

Challenges and Effectiveness of Mentoring in the Teaching-learning Practices of Eastern and Western Hararghe Zones of Eastern Ethiopia

Gemechu Abera Gobena (Associate Professor)
Department of Psychology, College of Education and Behavioural Sciences
Haramaya University, Eastern Ethiopia

The research is financed by self-sponsor by the researcher himself. (Sponsoring information)

Abstract

This research explored challenges and effectiveness of mentoring in the teaching-learning practices. Descriptive survey research design was employed with the sample size (n = 330) through stratified random sampling techniques. The findings show that about 75% of mentors and mentees were cumulatively developed a negative attitudes on mentoring processes whereas only about 25% of them were developed positive attitudes. The reason why they developed the negative attitudes on the mentoring processes were because (i) they did not clearly articulate their career needs; (ii) they did not assume responsibility for their own professional development; (iii) they did not set goals particularly mentees for their continuous professional development; (iv) they did not spend time on the achievement goals; and (v) mentees did not ready to receive constructive feedback. Therefore, it was concluded that mentoring processes was a critical failure indicator in Ethiopian New Teachers' Education systems.

Keywords: Mentoring, Mentee, Mentors, Attitudes, Challenges and Effectiveness

DOI: 10.7176/RHSS/12-7-01

Publication date: April 30th 2022

1. Introduction

Mentoring is very complex. It varies from one situation to another. It is interpreted in different way by different people. It is important that the purpose and intentions of mentoring in a particular context are explicit. Stakeholders particularly mentor and mentee, should debate what mentoring is to be in their particular context in order that a mutual understanding and vision of mentoring can be shared as they embark on their relationship (Adams, 1992). Most teachers remember the first time they stood in front of a class – no longer a learner looking up to the teacher but now a student-teacher trying to live up to a perfect ideal or passionately trying to perform well. As such, a student-teacher can be defined as a college student who is teaching under the supervision of a certified teacher in order to qualify for a degree in education (Farlex, 2008). Thus teaching practice can be described as the time in student teachers' training when they are exposed to school life under the guidance of a supervisor/mentor. Mentoring is a relationship. At the same time, it is a journey mentors and mentees embark on together. Throughout this journey, two or more individuals help each other arrive at a destination called professional excellence. Naturally, the journey can be challenging, with occasional muddy trails and blind spots but with many more panoramic lookouts and high points. Good mentoring is simply the best way to get there (Adams, 1992).

If a mentee is viewed as lacking commitment, it is important for the mentor to try to discern the cause. It may be that the mentee-mentor match is not working well, or it may be that the mentee has discovered that his or her career focus is no longer appealing. Individuals who choose academic careers tend to be highly motivated, so while there may be an occasional case in which there is a real lack of commitment; there is usually another issue underlying the problem and it is the mentor's job to identify it and help resolve it (Landman, 2008). In reference to Koye, Yesewzer, and Yonnas (2015) who conducted a survey on the attitudes of mentees on teaching profession, he found that the majority of mentees believed that they joined the teaching profession because of lack of other options, but not because they love it. This may indicate that they are living in the profession till they get other options and using teaching as a spring board to look for other profession and may not devote to their level best for teaching as a profession in general and mentoring relationships in particular. Therefore, this study was conducted to explore the mentoring challenges and its effectiveness in the teaching practice in the Eastern Ethiopian General Secondary Schools.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Internationally, teaching practice is an issue that has been researched for sometime (Robinson 2001). Recently, Landman (2008); Naude (2007); Rademeyer (2008a); and Van Niekerk (2008) observed that teaching practice in South Africa is in crisis. Although schools are willing to accommodate mentees, poor management, non-existent timetables, lack of staff and non-mentoring all impact negatively on the practice, leaving some students demotivated and disillusioned (Cillié, 2008; Rademeyer, 2008b; and Timm, 2008). Thus, the restructuring of

teaching practice at schools is essential. In support of this findings, Koye, Yesewzer and Yonnas (2015) who conducted a survey in the eastern Ethiopian secondary schools were found that poor school management, lack resources, lack of well qualified staff and non-mentoring all impact negatively on the practice, leaving some mentees demotivated and disillusioned about teaching- learning processes in schools. Several studies on teacher training revealed that the organization of practice teaching for mentees presents both logistical and educational challenges (Du Plessis, 2011; Aldridge, Fraser & Ntuli, 2009). Problems facing practical teaching in Ethiopian general secondary schools in general and the study area in particular were placing of mentees at approved schools, mentoring and supervising them during school visits, building relationships with all stakeholders, assessment, and feedback was inefficient and ineffective. Mentoring programs can bring many benefits to an organization and the mentors and mentees participating, but it does not come without a few challenges.

These challenges are (i) mentors that are not sufficiently motivated to truly share knowledge and experiences with their mentee will be less effective and less engaged. (ii) Unfortunately, mentees cannot always articulate what they want from their mentoring relationship, which was lacked to set goals by communicating the school's objectives, supplying them with the necessary tools, and continuous training. (iii) It is important to remember that mentee's typically look at a potential mentor's title rather than their experience and knowledge. (iv) It is not uncommon for mentees to be guarded, especially when their mentor is a leader in the school. They may be worried about making a good impression or being completely open about how the mentoring relationship is going. This leads to unopened feedback. Furthermore, (v) Setting objectives for mentoring program are important, but it did not be effective without tracking the outcomes of the program and reporting them. Therefore, due to these five potential challenges that the researcher observed for the last seven years mentorship experiences, he tried to conduct this study to investigate the challenges and the effectiveness of mentoring process in school based teaching practice which was necessary to be investigated the mentors' and mentees' views on the most vital concerns of mentoring for effectiveness of the practices.

1.2. Purpose of the study

Specifically, the specific objectives of the study were intended to

- Identify the status of mentoring processes in Secondary Schools of both East and West Hararghe of Oromia Regional State.
- Pinpoint the extent to which mentoring processes have an effective on mentors and mentees in performing the mentoring processes in Secondary School Teaching at both East and West Hararghe.
- Find out the relationship between mentors and mentees towards the mentoring processes?
- Sort out the challenges affecting the mentoring processes in the East and West Hararghe Zone of Oromia Regional State.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1. The relationship among mentees, mentors and college lecturers

The major weakness of supervision practices in traditional teaching practice is segmentation and isolation of the supervision processes. The college gives students theories of teaching based on written literature. When these student teachers go to their host schools for practicum they receive traditional advice from experienced teachers. There is a barrier between teachers, colleges and schools. The initial teacher-training course involves student teachers trying to learn in different sites: colleges and schools with two sets of personnel, a tutor and school mentor. As observed by Furlong and Maynard (1995), this poses problems for a student teacher who perceives a lack of coherence in the learning on two sites.

Practices in schools do not influence theories in colleges and, theories in colleges are not fully welcomed in schools, hence development of college/school conflicts as reported by some students who reported negative teaching practice experiences. Student teachers supervision by college lecturers is based on theories of teaching and learning from various authors, whereas in schools, mentors base their supervision on practical experience. The supervised students seem not to offer any input to the supervision process, but are supposed to conform and accept mentor/headmaster supervision model, and also supposed, silently, to accept comments from college tutors without question, otherwise they risk getting mediocre marks/grades. It is against such background situation that mentorship and a blended supervision model has been developed in most countries.

Blended supervision is an interactive cyclical approach to supervision of student teachers premised upon what Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) espoused as reflective practice, collegiality and collaboration. They regard blended supervision as the major cornerstone of any strategy which is likely to succeed in improving teaching. Berlak and Berlak (1981) rose similar when they observed that, „We have some evidence that teachers learn their craft largely from one another. The starting point for the student teachers is to observe how the mentor and the college tutor teach. Slowly they begin to develop their own experiential and practical theories. Through collaborative teaching, student teachers become insiders planning along experienced teachers and discussing jointly taught lessons afterwards.

Through collaborative teaching, student teachers have legitimate peripheral participation (Carr and Kemmis, 1986). Legitimate peripheral participation is a situation whereby a novice has a legitimate right to be an insider to a complex process and is thus progressively guided to take over more and more responsibility for that performance. It is by reflecting on teaching, thinking about it and trying to express it in words that student teachers begin to transform the behaviour they have copied into concepts and theories which they own for themselves. This reflective process is strengthened if it is systematically supported by an experienced teacher in the form of a mentor.

