

Vol. 8, No. 2, August 2010

Editorial

There are seven peer reviewed papers in this issue: the first is a European comparison of two assessment tools while the second two papers report on important work that is being carried out in Canada using the Co-active life coaching model. Then we have two papers that focus on coaching with academics in Higher Education, one from South Africa and one from the UK. The final two articles focus on mentoring in a school leadership and staff development context in the USA.

In our first paper Céline Rojon and Almuth McDowall from the University of Surrey outline a cross-validation study of the Cultural Orientations Framework assessment questionnaire (Rosinski, 2007) with the Saville Consulting Wave Focus Styles questionnaire (Saville Consulting, 2006) using populations in UK and Germany. This intriguing study found few national differences between them but did observe some gender differences. Rojon and McDowall discuss the implications of the study for the development and use of the COF in practice.

The second paper is also a much needed comparison of popular models used in coaching. It explores the unique characteristics and components of the Co-Active Coaching model compared to Motivational Interviewing and Egan's Skilled Helper Model. In the paper Courtney Newnham-Kanas and colleagues from the Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of Western Ontario, explore the similarities and differences of all three models and concludes that their uniqueness lies in the way that they are packaged and delivered. From the analysis, a model of Motivational Coaching is developed and presented that distils elements from all three approaches.

The third paper is also from researchers based at the University of Western Ontario. In this important study Tara Mantler, Jennifer Irwin and Don Morrow report on a 3-month coaching-administered Motivational Interviewing (MI) intervention. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to uncover trends regarding self-efficacy, self-esteem and cigarette dependency. Through the intervention participants gained personal insights as well as helpful ways to cope with smoking challenges and a heightened awareness about other choices.

The fourth paper focuses on a qualitative study of the use of coaching for accelerated research productivity. Hilary Geber from the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg describes a structured support programme for research productivity and publication at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. The programme incorporated internal coaching of participants by academics who were not expert in the participants' disciplines and resulted in tangible outcomes for research, publication and career changes. There were also a number of less tangible, but no less helpful, outcomes around the value of coaching.

Debra Cureton, Patricia Green and Lib Meakin from the University of Wolverhampton are the authors of the fifth paper in this issue. Their paper, also set in a Higher Education context, is entitled 'Peer Mentoring for Staff Development in a Changing Work Environment' and sets out the impact of a formalised staff mentoring scheme on people working in a University in the United Kingdom. The qualitative study looks at how mentoring can mediate the negative effects of a highly politicised environment. Findings have indicated that the scheme provides developmental opportunities, contact with others, emotional support and the opportunity for reflection.

The penultimate paper is from Susan Gettys, Barbara Martin and Linda Bigby from the University of Central Missouri. Their study examines the perceptions and experiences of six beginning principals in relation to the effectiveness of District-Created Mentoring Programmes (DCMP) and a statewide Administrator Mentoring Programme (AMP) in Missouri, USA. Data reveals that both types of mentoring programmes were weak in providing the appropriate support in each of six instructional standards of instructional leadership skills. From this finding six strategies for effective mentoring programmes were identified and so the implications for practice are important to both district level and university personnel.

Our final paper is a study of the relationship between mentoring practices and beginning teacher migration. Michele Parker examines mentor matching, degree of support, and frequency of interactions to determine the conditions under which novice teachers are more likely to stay in their school. Secondary analysis of data from the 2006 North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey was used to examine mentoring practices. The sample comprised 8,838 teachers who were mentored during their first 2 years of teaching and Chi-Square analyses revealed that beginning teachers who were purposefully matched, who received a lot of assistance with the supports listed, and who met with mentors at least monthly for the specified activities were more likely to remain in their school than those who had received less support.

Elaine Cox

Editor, International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring