2021

# Solving the Persistence Problem: Application of Peer Mentorship in the ROTC Community

Thomas Pelkey

# SOLVING THE PERSISTENCE PROBLEM:

# APPLICATION OF PEER MENTORSHIP IN THE ROTC COMMUNITY

A Capstone Experience/Thesis Project Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree Bachelor of Science

with Mahurin Honors College Graduate Distinction

at Western Kentucky University

By

Thomas J. Pelkey

May 2021

*****

CE/T Committee:

Dr. Bernie Strenecky, Chair

Dr. Elizabeth Lemerise

Lieutenant Colonel Morgan Greene

Dr. Craig T. Cobane

# ABSTRACT

Western Kentucky University, a medium-sized university in Kentucky, currently has a persistence rate of 74% (Helbig et al., 2020). The current public health crisis also poses a risk to university retention. A new method needs to be used to increase the rate in the next ten years. Dr. Brian Kuster, Vice President of WKU suggested a mentoring program for "at-risk" freshmen. Freshmen go through a lot of stress and anxiety in their first year of college. This is known as the "first-year adjustment" reaction. A myriad of factors contributes to the reaction, such as being by themselves for the first time, learning adult responsibilities, and playing the "game" that is called college. Western Kentucky Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) developed a mentorship program for freshmen Cadets to ease the first-year adjustment reaction, feelings of anxiety and hopelessness. Initial surveys from mentored freshmen show 80% persistence within the ROTC program. Freshmen who persisted reported that mentors provided a positive impact to the college transition and fostered "a sense of camaraderie."

I dedicate this thesis to my mentors, Les Pesterfield and Elizabeth Lemerise, who are a great inspiration to me and gifted me with timeless wisdom. Also, I also dedicate this work to Green Day's album *Insomniac*, which helped me overcome burnout for the past semester.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank WKU's ROTC Program for giving me a college experience that pushed me to grow in ways I never could foresee. I learned a great amount of life lessons from the leadership experiences it has presented me. I would not have completed this project without the help of cadre and other Cadets, especially Lieutenant Colonel Greene and Dr. Strenecky. Also, I would like to express my deepest gratitude towards Dr. Lemerise in the Psychological Sciences Department for being my second reader and being there to direct me through this project despite its ups and downs. Working in your lab gave me the idea of doing my thesis of peer mentorship, and you encouraged me. You did not have to go on this endeavor, but you chose to, and I thank you.

I would like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Pesterfield and both Dr. Blair and Dr. Kevin Williams from the Chemistry Department for being my mentors during my time here. Not only did you all lighten my mood in my two years of burnout, but you challenged me intellectually to make me the ambitious student I am today. You all gave me tips on studying for your exams and advice on how to take care of heartbroken friends who would not leave my couch for a month. I learned to appreciate life when I nearly died from a blood clot. I learned from your guidance that there is no such thing as perfect, but that does not mean you should not try your hardest.

I would also like to thank Dr. Martin in the Music Department for reigniting my love of music and giving me an outlet to express myself. In our conversations and

sessions playing together, I realized my life is the subject of an early Green Day album. We joked about whether my life was *Dookie* or *Nimrod.* Learning guitar and bass from you has been one of my favorite experiences in college. Your class has brought me joy I cannot express. Thank you for that.

# VITA

*EDUCATION*

Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY — May 2021
B.S. in Biochemistry – Mahurin Honors College Graduate
Honors CE/T: *Solving the Persistence Problem: Application of Peer Mentorship in the ROTC Community*

Northeast High School, Clarksville, TN — April 2021

*PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE*

Williams' Research Lab, WKU — Jan. 2020-Present
Research Assistant

Lemerise Research Lab, WKU — Aug. 2018-Dec. 2020
Research Assistant

Reserve Officer Training Corps, WKU — Jan. 2021-Present
Teaching Assistant

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

# INTRODUCTION

Western Kentucky University sported a nearly universal acceptance rate of 97.3% in 2020. Although this is great for the university, about 25% of the freshmen who enroll at WKU drop out. The persistence rate, the rate at which freshman stay for the second semester, is 74%. WKU has the resources available to promote persistence into the second year but freshmen rarely use them. Resources span from financial support, academic support, and social support. There is a disconnect between freshmen and the resources they utilize to succeed in their first year.

Additionally, the COVID-19 public health crisis does not ameliorate any anxiety upcoming freshmen feel about matriculating to college. Some classes have shifted to a combination of both in-person and virtual learning; other classes are completely online. Although this shift does support the efficacy of technology, it removes the vital social factor of education from the freshmen. Offices for resources such as financial aid and tutoring also transitioned to virtual office hours, which are unknown to freshmen. Freshmen reported feeling more stressed in remote learning environments due to external factors impeding on their learning (Ramachandran & Rodriguez, 2020). The pandemic exacerbates the ongoing disconnect between freshmen and the tools WKU offers to assist with persistence.