3. Methods

Descriptive survey research design was employed in carrying out this study because it provides an opportunity for the researcher to predict scores and explains the relationship among variables (Creswell, 2012). In Descriptive survey research designs, the researcher uses the correlation statistical test to describe and measure the degree of relationship between two or more variables or sets of scores. In this design, the researcher does not attempt to control or manipulate the variables as in an experiment; instead, he relates, using the correlation statistic two or more scores for each variables. Data collected through questionnaire and structured observation checklists from the respondents were subjected to both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The target population for this study consisted of in-service mentees and mentors who have been working in different regions of the country but attending their courses during summer in Haramaya University, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia, East Africa.

3.1. Study samples

The samples used consisted of 330 mentees and mentors of 1886 populations- who have been teaching different subjects and were sampled by using stratified random sampling. This is because firstly, there were different subdivisions in the targeted population which are important to be considered, secondly, there were also variations in population sizes of different strata in this case (sex, ages, experiences and field of specializations) of the populations which were not equal in size. To make the interpretation descriptively easier, the researcher used descriptive statistics (percentages, means, and standard deviation) to summarize the characteristics of the samples. Furthermore, inferential statistics (bivariate correlation, Chi-square test and ANOVA) were used to show the degree of strength & relationship, preferences and mean differences among the most likely value of those variables respectively. This result is significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

4. Results and Discussions

This section of the paper mainly dealt with the quantitative and qualitative data analysis of the study by embedding quantitative with the qualitative analysis. The section was going to talk about the characteristics of respondents and the core mentoring challenges and its effectiveness in the teaching practice. Three hundred and forty-five questionnaires were distributed to mentors and mentees who were participated in the study; however, three hundred and thirty mentors and mentees were returned the questionnaire back to the researcher. Therefore the returning rate of the questionnaire was 95.65% which comprised approximately 17.5 0% of the total mentors and mentees in the study; 267 (80.91%) were males and 63 (19.09%) females. The data obtained from respondents were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 16). The mean score (M) was used to see mentoring experiences in general secondary school teaching during their last practicum. Accordingly, if the computed mean score (M) = 1.00-1.50, it has strongly disagree; if M = 1.50-2.50, it has disagree; if M = 2.50-3.50, it has undecided, if M = 3.50-4.50, it has agree, and if M = 4.50-5.00, it has a strongly agree (Bluma, 2012).

Table1. Sex versus age of the respondents' cross-tabulation

Sex of the Respondents	Age of the respondents in years						Total	Percentage (%)
	Below 25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	Above 46		
Male	10	223	20	5	4	5	267	80.91
Female	19	40	3	0	1	0	63	19.09
Total	29	263	23	5	5	5	330	100
Percentage (%)	8.79	79.70	6.97	1.52	1.52	1.52	100	

As the table 1 shows, the majority 267 (80.91%) of the total sampled mentors and mentees were males whereas 63(19.09%) of them were females. From these data one could easily understand that there are gaps between male and female mentors and mentees that need be filled so as to keep equality and equity exist in the teaching-learning processes in Ethiopian General Secondary Schools. Moreover, from the same table it was understood that the majority 263 (79.70%) of the sampled mentors and mentees were aged between 25 to30 years; 29 (8.79%) of them lied below 25 years old; 23 (6.97%) of them lied between 30 to 35 years old; five

(1.52%) of them were lied between 35 to 40 years old; five (1.52%) of them were lied between 40 to 45 years old whereas five (1.52%) of the mere lied above 46 years old. This indicates that most of the mentors and mentees were very young adult so that this also provides opportunities for further professional development if they have been retained properly in schools.

