Perception of Mentees and Mentors towards Action Research as Reflective Practices for Professional Development: The Case of Eastern Ethiopian Post Graduate Diploma in Secondary School Teaching (PGDT)

Gemechu Abera GOBENA

gemechu46@yahoo.com

Haramaya University

College of Education and Behavioural Sciences

Department of Psychology

Abstract

This study was designed to investigate the Perception of Mentees and Mentors towards Action Research as Reflective Practices for Professional Development in Post Graduate Diploma in Secondary School Teaching (PGDT). The samples used for this study consisted of 82 mentees and 60 mentors taken from three clustered centers (Chiro, Haramaya, and Jigjiga) by using stratified random sampling technique. The researcher used questionnaire which contained three set of questions for each instrument so as to get pertinent information from these samples under the study,and structured observational checklists. To make the interpretation of the findings easier, the researcher wanted to use descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. A descriptive statistical analysis (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviation) was used so as to describe the dispersion or variability and the characteristics of the sample. Furthermore, inferential statistics (one way ANOVA) was employed so as to show the degree of significant mean difference between mentees and mentors with most likely value of those variables under the study. The findings revealed that large number of mentees per class, lack of innovative methodologies, lack of instructional materials and lack of dedication from lecturers were resulted in statistically significance mean differences among them in perceiving action research as reflective practices for professional development, $F(2, 79) = 5.22$, $p < 0.05$, one tailed in case of Haramaya center whereas it was found that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentees, $F(2, 79) = 2.13$ and $F(2, 79) = 1.83$, $p > 0.05$, one tailed in both Jigjiga and Chiro clustered centers respectively. It was found that personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge and modeling were resulted in no statistically significant mean differences among mentors' perceptions on action research as reflective practices for professional development, $F(2, 57) = 0.96$), $F(2, 57) = 2.33$), and $F(2, 57) = 0.78$, $p > 0.05$, one tailed respectively. Hence, mentors ought to provide mentees with necessary supports in personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge, modeling and feedback whenever they have been demanded.

Key Words

CEBS, Haramaya University, Psychology

Background of the Study

In the last decade, the slogans of 'reflective teaching', 'action research', 'research based' and 'inquiry-oriented' teacher education have been embraced by both teacher educators and educational researchers throughout the world. On the one hand, teacher educators who represent a variety of conceptual and ideological orientations to schooling and teacher education, have, under the umbrella of reflective practice, tried to prepare teachers who are more thoughtful and analytic about their work in some fashion. On the contrary, educational researchers, including researchers identified with the research on teacher-thinking movement, have attempted to document and describe the processes of teacher reflection and associated actions, and the relationship between these processes and teacher development (La Boskey, 1990; Russell and Munby, 1991). Other researchers have focused on studying the social and individual conditions which influence the reflections of teachers (Ashcroft and Griffiths, 1989; Erickson and Mackinnon, 1991; Grimmett and Crehan, 1990; Wubbels and Korthagen, 1990; Richert, 1990). Amid all of this activity by teacher educators and researchers, there has been a great deal of confusion about whether reflective practice is a distinct conceptual orientation or not (Feiman-Nemser, 1990; and Valli, 1992) and about whether it is necessarily a good thing that should be promoted (Day, 1993; Zeichner, 1993b).

The purpose of preservice teacher education elsewhere in the world is to prepare student teachers for their mission, namely, becoming effective teachers. Like any other profession, teaching can be characterized by specific knowledge, specific skills and specific modes of behaviour. Preservice education programs differ in their content and methods according to the beliefs, preferences and experiences of the teacher educators who run them. Recently many programs "purport to educate beginning teachers with an inquiry or reflective . . . orientation. The teacher education literature is becoming rich with images, patterns and programs which encourage further study of reflective inquiry" (Wubbels and Korthagen, 1990).

Even though teacher education programs in sub-Saharan African countries have been faced with more challenges, expansive interventions drive the sector in response to both domestic and international pressures and incentives. In particular, as the sector is often aided by Western countries (currently six Western European countries contribute to the major financial source of teacher education in Ethiopia), international financial institutions, and None-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), the pressure to fulfill certain imposed conditions is a major source of challenge. In particular, the facilitation of school experience, which is often referred to as 'supervision', has increasingly become difficult as the number of student teachers keeps on surging (Duke, 2000). These challenges are directly or indirectly affect the quality of the training of teacher education which in turn affects the student teachers who are in the training.

Ethiopia, one of the sub-Saharan countries, has hugely expanded activities in teacher education so that the major challenges have engulfed the sector. For instance, the teacher preparation pedagogy does not resonate with the realities in secondary schools where televised instruction is dominant. Moreover, various institutions have introduced teacher education programs without having adequate preparedness and the knowledge base to implement the practicum and action research (Tessema, 2007).

Interestingly, the reasons that initiated the Teacher Education System Overhaul (TESO) reform are very much similar to the current problems that characterize teacher education. For example, in introducing Teacher Education System Overhaul (TESO), it was to be remembered that Ministry of Education (MoE) (2003) outlined the following causes: (1) the professional competence of teachers is deficient,(2) the content knowledge of teachers is unsatisfactory, (3) the teaching skills and techniques are very basic, (4) teachers do not match up to the standards and expectations of their professions, (5) practicum receives inadequate emphasis and is insufficiently implemented, (6) the quality of courses and methods of teaching are theoretical and teacher centered, (7) there is lack of professionalism, and ethical values in Ethiopia teacher education program.

At present, there is a world-wide movement towards delegating more responsibilities and more decision-making power to teachers. Teachers' autonomy is characterized by phrases such as 'teachers as curriculum planners' Connelly & Clandinin (1990) and 'teachers as researchers' Schuck and Wood (2006); and Elliott, 2007). If indeed teachers are expected to play major roles as curriculum planners in general and action research practitioner in particular, then they need adequate preparation for their career and professional development as well.

Moreover, the first year of training has frequently been found to be difficult and stressful on the behalf of student teachers due to unclear policies and their own personal expectations in all the ten universities here in Ethiopia. There is an extensive literature (Barrett, 2004; Stringer and Dwyer, 2005) that documents the challenges that confront beginning teachers, and draws attention to the 'transition shock' (Cherry, 1999) that novices experience when moving from pre-service teacher education to teaching. It has long been suggested that the difficulties experienced by new teachers are due to a disconnection between teacher preparation and professional practice as a teacher (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Cherry, 1999).

In Ethiopia such criticism led, in the 2000s, to a major shift of resources from universities to schools, with the aim of making Teachers' Education Colleges and Universities more practical and workplace based. In Australia, Van Woerkem (2004) in his major review of teacher education, emphasized the importance of the action research and reflective practices in Teachers' Education Colleges and Universities, suggesting that the action research components should be extended and arguing for 'a high level of practical partnership between the supervising teachers and university lecturers'. Thus, in terms of the international debate around improving Teachers' Education Colleges and Universities, the places of the action research and reflective practices in the teacher preparation process have assumed critical importance.

Statement of the Problem

Many teacher educators do not do any research Henderson (1992) and see it as taking time away from high-quality teaching. Consequently, it is reasonably common for preservice courses to be designed predominantly on the basis of the personal beliefs and experiences of teacher educators, and for research-based activities to be excluded in preservice education. As a result, student teachers are often not introduced to educational research in general and action research as reflective practices in particular.

Although most preservice teachers heard and read about research in their courses in their education, this is less common in our curriculum and in subject area method courses. This helps enhance further students' suspicions about the relevance and validity of theory and action research as reflective practices to the teaching profession. Unfortunately, some teacher educators do not recognize the potential contribution of action research as reflective practices for their own

professional development and for that of their student teachers. Therefore, the researcher wanted to fill the existed gap so that the perceptions of student- teachers (mentees) and mentors would be improved so as to increase the perceptions of these stakeholders towards action research as reflective practices for their professional development.

Research Questions

This research was attempted to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What are the perceptions of mentees' on the performance of action research as reflective practices for their professional development?
2. To what extent do the perceptions of mentors affect the perceptions of mentees on action research as reflective practices?
3. To what extent do the mentees working environments affect the perception of them on action research as reflective practices?
4. To what extent do the lecturers' methods of teaching affect the perceptions of mentees on action research as reflective practices?
5. What would be expected from the stakeholders to settle those problems related to PGDT programs to make it effective?

Objectives

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of student-teachers (mentees) on action research as reflective practices for professional development. Specifically, the study was intended to:

- Find out the perception of student-teachers (mentees) on action research as reflective practices for their professional development.
- Pinpoint the extent at which the perceptions of mentors affect the perceptions of student-teachers (mentees) on action research as reflective practices.
- Identify the extent to which student-teachers (the mentees') working environments directly or indirectly affect their perceptions on action research as reflective practices.
- Assess the degree in which the lecturers' methods of teaching affect the perceptions of mentees on action research as reflective practices.
- Search for the possible alternative solutions in coordination with concerned stakeholders to settle those problems related to PGDT programs to make it effective as program in general and as a profession in particular.

Research Design and Methodology

Descriptive survey research design was employed in carrying out this study. Student teachers' perception on action research and reflective practices was surveyed and the data collected through questionnaire was subjected to quantitative analysis whereas the data collected throough structured observational checklistwas subjected to qualitative analysis. The target population for this study consisted of one public higher institutions particularly Haramaya University (HU)- College of Education and Behavioural Sciences' (CEBS), student- teacher (mentees) and mentors. The primary data were collected through questionnaires from mentors and student teachers (mentees) who have

been trained and supervised under this institution in the academic year-2013/14. Moreover, structured observational checklist was employed to get pertinent information for further evidence in this research.

The samples used for this study consisted of 82 mentees and 60 mentors taken from three clustered centers (Chiro, Haramaya, and Jigjiga) by using stratified random sampling techniques. It was employed to 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 (clustered center, sex, ages, and experiences) of the populations. To make the interpretation of the findings easier, the researchers wanted to use statistical techniques descriptive and inferential statistics. A descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation was used so as to describe dispersion or variability and the characteristics of the sample. Furthermore, inferential statistics (one way ANOVA) was used to show the degree of statistically significant mean difference among and within groups of the most likely value of those variables under study.

Results and Discussion

The overall purpose of this research was to investigate the perceptions of mentees', and mentors' on action research as reflective practices for professional development. To realize this goal, data were collected, organized and presented as follows.

Table 3.1. Summary of sample characteristics by sex and clustered center (n = 82)

No	Clustered Centers	Mentees- Sex					
		Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percentage (%)
1	Chiro	4	12.90	27	87.10	31	37.80
2	Haramaya	4	13.33	26	86.67	30	36.59
3	Jigjiga	3	14.29	18	85.71	21	25.61
Total		11	13.42	71	86.58	82	100.00

From this table one can identify that the majorities (71, 86.58%) of the total sampled mentees were male whereas the rest (11, 13.42%) of them were female student teachers (mentees). This tells us that there was a gap that needs to be filled so as to provide job opportunities, equality and equity of gender balance in teaching profession.

Table 3.1.1. Mentors by sex distributions in the three clustered centers (n = 60)

No	Clustered Centers	Mentors- Sex					
		Female	percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percentage (%)
1	Chiro	1	4.55	21	95.4.5	22	36.67
2	Haramaya	0	0.00	21	100	21	35.00
3	Jigjiga	3	17.65	14	82.35	17	28.33
	Total	4	6.67	56	93.33	60	100

As the table 3.1.1 summarizes that 36.67 % of the respondents were from Chiro cenete; 35.00% of these respondents were from Haramaya centers whereas the rest 28.33% of the total samples were from Jigjiga center. Moreover, it was found that the majorities (56, 93.33%) of the total sampled mentors were males whereas the rest (4, 6.67%) of them were females. This tells us that there was a

gap that needs to be filled so as to provide job opportunities, equality and equity of gender balance in teaching profession.

Table 3.1.2. Mentees age distributions in the three clustered centers

No	Age in Years	Chiro		Haramaya		Jigjiga		Grand	
		Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Total	Percentage (%)
1	< 25	3	22	2	21	2	15	65	79.27
2	25-30	1	5	2	5	1	3	17	20.73
3	30-35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	35-40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	40-45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		4	27	4	27	3	18	82	100.00

As the table 3.1.2 indicates, the majorities (65, 79.29%) of the total sampled mentees were under the age of 25 years whereas the rest (17, 20.73%) of them were between 25-30 years of age. This indicates that most of the mentees under study were very young adults.

Table 3.2. The highest educational qualification achieved by mentors

Qualifications	Chiro Center	Haramaya Center	Jigjig Center	Total	Percentage(%)
	Mentors	Mentors	Mentors		
Grade 12	0	0	1	1	1.67
Certificate	0	0	0	1	1.67
Diploma	0	10	0	10	16.67
Bachelor	12	20	14	46	76.67
MA	0	0	2	2	3.33
Total	12	21	17	60	100.00

The table 3.2 shows us that the majority of the mentors at the three clustered centers were bachelors holders (46, 76.67%), (16, 6.67%) were diploma holders, (2, 3.33%) were a master holders, (1, 1.67%) were certificate holders and the rest (1, 1.67%) of them were grade twelve complete. From this analysis one can understand that there were qualification gaps among mentors.

Table 3.2.1. Mentors responsibilities in supervising PGDT Program in their respective schools

Items	Chiro Center Mentors	Haramaya Center Mentors	Jigjiga Center Mentors	Total	Percentages (%)
Yes	1	3	1	5	8.33
No	21	18	16	55	91.67
Total	22	21	17	60	100.00

The summarized data in the table 3.2.1 shows that the majority (55, 91.67%) of the mentors were denied making themselves ready to accept the primary responsibilities in supporting mentees in the PGDT programs; however, a few of them (5, 8.33%) of them were accepted the primary responsibilities that were expected of them to shoulder the responsibilities.

Table 3.2.2. Mentors major sources of information about PGDT

Sources of Information	Chiro Center Mentors	Haramaya Center Mentors	Jigjiga Centers Mentors	Total	Percentages (%)
MoE	2	2	1	5	8.33
REB	1	0	0	1	1.67
Mentees	3	2	3	8	13.33
HU training	16	17	13	46	76.67
Total	22	21	17	60	100.00

From the summarized data in the table3.2.2, one can identify that the majorities (46, 76.67%) of the mentors got information about PGDT programs from the consultative training given by Haramaya University; (8, 13.33%) of them were got it from PGDT in-service mentees; (5, 8.33%) of them were from Ministry of Education (MoE), and the rest (1, 1.67%) of them were from Regional Education

Bureau (REB). These data emphasized that more awareness creation consultative training were expected from REB and MoE so as to make the program effective and efficient.

Table 3.3a. Mentees' perception towards action research as reflective practices (n = 82)

No	Descriptive Statistics		
	Items	GM	SD
1.	Chiro Cluster Center Mentees' perception on Action Research as Reflective Practices	3.54	1.52
2.	Haramaya Cluster Center-Mentees' Perception on Action as Reflective Practices	3.55	1.39
3.	Jigjiga Cluster Center Mentees' Perception on Action Research as Reflective Practices	3.57	1.51

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

The data summarized in the table 3.3 clearly reveals that the computed ground mean from the respondents of the three clustered centers respectively were 3.54, 3.55 and 3.57. This shows us that almost all of them were slightly agreed on lack of interest, lack of adequate knowledge, extreme dependence on theory, lack seminars and workshop in in-service courses, inadequate teaching skill from university PGDT lecturers and poor status of student-teachers themselves towards action research as reflective practices were drained them in poor motivation and poor perception on action research as reflective practices for professional development. Furthermore, the obtained standard deviations from the three clustered centres 1.52, 1.39 and 1.51 respectively showed us that there were a few variability between mentees from Chiro and Haramaya, and between Haramaya and Jigjiga even though there was no much variability between Chiro and Jigjiga.

Table 3.3b. Mentees' perception towards action research as reflective practices (n = 82)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Chiro Cluster Center Mentees' perception on Action Research as Reflective Practices	Between Groups	33.19	2	16.60	9.22	0.01
		Within Groups	142.20	79	1.80		
		Total	175.37	81			
2	Haramaya Cluster Center-Mentees' Perception on Action as Reflective Practices	Between Groups	16.48	2	8.24	3.01	0.06
		Within Groups	215.67	79	2.73		
		Total	242.15	81			
3	Jigjiga Cluster Center Mentees' Perception on Action Research as Reflective Practices	Between Groups	6.29	2	3.15	1.48	0.60
		Within Groups	168.27	79	2.13		
		Total	174.56	81			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

In addition to the descriptive analysis made under table 3.3a, it was found that the obtained F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 79) = 9.22 in the case of Chiro clustered centre which exceedded the critical region at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 79) = 3.11). Hence, it can be concluded that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentees in lack of interest, lack of adequate knowledge, extreme dependence on theory, lack of seminars and workshop in in-service courses, inadequate teaching skill from university PGDT lecturers and poor status of student-teachers themselves in the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for their further professional development, F (2, 139) = 9.22, $p < 0.05$, one tailed. On the contrary, the computed F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 79) = 3.01 and F (2, 79) = 1.48 in case of Haramaya and Jigjiga clustered centres were less than the critical region at F (2, 79) = 3.11). Hence, it can be concluded that there were no statistically significance mean difference among mentees in terms of those parameters on the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for professional development, F (2,137) = 3.01and F (2, 79) = 1.48, $p > 0.05$, one tailed respectively. In addition, the structured observational checklists during supervision and reflective sessions gave

further evidence that the mentees had poor perception towards action research as reflective practices for their professional development.

Table 3.3.1a. Mentees' perception on lecturers' method of teaching on action research (n= 82)

No	Descriptive Statistics		
	Items	**GM**	**SD**
1	Haramaya Clustered Center Mentees' Influence by PGDT on Action Research as RP	2.59	1.46
2	Jigjiga Clustered Center-Mentees' Influence by PGDT on AR as RP	2.68	1.57
3	Chiro Clustered Center Mentees' Perception on the influence of PGDT Program lecturers'	2.94	1.57

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

As the data given in the table 3.3.1a clearly reveals, the computed ground mean from the respondents of the three clustered centers respectively were 2.59, 2.68 and 2.94. These were shown that almost all of them were undecided on large number of mentees per class, lack of innovative in methodology, lack of instructional materials, and lack of dedication from lecturers did not bring anything different among each of them as far as the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for their further professional development was concerned. Besides, the obtained standard deviations of the three clustered centres respectively were 1.46, 1.57 and 1.57. These showed us that there were no much variability existed in each of the three clustered centres on large number of mentees per class, but there were dispersion among mentees on a few lack of innovative in methodology, lack of instructional materials, and lack of dedication from lecturers.

Table 3.3.1b. Mentees' perception on lecturers' method of teaching on action research (n= 82)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Haramaya Clustered Center Mentees' Influence by PGDT on Action Research as RP	Between Groups	20.86	2	10.43	5.22	0.02
		Within Groups	158.00	79	2.00		
		Total	176.86	81			
2	Jigjiga Clustered Center-Mentees' Influence by PGDT on AR as RP	Between Groups	9.01	2	4.51	2.13	0.44
		Within Groups	294.17	79	2.12		
		Total	167.48	81			
3	Chiro Clustered Center Mentees' Perception on the influence of PGDT Program lecturers'	Between Groups	7.82	2	3.91	1.83	0.51
		Within Groups	169.06	79	2.14		
		Total	176.88	81			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

As it can be understood from table 3.3.1b, the obtained F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 79) = 5.22, in case of Haramaya clustered centre which exceeds the critical region at $\alpha = 0.05$, F(2, 79) = 3.11. Hence, one can conclude that there was statistically a significance mean difference among mentees on large number of mentees per class, lack of innovative in methodologies, lack of instructional materials, and lack of dedication from lecturers in the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for professional development in terms those factors described in the analysis, F (2, 79) = 5.22, $p < 0.05$, one tailed.

On the contrary, the computed F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 79) = 2.13 and F (2, 79) = 1.83 in both Jigjiga and Chiro clustered centers respectively were less than the critical region at F (2, 79) = 3.11. Hence, it can be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentees in terms of those parameters described above in the perception of action research as reflective practices for professional development, F (2, 79) = 2.13 and F (2, 79) = 1.83, $p > 0.05$, one tailed respectively. Moreover, the structured observational checklist showed that almost the same evidence observed except the difference existed on lack of instructional materials and references.

Table 3.3.2a. Mentees' perception on their environment on AR as RP (n = 82)

No	Descriptive Statistics		
	Items	GM	SD
1	Haramaya Clustered Center Mentees' Perception towards their working Environment	2.97	1.45
2	Chiro Clustered Center Mentees' Perception on their working Environment	3.11	1.57
3	Jigjiga Clustered Center Mentees' Perception towards their working Environment	3.26	1.58

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

As the data summarized in the table3.3.2a shows, the computed ground mean from the respondents of the three clustered centers respectively were 2.97, 3.11 and 3.26 were showed that almost all of them were undecided in all the three centres on the negative environmental stimuli, inadequate services that have been delivered by MoE, Zone, Woredas and school communities, school cultures and negative students' behavior and uncooperative mentors. However, the obtained standard deviations of the three clustered centers respectively were 1.45, 1.57 and 1.58. This showed us that there were variations exist between Haramaya and Chiro Clustered centers as well as Haramaya and Jigjiga cluster center even though Chiro and Jigjiga clustered centers were no variation in environmental related factors.

Table 3.3.2b: Mentees' perception on their environment on AR as RP (n = 82)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Haramaya Clustered Center Mentees' Perception towards their working Environment	Between Groups	26.81	2	13.41	6.91	0.00
		Within Groups	153.26	79	1.94		
		Total	170.07	81			
2	Chiro Clustered Center Mentees' Perception on their working Environment	Between Groups	11.48	2	5.74	2.68	0.31
		Within Groups	169.06	79	2.14		
		Total	180.50	141			
3	Jigjiga Clustered Center Mentees' Perception towards their working Environment	Between Groups	0.74	2	0.37	0.21	0.99
		Within Groups	139.83	79	1.77		
		Total	140.57	81			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

In addition to the descriptive analysis made in table 3.2.2a, the computed F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 79) = 6.91 in the case of Haramaya clustered centre which exceeds the critical region at $\alpha = 0.05$, F(2, 79) = 3.11). Therefore, it can be concluded that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentees in the perception of action research as reflective practices for their professional development in terms of those environmental related factors, $F(2, 79) = 6.91$, $p < 0.05$, one tailed. On the other hand, the computed F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 79) = 2.68 and F (2, 79 = 0.21 in both Chiro and Jigjiga clustered centers respectively were less than the critical region at F (2, 79) = 3.11). Therefore, it can be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentees in the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for their professional development in terms of environmental related factors, F (2, 79) = 2.68 and F (2, 79) = 0.21, $p > 0.05$, one tailed respectively . Besides, the structured observational checklist made during supervisions and reflective sessions also reflected that the same result was identified.

Table 3.4a. Factors affecting mentoring practices (n = 60)

No	Descriptive Statistics		
	Items	GM	SD
1	Haramaya Clustered Center- Factors Affecting Mentoring Practices	3.54	1.43
2	Chiro Clustered Center- Factors Affecting Mentoring Practices	3.68	1.35
3	Jigjiga Clustered Center –Factors Affecting Mentoring Practices	3.97	1.37

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

As it can be seen from the table 3.4a, the grand mean values (3.54, 3.68 and 3.97) showed us that all the mentees in these three clustered centers were agreed on those factors that can affect the mentoring practices. This in turn could affect the perceptions of these mentees on the action research as reflective practices for professional development. Even though there were almost a few variability (1.43, 1.35 and 1.37) among these clustered centers mentees on these five factors (personal attributes, system requirements, feedback, modeling and pedagogical knowledge), all of them agreed on these factors.

Table 3.4b. Factors affecting mentoring practices (n = 60)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Haramaya Clustered Center- Factors Affecting Mentoring Practices	Between Groups	1.82	2	0.96	0.96	0.93
		Within Groups	57.00	57	1.00		
		Total	58.82	59			
2	Chiro Clustered Center- Factors Affecting Mentoring Practices	Between Groups	6.98	2	3.49	2.33	0.37
		Within Groups	85.50	57	1.5		
		Total	92.48	59			
3	Jigjiga Clustered Center –Factors Affecting Mentoring Practices	Between Groups	0.99	2	0.5	0.78	0.97
		Within Groups	36.48	57	0.64		
		Total	37.47	59			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

As it can be understood from the table 3.4b, the computed F ratio at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 0.96), F (2, 57) = 2.33) and F (2, 57) = 0.78) respectively were less than the critical region at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 3.16). Therefore, it can be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentee in the perception of action research as reflective practices for professional development in terms of those factors (personal attributes, system requirements, feedback, modeling and pedagogical knowledge) as described in the analysis, F (2, 57) = 0.96), F (2, 57) = 2.33), and F (2, 57) = 0.78, p > 0.05, one tailed respectively. Moreover, the structured observational checklists during supervision and reflection sessions reflected that the same issues were observed even though the magnitude of variability among each center is different.

