university professor responsible for making music student teaching placements. The purpose of this study is to examine how personality relates to mentoring in the student teaching experience. If you choose to participate it will entail the following obligation:
1. You will be asked to complete a personality inventory and a questionnaire, which consists of demographic information as well as questions about the student teaching experience. The inventory and questionnaire will not take more than two hours, and will likely take much less time.
2. When completing the survey, be sure to correctly enter the code supplied to you by your university professor.

That's it! You will not receive any rewards or incentives for participation in this study, you are under no obligation to participate, and you will suffer no consequences if you choose not to participate. If you agree to participate in the study, please find your assigned code below which you will need when you complete the online survey:
Student Teacher Name/Cooperating Teacher Name-A1S/A1C
Student Teacher Name/Cooperating Teacher Name-A2S/A2C
Student Teacher Name/Cooperating Teacher Name-A3S/A3C
Student Teacher Name/Cooperating Teacher Name-A4S/A4C

Please click the link below to read the consent information and complete the personality inventory and questionnaire.

https://ugeorgia.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_do58377aPSe2UmN

Please feel free to contact me, Jocelyn Prendergast, the Co-Principal Investigator, with any questions or concerns at jprend@uga.edu, or you may contact my advisor and the Principal Investigator of the study, Mary Leglar, at mleglar@uga.edu.

Jocelyn Stevens Prendergast
Doctoral Candidate and Graduate Teaching Assistant, Music Education
University of Georgia
612.240.1577
jprend@uga.edu

Appendix C: *Survey Instrument*

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled "The Relationship Between Personality Domains and Mentoring Content in the Context of Student Teaching in Music." The purpose of the study is to examine if and how the personality traits of cooperating teachers and student teachers interact and impact mentoring in the student teaching experience. Your participation will involve completing a personality inventory and a questionnaire, which includes demographic questions, as well as questions related to the student teaching experience. Your participation should take no more than one hour, and will probably take much less time. If you decide to stop or withdraw from the study, the information/data collected from or about you up to the point of you withdrawal will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You and your student teacher/cooperating teacher have been assigned a code. It is very important that you accurately enter this code when completing the survey. This is the only way to connect your responses and your student/cooperating teacher's responses. Nobody, including the researchers, will have any way of linking your code directly to you, but the code will be used to confidently match you with your student teacher/cooperating teacher. Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. However, once the materials are received by the researcher, standard confidentiality procedures will be employed. The results of the research study may be published, but your name or any identifying information will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only. The findings from this project may provide information on the student teaching experience in general and ways we can optimize this experience. It may also provide information on how we can better match student teachers and cooperating teachers in order to create the most successful student teaching experience possible. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research and you may choose not to participate with no penalty whatsoever. No incentives or rewards are offered for participation in this study. I consent to participating in this study.

❍ Yes (1)

❍ No (2)

1. Please enter your assigned code: _____

2. I am a:

❍ Cooperating Teacher (1)

❍ Student Teacher (2)

3. Mentoring Questionnaire for the Cooperating Teacher

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
The mentoring relationship between my student teacher and I was very effective. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am satisfied with the mentoring relationship my student teacher and I developed. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I was effectively utilized as a mentor by my student teacher. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My student teacher and I enjoyed a high-quality relationship. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Both my student teacher and I benefitted from the mentoring relationship. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have shared my career history with my student teacher. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have encouraged my student teacher to participate in professional development/growth activities. (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have suggested specific strategies to my student teacher for achieving career goals. (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have shared	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

professional ideas with my student teacher. (9)					
I have suggested specific strategies to my student teacher for accomplishing teaching objectives. (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have given my student teacher feedback regarding performance in his/her present position. (11)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have encouraged my student teacher to try new approaches or methods of teaching and interacting with students at school. (12)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have conveyed feelings of respect for my student teacher as an individual and as a professional. (13)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have asked my student teacher for suggestions concerning problems I have encountered at school. (14)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have modeled my teaching style for my student teacher. (15)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have modeled my attitudes and values regarding education for my student teacher. (16)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have tried to earn the respect and admiration of my	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

student teacher. (17)					
I have encouraged my student teacher to strive for the same level of expertise upon reaching my similar career position. (18)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have demonstrated good listening skills in our conversations. (19)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have addressed my student teacher's questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence. (20)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have addressed my student teacher's concerns regarding relationships with peers, supervisors, and/or work/family conflicts. (21)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to my student teacher's problems or concerns. (22)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have encourages my student teacher to talk openly about anxiety and fears that cause work distractions. (23)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings my student teacher has discussed with me. (24)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have kept feelings and doubts my student	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