Table2. Mentors and mentees versus their experiences cross-tabulation

Respondents	Experiences of the respondents in years					Total	Percentage (%)
	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	Above 20		
Mentors	69	33	19	4	7	132	40.00
Mentees	176	19	0	0	3	198	60.00
Total	245	52	19	4	10	330	100
Percentages (%)	74.24	15.76	5.76	1.21	3.03	100	

As the Table2 indicates, the majority198 (60.00%) of the total respondents were mentees whereas 132 (40.00%) of them were mentors. These indicates that any conclusion made based on these data collected from these respondents were appropriate. On the other hand, the majority–245 (74.24%) of both mentors and mentees were experienced between 0 to 5 years; 52 (15.76%) of the were experienced between 5 to 10 years; nineteen (5.76%) of them were experienced between 10 to 15 years; ten (3.03%) of them were experienced above 20 years whereas four (1.21%) of them were experienced between 15 to 20 years. From these data one could easily understand that the data collected from these respondents were sufficient enough to make a sound conclusion.

Table3. Teachers’ willingness to serve their schools as mentors

Have you served as mentor?	Frequency	Percent	F _o	F _e	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)_2}{f_e}$
Yes	64	48.48	64	66	4	.06
No	68	51.52	68	66	4	.06
Total	132	100	132	132		$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} = .12$

As the Table3 indicates, the majority, 68 (51.52%) of the total mentors were responded that they were said no to be serving as mentors to their newly deployed mentees at their respected schools whereas 64 (48.48%) of them were responded that they were said yes to be willing to serve as mentors to the newly deployed mentees. However, the computed chi-square tests at $\alpha = .05$ which was 0.12 was much less than the critical values at $\alpha = .05$, $\chi^2(1) = 3.84$. Therefore, it could be concluded that there were no statistically significant preferences among mentors who were willingness to serve as mentors or who were not to serve, $\chi^2(1, n = 132) = .12$, $p > .05$, one tailed. From focused group discussions made with mentors for an hour indicated that mentors had difficulty accepting the mentoring process in their school. According to the participants, as a new approach, mentoring will take time and effort to be effectively applied in the school context. Moreover, it was seen that even though the mentors were capable and willing to work together with their colleagues-mentees, in some cases there were arguments between them, especially from teachers who consider the mselves to be more experienced than their colleague-mentors.

When both the mentor and the mentee were asked to explain what they believe the mentors’ role is, one experienced mentee teacher related the mentor’s role only with scientific and academic knowledge: The mentor must be better than I am professionally; he or she must have more academic knowledge. They must be better prepared than us, the mentees. The obviously noticed misunderstanding of the mentor’s role was seen as a trigger for the mentors of this study, to try to change their behaviour and communication style with their mentees. Through sincere conversations, testing prejudgments, and searching out meanings, the mentors and the mentees as teachers become more critical in understanding their role (Jewell, 2007).

Table4. Mentors' service years in serving as mentors

Years of mentoring services	Frequency	Percent	f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$
1-4 years	52	81.25	52	32	400	12.5
4-8 years	12	18.75	12	32	400	12.5
Total	64	100	64	64		$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} = 25.00$

As the Table4 indicates, the majority, 52 (81.25%) of the mentors were served the schools for 1 to 4 years in mentoring processes whereas only 12 (18.75%) of them were served the schools in mentoring processes for 4 to 8 years. Moreover, the computed chi-square tests at $\alpha = 0.05$ was 25.00 which was exceeded the critical values at $\alpha = 0.05$, $\chi^2(1) = 3.84$. Therefore, it could be concluded that there were statistically significant preferences among mentors who were served as mentors, $\chi^2(1, n = 64) = 25.00$, $p < 0.05$, one tailed. From these analyses one could conclude that most mentors who have been giving mentoring services were less experienced.

Table5. The importance of mentoring processes to the respondents

Respondents	Mentors and Mentees responses about mentoring processes -frequencies				Total	df	χ^2	Sig.	V
	Yes	%	No	%					
Mentors	91	68.94	41	31.06	132	1	13.20	0.00	0.2
Mentees	112	56.57	86	43.43	198				
Total	203	61.52	127	38.48	330				