Table3.4.1a. "Personal attributes" on mentoring practices in action research (n = 60)

No	Descriptive Statistics		
	Items	GM	SD
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center -Personal attitudes towards mentoring practices	3.55	1.47
2	Haramaya Clustered Center -Personal attitudes towards mentoring practices	3.81	1.15
3	Chiro Clustered Center- Personal Attitudes towards mentoring practices	4.08	1.22

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

As the data summarized in the table 3.4.1a shows, the obtained grand mean (3.55, 3.81 and 4.08) of the respondents at the three centers respectively were agreed on personal attitudes such as listening attentively, comforting in talking, supporting, assisting in reflecting and instilling confidence

towards mentoring practices that could directly affect the perceptions of mentees on action research as reflective practices for their professional development. However, the computed standard deviations (1.47, 1.15 and 1.22) evidenced that there were inconsistencies among mentees on personal attributes mentioned above.

Table3.4.1b: "Personal attributes" on mentoring practices in action research (n = 60)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center -Personal attitudes towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	18.53	2	9.27	6.48	0.05
		Within Groups	81.51	57	1.43		
		Total	100.04	59			
2	Jigjiga Clustered Center -Personal attitudes towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	5.34	2	2.67	1.25	0.46
		Within Groups	121.98	57	2.14		
		Total	127.32	59			
3	Chiro Clustered Center- Personal Attitudes towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	9.67	2	2.42	1.66	0.16
		Within Groups	83.22	57	1.46		
		Total	92.89	59			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

As it was seen from table 3.41b, the computed F ratio at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 6.48) in case of Jigjiga center exceeds the critical region at α = 0.05, F(2, 57) = 3.16). Therefore, it could be concluded that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentors in personal attitudes in the perception of action research as reflective practices for their professional development in terms of personal attributes, system requirements, feedback, modeling and pedagogical knowledge, F(2, 57) = 6.48, $p < 0.05$, one tailed. On the other hand, the computed F ratio at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 1.25 and F (2, 57) = 1.66 in the case of Haramaya and Chiro clustered centers respectively were less than the critical region at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 3.16). Hence, it was found that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentor in personal attitudes on the perception of action research as reflective practices for their professional development in terms of those factors described in the analysis, F(2, 57) = 1.25 and F (2, 57) = 1.66, $p > 0.05$, one tailed respectively. Even though the degree of variations among these issues were not indicated by structured observational checklist during supervision and reflective sessions, the problems of personal attitudes on action research as reflective practices were emphasized more in Jigjiga center as most of the mentees lacked mentors.

Table 3.4.2a. "System Requirements" on mentoring practices in action research (n = 60)

No	Descriptive Statistics		
	Items	GM	SD
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center - System requirement towards mentoring practices	3.53	1.39
2	Haramaya Clustered Center System requirement towards mentoring practices	3.97	1.01
3	Chiro Clustered Center-System requirements towards mentoring practices	3.99	1.32

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

As clearly indicated in the table 3.4.2a, the computed grand means (3.53, 3.97 and 3.99) from these three clustered centers mentors' responses were agreed on the system requirements such as outlining curriculum, discussing policies, and discussing aims as one of the factors that can negatively affect the perceptions of the mentees on action research as reflective practices for their future professional development. However, the computed standard deviations (1.39, 1.01 and 1.32) at the three clustered centers showed us that there was variability among them. For instance, Haramaya clustered center mentees responses showed us that there were relatively consistent (less variation) in comparisons with both Chiro and Jigjiga. However, Jigjiga cluster center mentors responses were the most varied (inconsistency) responses of the two clustered centers.

Table 3.4.2a. "System Requirements" on mentoring practices in action research (n = 60)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center - System requirement towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	1.53	2	0.77	1.83	0.46
		Within Groups	23.94	57	0.42		
		Total	25.47	59			
2	Haramaya Clustered Center System requirement towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	3.74	2	1.87	2.75	0.10
		Within Groups	38.76	57	0.68		
		Total	42.50	59			
3	Chiro Clustered Center-System requirements towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	22.17	2	11.10	10.09	0.02
		Within Groups	62.70	57	1.10		
		Total	84.87	59			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

Besides to the descriptive analysis made under table 3.4.2a, the computed F ratio at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 1.83) and F (2, 57) = 2.75 in both Jigjiga and Haramaya clustered centers respectively were less than the critical region at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 3.16). Hence, it was found that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentors in perception of action research as reflective practices for professional development on system requirements -factors as described in the analysis, F(2, 57) = 1.83 and F (2, 57) = 2.05, $p > 0.05$, one tailed respectively. On the contrary, the computed F ratio at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 10.09 in the case of Haramaya clustered center is much exceeds the critical region at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 3.16). Hence, it was found that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentors in system requirements on the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for professional development as it was described in the analysis, F(2, 57) = 10.09, $p < 0.05$, one tailed. Besides these statistical evidences, the structured observational checklists during supervision and reflection sessions showed us that Jigjiga center mentees perception on action research and reflective practices seem highly frustrating.

Table 3.4.3a. Pedagogical Knowledge" on mentoring practices in action research (n = 60)

No	**Descriptive Statistics**		
	Items	**GM**	**SD**
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center -Pedagogical Knowledge towards mentoring practices	3.51	1.45
2	Haramaya-Pedagogical Knowledge towards Mentor Practices	3.91	1.01
3	Chiro Clustered center Pedagogical Knowledge of Mentors in mentoring Practices	4.21	1.09

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

As table 3.4.3 further insights, the computed grand mean item scores for the three clustered centers namely Jigjiga, Haramaya and Chiro respectively were 3.51, 3.91 and 4.21. This indicates that the three centers (Jigjiga, Haramaya and Chiro) mentors were agreed on "Pedagogical Knowledge" (providing viewpoints, discussing on problem solving, guiding preparation, discussing on assessment, assisting with teaching strategies, discussing on content knowledge, assisting with classroom management, discussing on questioning techniques, discussing on implementation, assisting in planning and assisting with time tabling from mentors said) were expected and important. The standard deviation of the three clustered center mentioned above respectively were 1.49, 1.01 and 1.09. These indicated that the majority of mentors were "agreed" on "Pedagogical Knowledge" for action research as reflective practices for professional development.