teacher shared with me in strict confidence. (25)					
I have helped my student teacher with problems that could threaten the possibility of him/her obtaining their desired positions/assignments. (26)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have helped my student teacher complete projects/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete. (27)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have helped my student teacher meet new colleagues. (28)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have given my student teacher projects that increased written and personal contact with colleagues. (29)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have encouraged my student teacher to assume responsibilities that increase personal contact with people in the district who may influence his/her future career development. (30)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have given my student teacher projects or work tasks that prepare him/her for new teaching assignments,	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

professional growth, or administrative positions if desired. (31)					
I have given my student teacher projects that present opportunities to learn new skills. (32)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have provided my student teacher with critical feedback regarding completion of challenging teaching assignments and work performance. (33)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have invited my student teacher to join me for lunch (or another function) at work. (34)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have interacted with my student teacher socially outside of work. (35)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

4. What specialty area(s) do you teach (band, orchestra, elementary/general, etc.)?

5. What level(s) do you teach (elementary, high school, etc.)?

6. What is your gender?
- ❍ Male (1)
- ❍ Female (2)

7. What is your racial/ethnic background?
- ❍ African American/Black (1)
- ❍ Asian/Pacific Islander (2)
- ❍ Hispanic/Latino (3)
- ❍ Native American/Indian (4)
- ❍ Caucasian/White (5)
- ❍ Other, please specify (6) _____

8. I have served as a cooperating teacher before.
- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

9. This has been a good student teaching experience.
- ❍ Strongly Agree (1)
- ❍ Agree (2)
- ❍ Disagree (3)
- ❍ Strongly Disagree (4)

10. Please explain why you think this was or was not a good student teaching experience.

11. My student teacher is similar to me.
- ❍ Strongly Agree (1)
- ❍ Agree (2)
- ❍ Disagree (3)
- ❍ Strongly Disagree (4)

12. Please explain why you do or do not think your student teacher is similar to you.

3. Mentoring Questionnaire for the Student Teacher

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
The mentoring relationship between my cooperating teacher and I was very effective. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am satisfied with the mentoring relationship my cooperating teacher and I developed. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I effectively utilized my cooperating teacher as a mentor. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher and I enjoyed a high-quality relationship. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Both my cooperating teacher and I benefitted from the mentoring relationship. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has shared his/her career history with me. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has encouraged me to participate in professional development/growth activities. (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has suggested specific strategies for achieving career goals. (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

My cooperating teacher has shared professional ideas with me. (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has suggested specific strategies for accomplishing teaching objectives. (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has given me feedback regarding my performance in my present position. (11)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has encouraged me to try new approaches or methods of teaching and interacting with students. (12)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has conveyed feelings of respect for me as an individual and as a professional. (13)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has asked me for suggestions concerning problems he/she has encountered at school. (14)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has modeled his/her teaching style and encouraged me to imitate the style. (15)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has modeled his/her attitudes and	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

values regarding education. (16)					
My cooperating teacher has earned my respect and admiration. (17)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has encouraged me to strive for high levels of expertise in my current and future career positions. (18)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has demonstrated good listening skills in our conversations. (19)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has addressed my questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence. (20)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has addressed my concerns regarding relationships with peers, supervisors, and/or work/family conflicts. (21)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to my problems or concerns. (22)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has encouraged me to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

from my work. (23)					
My cooperating teacher has conveyed empathy for my concerns and feelings during our discussions. (24)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has kept the feelings and doubts I share with him/her in strict confidence. (25)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has helped me with problems that could threaten my obtaining other desired positions/assignments. (26)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has helped me complete projects/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete. (27)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has helped me meet new colleagues. (28)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has given me projects that increased written and personal contact with colleagues. (29)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has encouraged me to assume responsibilities that increase personal	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

contact with people in the district who may judge my potential for future career development. (30)					
My cooperating teacher has given me projects or work tasks that could prepare me for new teaching assignments, professional growth, or administrative positions if desired. (31)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has given me projects that present opportunities to learn new skills. (32)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has provided me with critical feedback regarding completion of challenging teaching assignments and work performance. (33)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has invited me to join me for lunch (or another function) at work. (34)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My cooperating teacher has interacted with me socially outside of work. (35)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