As the Table5 indicates, the majority, 91 (68.94%) of the total sampled mentors believed that mentoring process is important in teaching-learning processes whereas 41 (31.06%) of them were believed that mentoring process is not so important in teaching-learning processes. Furthermore, 112 (56.57%) of the mentees were believed that mentoring process is important in teaching-learning processes whereas 86 (43.43%) of them were believed that mentoring process is not so important in teaching-learning processes. Generally, 203 (61.52%) of mentors and mentees cumulatively believed that mentoring process is important in teaching-learning processes whereas 127 (38.48%) of them were believed that mentoring process is not so important in teaching-learning processes. Moreover, the computed chi-square tests at $\alpha = 0.05$ was 13.20 which was exceeded the critical values at $\alpha = 0.05$, $\chi^2(1) = 3.84$. Therefore, it could be concluded that there were statistically significant preferences among mentors and mentee on the importance of mentoring processes in teaching learning processes with small effect size, $\chi^2(1, n = 330) = 13.20$, $p < .05$, $V=.2$, one tailed. From these analyses one could conclude that most mentors and mentees have a positive believe in the importance of mentoring processes in teaching-learning processes.

In support of these findings, Jewell (2007) and Hudson (2010) argue that besides the benefits on the personal and professional levels of the teachers as professional educators, the mentoring process positively influences the mentors and mentees relationships and collaborations toward solutions to work-related issues. In addition to correlations with higher educational aspirations, research shows that mentoring is correlated with positive outcomes, including changing attitudes (higher self-esteem, stronger relationships with adults, including teachers and peers), better behavior and higher academic performance. Mentoring can provide powerful connections to decrease these stressors, and improve connections.

Table6: Focus areas of mentors and mentees in mentoring processes

Descriptive Statistics				ANOVA Table Summary							
The focuses of mentoring	Responsibility			Percentages (%)	Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	η^2
	Mentors	Mentees	Total								
Completing their workbooks	11	9	20	6.06	Between groups	1.58	1	1.58	2.17	.142	.01
Teaching my courses	20	37	57	17.28	Within groups	239.62	328	.73			
All aspect of teaching	88	137	225	68.18	Total	241.20	329				
Others	13	15	28	8.48							
Total	132	198	330	100							

As the Table6 indicates, the majority, 88 (66.67%) mentors and 137(69.20%) mentees, altogether, 225 (68.18%) of these respondents together were focused on all aspects of teaching in the mentoring processes; 20 (15.15%) mentors and 37 (18.69%) mentees, altogether, 57 (17.28%) of them were focused on teaching their courses in the mentoring processes; 13(9.85%) mentors and 15(7.58%) mentees, all together 28 (8.48%) of them were focused on others mentoring processes. From open ended questionnaire, it was found that both mentors and mentees mentioned that reflective practices, socialization, developing self-confidence, improving academic competence and realizing the practices that have been practiced in the schools were the other focuses of mentoring processes. On other hand, 11(8.33%) mentors and nine (4.55%) mentees, altogether, 20 (6.06%) of them focused on completing their workbooks.

However, the computed F- tests at $\alpha = .05$, $F(1, 328) = 2.19$ which was much less than the critical values at $\alpha = 0.05$, $F(1, 328) = 3.94$. Therefore, it could be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentors and mentees on the areas where the mentoring process have been focused (all aspects of teaching, teaching in their courses, completing their workbooks and others) with very small effect size, $F(1, 328) = 330) = 2.17$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$, one tailed. In support of these findings, a research conducted in University of South Africa (2013) identified that most of the respondents (80.0%) indicated that the focus of the mentoring they received was mainly on all aspects of teaching.

Table7. Attitudes of mentors and mentees on mentorships

No	Attitudes of mentors and mentees on mentorship	Mentors	%	Mentees	%	Total	Percent ages (%)
1	Positive	35	26.52	48	24.24	83	25.15
2	Negative	97	73.48	150	75.56	247	74.85
Total		132	100	198	100	330	100

As the Table7 indicates, the majority, 97 (73.48%) of the mentors had a negative attitude on mentoring processes whereas only 35 (26.52%) of them had a positive attitudes towards mentorships. Similarly, 150 (75.56%) of the mentees had a negative attitudes towards the mentorship whereas 48 (24.24%) of them had a positive attitudes towards the mentoring processes.. Generally, 247 (74.85%) of mentors and mentees cumulatively responded that they had a negative attitudes towards mentorships only 83 (25.15%) them had a positive attitude. In contradiction to these findings, Musanti (2004), in many in-service professional development mentoring programs, the mentors plays a collaborative role with their mentees. In his study, he finds that mentoring is used as a tool for collaboration between colleagues. Immediately following the second workshop, he noticed that there was more flexibility in the communication between mentors and mentees. Mentoring has benefits specifically for the mentors (Banks, 2010), because in serving as a mentor, many skills were developed, such as collaboration, effective communication, planning, problem solving, and other factors. Researchers promote mentoring as a force for change to diminish isolation and promote teacher collaboration (Semenuk & Worrall, 2000).