Table 3.4.3b. Pedagogical Knowledge" on mentoring practices in action research (n = 60)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center -Pedagogical Knowledge towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	16.07	2	8.04	7.73	0.00
		Within Groups	59.28	57	1.04		
		Total	75.35	59			
2	Haramaya-Pedagogical Knowledge towards Mentor Practices	Between Groups	6.34	2	3.19	2.91	0.28
		Within Groups	61.56	57	1.08		
		Total	67.90	59			
3	Chiro Clustered center Pedagogical Knowledge of Mentors in mentoring Practices	Between Groups	21.75	2	10.88	5.40	0.04
		Within Groups	121.41	57	2.13		
		Total	143.16	59			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

In addition to the evidences motioned in descrptive analysis made under table 3.4.3a, the computed F ratio at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 7.73) and F (2, 57) = 5.40 in both Jigjiga and Chiro clustered center respectively exceed the critical region at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 3.16). Hence, it can be concluded that there were statistically significant mean differences among mentors on pedagogical knowledge in the two cluster centers on the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for professional development as it was described in the analysis, F (2, 57) = 7.73 and F (2, 57) = 5.40, $p < 0.05$, one tailed respectively. Nevertheless, the computed F ratio at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 2.91 in case of Haramaya clustered center is much less than the critical region at α = 0.05, F (2, 57) = 3.16). Hence, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference among mentors perception on "Pedagogical Knowledge" of action research as reflective practices for professional development as described in the analysis, F(2, 57) = 2.91, $p > 0.05$, one tailed. However, in this study, the structured observational checklists made during supervision and reflection sessions indicated that mentors may not have mentored mentees about pedagogical knowledge practices as expected.

Table3.4.4a. Modeling" on mentoring practice of action research (n = 60)

No	Descriptive Statistics		
	Items	GM	SD
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center -Modeling towards mentoring practices	3.54	1.25
2	Haramaya cluster Modeling towards Mentor Practices	3.89	1.06
3	Chiro Cluster Centered Modeling of Mentors in mentoring Practices	4.13	1.03

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

The table3.4.4a further insights that the computed grand mean item scores from the responses of mentors at the three clustered centers namely Jigjiga, Haramaya and Chiro respectively were 3.54, 3.89 and 4.13. This indicates that the three centers (Jigjiga, Haramaya and Chiro) mentors were agreed on "modeling" practices (demonstrating hands-on activities, displaying enthusiasm for teaching, modeling a well-designed lesson, modeling classroom management, modeling teaching, modeling rapport with students, using syllabus language and modeling effective teaching from mentors say) were expected to be important. Moreover, the computed standard deviation of the three clustered centers mentioned above respectively were 1.25, 1.06 and 1.03. These also indicated that the majority of mentors were "agreed" on "modeling" on action research as reflective practices for their future professional development.

Table3.4.4a. Modeling" on mentoring practice of action research (n = 60)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center -Modeling towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	16.04	2	8.02	7.04	0.01
		Within Groups	64.98	57	1.14		
		Total	81.02	59			
2	Haramaya cluster Modeling towards Mentor Practices	Between Groups	2.37	2	1.19	1.53	0.62
		Within Groups	44.46	57	0.78		
		Total	46.83	59			
3	Chiro Cluster Centered Modeling of Mentors in mentoring Practices	Between Groups	5.57	2	2.79	1.99	0.37
		Within Groups	79.80	57	1.40		
		Total	85.37	59			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

In addition to the evidences from descriptive analysis made under table 3.4.4a, the computed F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 57) = 7.04 in the case of Jigjiga clustered center which exceeds the critical region at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 57) = 3.16. Hence, it can be concluded that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentors on **modeling** in the cluster center on the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for professional development , F (2, 57) = 7.04, $p < 0.05$, one tailed. On the other hand, the computed F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 57) = 1.53) and F (2, 57) = 1.99 in both Haramaya and Chiro clustered centers respectively were much less than the critical region at F (2, 57) = 3.16. Hence, it can be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentors in "**modeling"** in the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for professional development, F (2, 57) = 1.53) and F (2, 57) = 1.99, $p > 0.05$, one tailed respectively. However, in this study, the structured observational checklists during supervision and reflection sessions indicated that mentors may not have mentored **modeling** practices as expected.

Table3.4.5a. Providing "Feedback" on action research (n = 60)

No	Descriptive Statistics		
	Items	GM	SD
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center –providing Feedback towards mentoring practices	3.53	1.25
2	Haramaya Clustered Center –providing Feedback towards mentoring practices	3.95	1.04
3	Chiro Clustered Center - Providing Feedback from mentors practices	4.25	0.99

NB. If GM = 1.0-1.5 -Strongly Diagree, GM =1.5-2.5 –Disagree, GM= 2.5-3.5- Undecided, GM= 3.5-4.5- Agree,GM = 4.5-5.0- Strongly Agree.

As the table 3.4.5a insights, the computed grand mean item scores from the responses of mentors at the three clustered centers namely Jigjiga, Haramaya and Chiro respectively were 3.53, 3.95 and 4.25. This indicates that the three centers (Jigjiga, Haramaya and Chiro) mentors were agreed on the important of "**feedback**" practices (providing evaluation on teaching, reviewing lesson plans, observing teaching for feedback, providing written feedback, articulating expectations and providing oral feedback) on their perceptions of action research as a reflective practices from mentors were expected to be important. Moreover, the computed standard deviation of the three clustered center mentioned above respectively were 1.25, 1.03 and 0. 99. These indicated that the majority of mentors were "agreed" on their mentor displaying "**feedback"** on action research as reflective practices for professional development were varied.