4. What specialty area(s) do you hope to teach (band, orchestra, elementary, etc.)?

5. What level(s) do you hope to teach (elementary, middle, high school, etc.)?

6. What is your gender?
- ❍ Male (1)
- ❍ Female (2)

7. What is your racial/ethnic background?
- ❍ African American/Black (1)
- ❍ Asian/Pacific Islander (2)
- ❍ Hispanic/Latino (3)
- ❍ Native American/Indian (4)
- ❍ Caucasian/White (5)
- ❍ Other, please specify (6) _____

8. This has been a good student teaching experience.
- ❍ Strongly Agree (1)
- ❍ Agree (2)
- ❍ Disagree (3)
- ❍ Strongly Disagree (4)

9. Please explain why you think this was or was not a good student teaching experience.

10. My cooperating teacher is similar to me.
- ❍ Strongly Agree (1)
- ❍ Agree (2)
- ❍ Disagree (3)
- ❍ Strongly Disagree (4)

11. Please explain why you do or do not think your cooperating teacher is similar to you.

13. For each of the following statements select the degree to which you agree that they are accurate.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
I often feel blue. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I dislike myself. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am often down in the dumps. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have frequent mood swings. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I panic easily. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am filled with doubts about things. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I feel threatened easily. (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I get stressed out easily. (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I fear for the worst. (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I worry about things. (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I seldom feel blue. (11)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I feel comfortable with myself. (12)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I rarely get irritated. (13)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am not easily bothered by	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

things. (14)					
I am very pleased with myself. (15)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am relaxed most of the time. (16)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I seldom get mad. (17)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am not easily frustrated. (18)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I remain calm under pressure. (19)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I rarely lose my composure. (20)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I feel comfortable around people. (21)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I make friends easily. (22)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am skilled in handling social situations. (23)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am the life of the party. (24)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I know how to captivate people. (25)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I start conversations. (26)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I warm up	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

quickly to others. (27)					
I talk to a lot of different people at parties. (28)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I don't mind being the center of attention. (29)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I cheer people up. (30)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have little to say. (31)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I keep in the background. (32)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I would describe my experiences as somewhat dull. (33)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I don't like to draw attention to myself. (34)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I don't talk a lot. (35)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I avoid contact with others. (36)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am hard to get to know. (37)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I retreat from others. (38)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I find it difficult to approach others. (39)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I keep others at a distance.	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

(40)					
I believe in the importance of art. (41)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have a vivid imagination. (42)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I tend to vote for liberal political candidates. (43)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I carry the conversation to a higher level. (44)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I enjoy hearing new ideas. (45)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I enjoy thinking about things. (46)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I can say things beautifully. (47)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I enjoy wild flights of fantasy. (48)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I get excited by new ideas. (49)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have a rich vocabulary. (50)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am not interested in abstract ideas. (51)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I do not like	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

art. (52)					
I avoid philosophical conversations. (53)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I do not enjoy going to art museums. (54)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I tend to vote for conservative political candidates. (55)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I do not like poetry. (56)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I rarely look for a deeper meaning in things. (57)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I believe that too much tax money goes to support artists. (58)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am not interested in theoretical discussions. (59)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas. (60)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have a good word for everyone. (61)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I believe that others have good	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

intentions. (62)					
I respect others. (63)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I accept people as they are. (64)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I make people feel at ease. (65)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am concerned about others. (66)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I trust what people say. (67)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I sympathize with others' feelings. (68)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am easy to satisfy. (69)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I treat all people equally. (70)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have a sharp tongue. (71)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I cut others to pieces. (72)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I suspect hidden motives in others. (73)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I get back at others. (74)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I insult people. (75)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I believe that I am better than others. (76)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

I contradict others. (77)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I make demands on others. (78)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I hold a grudge. (79)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am out for my own personal gain. (80)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am always prepared. (81)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I pay attention to details. (82)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I get chores done right away. (83)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I carry out my plans. (84)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I make plans and stick to them. (85)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I complete tasks successfully. (86)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I do things according to a plan. (87)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am exacting in my work. (88)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I finish what I start. (89)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I follow through with my plans. (90)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I waste my time. (91)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

I find it difficult to get down to work. (92)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I do just enough work to get by. (93)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I don't see things through. (94)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I shirk my duties. (95)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I mess things up. (96)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I leave things unfinished. (97)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I don't put my mind on the task at hand. (98)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I make a mess of things. (99)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I need a push to get started. (100)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

14. Thank you for participating in this study!