Integrating a mentoring and collaborative teacher role in a professional development program requires the construction of a network of interactions instead of the traditional dyadic relationship ascribed to mentoring role (Musanti, 2004). Therefore, building a positive relationship between mentors and mentees is the most important skill for the success of the mentoring process. Effective mentoring depends on the affectivity of the joint work of the mentor and the mentee (Fischer & Andel, 2002). Thus, during the mentoring program, the mentors and mentees worked together on curriculum planning, classroom management, and on assessment procedures. These important positive relationships have not been existing in Ethiopian Teachers' Education Systems. This is the

reason why mentoring effectiveness was very poor in the last seven years in Ethiopian General Secondary Schools' mentoring processes.

Table8. Reason for negative attitude of mentors and mentees towards mentorship

No	The reason for Negative Relationship between Mentors and Mentees	Respondents		Total	Percentages (%)
		Mentors	Mentees		
1	They did not clearly articulate their career needs	3	9	12	3.64
2	They did not assume responsibility for their own PD	22	51	73	22.11
3	They did not set goals	7	8	15	4.55
4	They did not spend time on the achievement goals	7	3	10	3.03
5	They did not ready to receive constructive feedback	11	5	16	4.85
6	Five of them (1, 2 3, 4 and 5)	82	122	204	61.82
Total		132	198	330	100

As it can be seen from Table8, the majority, 82(62.12%) mentors and 122(61.62%) mentees, altogether, 204 (61.82%) of these respondents were developed a negative attitude towards mentorship were because (i) they did not clearly articulate their career needs; (ii) they did not assume responsibility for their own professional development; (iii) they did not set goals particularly mentees for their continuous professional development; (iv) they did not spend time on the achievement goals; and (v) mentees did not ready to receive constructive feedback. However, 22(16.67%) mentors and 51(25.76%) mentees, altogether, 73 (22.11%) of them were developed a negative attitude towards mentorship because they did not assume responsibility for their own professional development; 11(8.33%) mentors and five (2.53%) mentees, altogether, 16(4.85%) of them were developed a negative attitude towards mentorship because mentees did not ready to receive constructive feedback; seven (5.30%) mentors and eight (4.04%)mentees, altogether, 11 (4.55%) of them were developed a negative attitudes towards mentorship because both mentees and mentors did not set goals for their effective mentoring processes; three (2.27%) mentors and nine(4.55%) mentees, altogether, 12 (3.64%) of them were developed a negative attitudes towards mentorship because both mentors and mentees did not clearly articulate their career needs; finally, seven (5.30%) mentors and three(1.52%) mentees developed a negative attitudes because they did not spend time on the achievement goals in their mentoring processes for last seven years.

In contradiction to these findings, Fischer & Andel (2002) argued that any educational reform, in general, does not have to follow the same predetermined linear scheme. In fact, educational transformations are related to the reflective thinking of both mentors and mentees. They ought to develop their own thinking about their own practices with the aim of changing it according to students' needs (Galea, 2012). Thus, Donald Schon's theory of the teacher as a reflective practitioner can formally be established in the mentoring relationship.