Table 3.4.5b. Providing "Feedback" on action research (n = 60)

No	Items	Summary of ANOVA					
		Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
1	Jigjiga Clustered Center –providing Feedback towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	9.49	2	4.75	2.25	0.09
		Within Groups	120.27	57	2.11		
		Total	129.76	59			
2	Haramaya Clustered Center –providing Feedback towards mentoring practices	Between Groups	4.07	2	2.04	1.44	0.34
		Within Groups	80.94	57	1.42		
		Total	85.01	59			
3	Chiro Clustered Center - Providing Feedback from mentors practices	Between Groups	7.54	2	3.77	2.27	0.08
		Within Groups	129.39	57	1.67		
		Total	136.93	59			

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

As it can be depicted from the table 3.4.5b, the computed F ratio at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 57) = 2.25), F (2, 57) = 1.44 and F (2, 57) = 2.27 in the three clustered centers namely, Jigjiga, Haramaya and Chiro were slightly less than the critical region at $\alpha = 0.05$, F (2, 57) = 3.16. Hence, it can be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentors on feedback in the three clustered centers on the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for their professional development, F (2, 57) = 2.25), F (2, 57) = 1.44 and F (2, 57) = 2.27, $p > 0.05$, one tailed respectively. However, in this study, the structured observational checklist made during supervision and reflection sessions indicated that mentors may not have mentored yet given due attentions to feedback practices as expected.

Conclusions

Based on the result and discussion parts, the researcher drew the following conclusions:

- From descriptive statistical analysis, it could be concluded that 86.58% of mentees were male whereas only 13.42% of them were female. From this one can conclude that there were gender gaps that need to be filled so as to provide equal job opportunities, equality and equity of gender balance in the teaching profession.
- It could be concluded out that the majorities (79.29%) of the total sampled mentees were under the age of 25 years. This concludes that most of mentees under study were very young adults who could able to develop their future profession further.
- From the result and discussion parts, it could be concluded that the 93.33% of the mentors were male whereas only 6.67% of them were female. From this one can easily conclude that there were gender gaps that need to be filled in order to provide equal job opportunities, equality and equity of the gender balance in the teaching profession. As far as the age of mentors were concerned, the majorities (45.00%) of the total sampled mentors were between the ages of 33-35 years. This concludes that most of the mentors were relatively older than that their counterpart mentees.
- From the descriptive statistical analysis, it could be concluded that 89.52% of the mentors were responded that they were not very comfortably ready to accept the primary responsibilities in supporting mentees in the PGDT programs; however, a few (10.48%) of them were accepted the primary responsibilities given to them to provide necessary support to mentees as mentors. From this one can conclude that

there would be a critical problem that needed to be followed up so as to make the program effective.

- From the result and discussion part, it could be concluded that 80.00% of the major sources of information about PGDT program to the mentors were from the consultative training made by Haramaya University, but only 20.00% of the information about the program was from mentees, WEB and MoE. From this, one can conclude that those major stakeholders (MoE and WEB) of the program did not give special attention to the program effectiveness.
- From inferential statistical analysis, it could be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean difference among mentees in lack of interest, lack of adequate knowledge, extreme dependence on theory, lack seminars and workshop in in-service courses, inadequate teaching skill from university PGDT lecturers and poor status of student-teachers themselves towards action research as reflective practices in both Haramaya and Jigjiga clustered centers whereas it could be concluded that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentees in Chiro clustered center on these parameters.
- From the inferential statistical analysis, it could be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentees in large number of mentees per class, but agreed on lack of innovative in methodology, lack of instructional materials, and lack of dedication from lecturers on the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for their further professional development in Chiro and Jigjiga clustered centers whereas it was concluded that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentees in Haramaya clustered center.
- From the results and discussion parts, it could be concluded that personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge and modeling were resulted in no statistically significant mean differences among mentors' perceptions on action research as reflective practices for professional development in both Chiro and Jigjiga clustered centers, but it could be concluded that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentors in Haramaya clustered center.
- From the inferential statistical analysis, it could be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentors in the personal attitudes (listening attentively, comforting in talking, supporting, assisting in reflecting and instilling confidence towards mentoring practices) that could directly affect the perceptions of on action research as reflective practices for their professional development in Haramaya and Chiro clustered centers whereas it was found statistically significant mean difference in Jigjiga cluster center.
- From the result and discussion parts, it could be concluded that the system requirements (outlining curriculum, discussing policies, and discussing aims) were resulted in statistically insignificant mean differences among mentors' perceptions on action research as reflective practices for professional development in both Haramaya and Jigjiga clustered centers, but it could be concluded there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentors in Chiro clustered center.
- From the inferential statistical analysis, it can be concluded that there were statistically significant mean differences among mentors in the Pedagogical

Knowledge"(providing viewpoints, discussing on problem solving, guiding preparation, discussing on assessment, assisting with teaching strategies, discussing on content knowledge, assisting with classroom management, discussing on questioning techniques, discussing on implementation, assisting in planning and time tabling) were directly or indirectly affected mentoring practices in both Jigjiga and Chiro clustered centers whereas it would be concluded that there was no statistically significant mean difference among mentors in Haramaya cluster center.

- From the inferential statistical analysis, it would be concluded that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentors in the "Modeling" practices (demonstrating hands-on activities, displaying enthusiasm for teaching, modeling a well-designed lesson, modeling classroom management, modeling teaching, modeling rapport with mentees, using syllabus language and modeling effective teaching) could directly affect the mentoring practices on action research as reflective practices for their professional development in Haramaya and Chiro clustered centers whereas it could be concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference in Jigjiga cluster center.
- From the results and discussion parts, it was found that "feedback" practices (providing evaluation on teaching, reviewing lesson plans, observing teaching for feedback, providing written feedback, articulating expectations and providing oral feedback) were resulted in no statistically significant mean differences among mentors 'in mentoring practices on action research as reflective practices for professional development in the three cluster centers.

Recommendations

On the bases of the conclusions drawn from the above data, the researcher would like to forward the following recommendations.

- Even though the government bodies in collaborations with the Ministry of Education of the country did much on the affirmative action in female education, still these issues of imbalance between genders have been reflected in the new Post Graduate Diploma in Secondary School Teaching (PGDT). Therefore, all the stakeholders who have been rigorously working on teacher education should create awareness, encourage, involve and attract female to the teaching profession so as to bring equality, equity and exemplary female teachers to the next generation.
- As most of the mentees were young adults, there would be a good opportunities for the country to use these young generation for a better teaching professional development in the future. Therefore, special attentions should be given for these teaching professionals from the governing bodies of the country particularly Ministry of Education (MoE) so as to change the dark faces of the teaching professions for these golden generations.
- As it was found out in the analysis, it was concluded that most of the mentors were male teachers. From this one can conclude that there would be clearly indicated that there were gender gaps that need to be filled so as to balance the job opportunities, equality and equity in the teaching profession. Therefore, the affirmative action that

was taken so far on gender issues need critical revision or amendment. Furthermore, the ages of mentors were relatively older than their mentees counterparts so that it was logical in providing necessary support in the sense of respect.