Table9. The extent to which mentoring process implemented in schools ($n_i = 330, p, 0.05$)

Descriptive Statistical Analysis				ANOVA Summary Table					
Respondents	N	Mean	SD	SV	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Mentors	132	1.87	1.10	Between Groups	1.21	1	1.21	.87	.35
Mentees	198	1.75	1.23	Within Groups	456.18	328	1.39		
Total	330	1.80	1.18	Total	457.39	329			

As it was indicated in the Table9, the computed mean score ($M_1 = 1.87$, and $M_2 = 1.75$) for both mentors and mentees were respectively revealed that they were low level of implementing mentoring processes in their respected schools. Moreover, the computed standard deviation scores ($SD_1 = 1.10$ and $SD_2 = 1.23$) were respectively indicated that there were a little variability among them in implementing mentoring processes in their respected schools. Moreover, the computed combined mean ($M = 1.80$) of both respondents was indicated that there was low level of implementing of mentoring processes in their respected schools in the system. In addition to this, the combined standard deviation (1.18) was indicated that there was a little variability between them in implementing the mentoring processes. However, the computed F-test at $\alpha = 0.05$, $F(1, 328) = 0.87$ which was much less than the critical value at $\alpha = .05$, $F(1, 328) = 3.94$. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no statistically a significant mean difference between mentors and mentees in the degree to which mentoring processes have been implemented in their respected schools in the systems, $F(1,328) = .87, p > .05$, one tailed.

5. Conclusions

This study has explored significant challenges and effectiveness of mentoring processes in general secondary schools of East and West Hararghe Zones, Oromia Regional State of Eastern Ethiopia. From this study, it was concluded that there were gender gaps between mentors and mentees that need be filled so as to keep equality

and equity exist in the teaching-learning processes in Ethiopian General Secondary Schools. 98.48 % of the respondents had minimum of bachelors of Arts Degree molders either in natural or social sciences which were met the teaching standards of the country. Most mentors who have been giving mentoring services were less experienced as compared to mentees which was naturally against the concept of mentorship so that it needs critical revision for critical implementations. Most mentors were developed a negative attitudes to the mentoring processes in their schools. However, it was found that there were no statistically significant preferences among them in attitudes towards mentorship.

The attitudes of mentors and mentees towards mentorship was cumulatively a negative one which was one of the critical challenges that lead to weak implementation, effectiveness, engagement, cooperativeness, communication, appropriateness, readiness and commitment. This was again one of the critical failure indicator of mentoring processes in Ethiopian New Teachers' Education systems. The major reasons why mentors and mentees developed a negative attitudes towards the mentoring processes were because (i) they did not clearly articulate their career needs; (ii) they did not assume responsibility for their own professional development; (iii) they did not set goals particularly mentees for their continuous professional development; (iv) they did not spend time on the achievement goals; and (v) mentees did not ready to receive constructive feedback. These were the major contributing challenges that directly affect the overall engagement of the respondents in the system.

6. Recommendations

While it is important for the mentor to stay vigilant about his or her actions, this is probably a time when the mentee ought to step up and take action. It may be useful for both stakeholders to talk to each other to get a better picture of the extent of direction they are receiving. When the mentee has a good understanding of the situation and is prepared to discuss it with the mentor, the mentee should do so. Assuming that they have a relationship of trust and uses good communication skills, the mentor will be responsive to mentees concerns. However, there is almost no such communications among the two stakeholders. Therefore, mentors should be wise and knowledgeable enough, but they should not infallible. When they get conflicting advice, they should think about what they want to do with their mentees in the mentoring systems. If a mentee is viewed as lacking commitment, implementation, engagement, effectiveness, cooperativeness, appropriateness, and readiness, it is important for the mentor to try to discern the cause. Individuals who choose academic careers tend to be highly motivated, so while there may be an occasional case in which there is a real lack of commitment, implementation, engagement, effectiveness, cooperativeness, appropriateness, and readiness, there is usually another issue underlying the problem and it is the mentors' job to identify it and help resolve it.

If a mentor is viewed as lacking commitment, implementation, engagement, effectiveness, cooperativeness, appropriateness, and readiness and is missing meetings and discussions, the mentee needs to do something about it. Remembering that individuals who have agreed to be mentors already have a strong commitment, implementation, engagement, effectiveness, cooperativeness, appropriateness, and readiness to the process, the mentee should raise the issue with the mentor. If it is an especially busy time for the mentor, the mentee can ask if the mentor wants to touch base or have meetings by phone for a few weeks. 0% mentees, altogether, 225 (68.18%) of these respondents together were focused on all aspects of teaching in the mentoring processes; 20 (15.15%) mentors and 37 (18.69%) mentees, altogether, 57 (17.28%) of them were focused on teaching their courses in the mentoring processes; 13(9.85%) mentors and 15(7.58%) mentees, all together 28 (8.48%) of them were focused on others mentoring processes. From open ended questionnaire, it was found that both mentors and mentees mentioned that reflective practices, socialization, developing self-confidence, improving academic competence and realizing the practices that have been practiced in the schools were the other focuses of mentoring processes. On other hand, 11(8.33%) mentors and nine (4.55%) mentees, altogether, 20 (6.06%) of them focused on completing their workbooks.

References

- Adams, H. G.(1992). *Mentoring: an essential factor in the doctoral process for minority students*. Notre Dame: ERIC, Publications.
- Aldridge, J., Fraser, B. & Ntuli, S. (2009). Utilizing learning environment assessments to improve teaching practices among in-service teachers undertaking a distance-education programme. *South African Journal of Education* 29(2) p.147.
- Banks, H. K. (2010). A qualitative investigation of mentor experiences in a service learning course. *Educational Horizons*, 89(1), 68-79.
- Berlak, A. and H. Berlak, 1981. *Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change*. London: Methven.
- Carr, W. and Kemmis W. (1986). *Becoming critical*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Cilliê, J. (2008) Cunningham, B. (2007). All the right features: towards an 'architecture' for mentoring trainee teachers in UK further education colleges. *Journal of Education for Training* 33 pp.83-87.
- Cogan, M., (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Boston Hughton: Mifflin.

- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Du Plessis, E.C. (2011). 'A Mixed Method Study about the Experiences of Students and Lecturers of Work-integrated Learning in Teacher Education. *International Journal for e-Learning Security*1(1/2)pp.60-70 <http://www.infonomicsociety.org/IJeLS/Published%20papers.htm>. (Accessed 6 May 2013).
- Farlex, (2008). Free Dictionary <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/practice+teaching>. (Accessed 6 May 2021).
- Fischer, D., & Andel, L. (2002). Mentoring in teacher education - toward innovative school development. 27th annual conference of ATEE. Warsaw. Retrieved from http://www.mint-mentor.net/en/pdf/Papers_fischerAndel.pdf.
- Galea, S. (2012). Reflecting reflective practice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44(3), 245-258.
- Goldhammer, R., (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teacher*. New York: Rinheert and Wiston.
- Hudson, P. (2010). Mentors Report on Their Own Mentoring Practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(7). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n7.3>.
- Jewell, M. (2007). What does mentoring mean to experienced teachers? A phenomenological interview study. *Teacher Educator*, 42, 289-303.
- Koye, K, Yesewzer, T and Yonnas AM. (2015). The Practice of Teachers' Continuous Professional Development (CPD) Programme in Harari Regional State, Ethiopia. *Middle Eastern & African Journal of Educational Research*, Issue 14:48-66.
- Landman, W. (2008) 'Beter skole is ANC se morele plig' Beeld Sake 24. 28.08.2008 p.12.
- Musanti, S. I. (2004). Balancing mentoring and collaboration. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 6(1), 13-23.
- Naudé, C. (2007). Slegte nuus oor onderwys, goeie nuus oor wenkultuur' Beeld Sake 24. 13.11.2007. Pretoria.
- Rademeyer, A. (2008a). Net 46% gr 1's vorder tot gr. 12. Beeld. 13.08.2008: Pretoria.
- Robinson, M. (2001). Teachers as Mentors: A critical view of teacher development in S.A. Schools. *Perspectives in Education* 19(2) pp.99-115.
- Robinson, E. & Mastny, A. (1989). *Linking Schools and Community Services: A Practical Guide*. Center for Community Education: New Brunswick, NJ.
- Semeniuk, A., & Worrall, M. A. (2000). Rereading the dominant narrative of mentoring. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 30(4), 405-428.
- Timm, S. (2008). Steer clear of incompetent mentors, small firm's warned Business Report. 26.06.2008 Johannesburg p.4.
- Van Niekerk, C. (2008). Min leerlinge oorweeg deesdae werk as onnie' Beeld Plus Netads24, 30.07.2008 Pretoria p.8.