- As it was identified in the result and discussion part, it was found that the majority of the mentors were not ready to accept the primary responsibilities in supporting mentees in the PGDT program. Consequently, it was expected of mentors to put mentoring practices in to practice rather than a simple lip talk. They should think of his/ her own professional responsibilities and ethics because the very objective of teaching profession in general and mentoring in particular was, is and will be providing support, socialize, encourage, involve, facilitate and create conducive environment for living and teaching. Therefore, mentors should become more effective and responsible to examine and assess their own work and then consider ways of working differently, help each other by working collaboratively, work with colleagues' helps mentees and even themselves in their professional development (Watts, 1985).
- From the result and discussion part, it was found that 80.00% of the major sources of information about PGDT program to the mentors were from the consultative training made by Haramaya University. Therefore, Haramaya University particularly, College of Education and Behavioural Sciences should pursue these consultative training and meeting so as to aware and make effective the mentoring practices in these secondary schools. Moreover, MoE, ZEB, and WEB had better inform the stakeholders about the program implementation processes, expectations, roles and responsibilities of mentors and necessary funding for the effectiveness of the program in general and the teaching professions in particular.
- From inferential statistical analysis, it was found that there were no statistically significant mean difference among mentees in lack of interest, lack of adequate knowledge, extreme dependence on theory, lack seminars and workshop in in-service courses, inadequate teaching skill from university PGDT lecturers and poor status of student-teachers themselves towards action research as reflective practices in both Haramaya and Jigjiga clustered centers whereas it could be concluded that there was statistically a significant mean difference among mentees in Chiro clustered center on these parameters. Therefore, special attention should be given to the program by all stakeholders (MoE, ZEB, WEB, Teacher Educators, Mentees, Mentors, Principals and Supervisors) so as to make the program effective, interesting, knowledgeable, methodologically innovative, practical and motivating.
- From the inferential statistical analysis, it was found that there were no statistically significant mean differences among mentees in large number of mentees per class, but agreed on lack of innovative in methodology, lack of instructional materials, and lack of dedication from lecturers on the perceptions of action research as reflective practices for their further professional development in Chiro and Jigjiga clustered centers whereas it was found statistically significant mean difference among mentees in Haramaya clustered center. Therefore, it was advisable to restrict the number of student-teachers (mentees) per class as per MoE (40 student- teachers per class). On the other hand, providing all necessary instructional materials over night for a given educational institutions and bureaus might be beyond its capacity because of budget

implications. Therefore, it would be recommended to make these materials available to some extent if not all from local sources rather than solely bold in saying it is impossible.

- From the results and discussion parts, it was found that personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge and modeling were resulted in no statistically significant mean differences among mentors' perceptions on action research as reflective practices for professional development in both Chiro and Jigjiga clustered centers, but it was found statistically a significant mean difference among mentors in Haramaya clustered center. Therefore, it would be advisable that any public servant should feel responsible and accountable for any payment they received as basic salary from the public. Moreover, providing professional support for what one has been hired is a great responsibility which directly or indirectly affects the whole system of the nation than individual. Hence, mentors ought to provide mentees with necessary supports in personal attributes, system requirements, pedagogical knowledge, modeling and feedback whenever they have been demanded.

References

Ashcroft, K. and Griffiths, M. (1989). 'Reflective teachers and reflective tutors: School experience in an initial teacher education course'. *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 15, (1): 35–52.

Connelly, F.M. And Clandinin, D.J. (1990). 'Stories of experience and narrative inquiry.' *Educational Researcher,* 19(5): 2–14.

Day, C. (2004). *A Passion for Teaching.* London: Routledge. Deakin University Press.

Duke, S. and Appleton, J. (2000). The use of reflection in a palliative care programme: a quantitative study of the development of reflective skills over an academic year. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32(6): 1557–69.

Elliott, J. (2007). *Rethinking pedagogy as the aesthetic ordering of learning experiences*. London: Routledge. Deakin University Press.

Erickson, G. and Mackinnon, A. (1991). 'Seeing classrooms in new ways: On becoming a science teacher**'.** *The* Reflective Turn: Case Studies In and On Educational experience in an initial teacher education course'. *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 15 (1): 67-89.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1991). Helping novices learn to teach:Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(1): 17-30.

Grimmet, P. and Crehan, E.P. (1990). *Conditions Which Facilitate and Inhibit Teacher Reflection in Clinical Supervision: Collegiality Re-Examined.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Henderson, J.G. (1992). *Reflective Teaching: Becoming an Inquiring Educator*. New York; McCMilan.

LA Boskey, V.K. (1990). *Reflectivity in Preservice Teachers: Alert Novices vs. Common sense Thinkers.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Richert, A. (1990). '*Teaching teachers to reflect: A consideration of programme structure'*. River, New Jersey: Pearson Merill Prentice-Hall.

Russell, T. and Munby, H. (1991). 'Reframing: The role of experience in developing teachers' professional knowledge'. *The Reflective Turn: Case Studies In and On Educational Practice*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp. 164–88.

Sands, R.et.al., (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education, 62:* 174-193.

Schuck, C. and Wood, J. (2006). Playing, reflecting, and reality. *Journal of Holistic Healthcare*, British Holistic Medical Association.

Tessema B. (2007). The development of student teachers practical theory of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*(1): 1- 24.

Valli, L. (1992). 'Introduction', in VALLI, L. (Ed) *Reflective Teacher Education: Cases and Critiques*. Albany, Suny Press.

Van Woerkem, M. (2004). The concept of critical reflection and its implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 6(2): 178–92.

Watts, H. (1985). *When teachers are researchers, teaching improves learners*. River, New Jersey: Pearson Merill Prentice-Hall.

Zeichner, K. (1993b). 'Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle for social justice'. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 19: 54-67.

Zeichner, K. (1987). 'Preparing reflective teachers'. *International Journal of Educational Research,* 11(5): 565–75.