The adjustment from high school to college can be tough for new college students. It is during this time where the first-year adjustment reaction can be seen in young adults. The first-year adjustment reaction is a challenge freshmen face with their

first academic endeavors. Freshman are faced with personal problems such as achieving a school/life balance, proper nutrition, and dealing with academic bureaucracy. In short, freshmen need to learn how to be a self-sufficient adult. Freshmen often exhibit depression, anxiety, loneliness, and alienation in response of the rigor of higher education (Kneipp, Kelly & Cyphers, 2009). If unattended, college students can become too overwhelmed and drop out of college their first semester.

This problem of persistence is amplified in the university's Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program. ROTC is a niche community within the university that develops students, or Cadets in Army vernacular, to become competent officers in the Army. New Cadets often struggle with adapting to the expectations of the program which include maintaining physical fitness, staying on top of grades, and leading their peers in various activites. WKU ROTC's persistence rate as of 2019 was 50%: meaning half of newcomers dropped the program.

A potential solution to this problem would be for upperclassmen to mentor freshmen and give them the guidance to persist through their first year of college. Mentorship from upperclassmen who possess experience with distance learning should improve freshmen persistence in this crisis. Because upperclassmen adapted to the change, they have some experience with the change and can give proper guidance to the freshmen. Persistence is the main goal for the mentoring program. The program would give college freshmen someone to talk to about their struggles in college, someone to help freshmen figure out how to play the game of college, increase their independence, and help both parties develop leadership skills.

## Categories of Mentorship

There are still simple things that WKU can do to increase retention. Mentoring tries to convince someone else to follow the appropriate path. Peer mentoring, however, is different. Peer mentoring is less expensive than hiring life coaches or actual mentors like Portland State (Collier, 2015), but it can be ambiguous most of the time. Most peer mentoring programs that colleges implement are generally unfocused and lack a specific goal to succeed (Terion & Leonard, 2007).

When developing a peer mentorship program, the type of mentoring needs to be established as well. There are a few types of peer mentoring: Paired face-to-face, group face-to-face, and e-mentoring. Paired face-to-face mentorship is when a mentor and a mentee meet and talk in a physical space such as a study room or a coffee shop. This type of mentoring allows for optimal guidance to mentees because mentors can read nonverbal cues and verbal interactions between both parties.

The main advantage of paired face-to-face mentoring is the personal connection between two people (Collier, 2015). The mentor is going to be able to read nonverbal cues and figure out the mentee's issues. Drawbacks of this mentoring style are the proficiency of the mentors and mentees in their respective contexts and the number of mentors that the administration hires.

Group face-to-face mentoring is when one mentor meets with many mentees. A huge advantage of this is that the whole process can be expedited, and everyone learns quicker (Collier, 2015). The mentees who are in the group can learn from each other and can create a strong group to increase commitment. Mentorship in this form can also account for a larger pool of mentees at once. The biggest drawback of this, however, is finding a right time and place for everyone to meet. Another consequence of meeting in a

group is the weaker connections between the mentor and the mentees. Although group face-to-face mentorship gives a personal interaction with a group of mentees, it lacks the individual connections of paired face-to-face mentorship.

E-mentoring uses technology to mentor students such as smartphones and the internet. This method allows mentors and mentees to reach farther distances, catering to a greater collegiate audience (Collier, 2015). Additionally, e-mentoring provides flexibility to mentors and mentees through instant messaging and video-chatting software. Although e-mentoring looks like the catch-all of mentoring, the drawbacks are equally large. Miscommunication can happen because etiquette can differ among individuals; proper training would need to be stressed. There are some unrealistic expectations associated e-mentoring without the nonverbal cues that are present in face-to-face mentoring. The addition of Zoom, FaceTime, and other video-chatting software allows for facial cues to be seen in e-mentoring (Tinoco-Giraldo et al. 2020). Technology like this can enhance the quality of mentoring. Alas, the new format of mentoring has yet to have an effective program of evaluation.

### Peer Mentorship in the Army

Peer mentoring in the U.S. Army has been attempted many times before. The criteria for mentorship in the Army has usually been Senior Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers (NCOs) providing guidance and direction to a younger Soldier. The Army is an ideal environment to harbor mentoring relationships due to the similarities between mentors and mentees. The Army has a plethora of resources and handbooks available, begging the question of why mentorship in the Army is not in the top tier of mentoring programs.

A deeper analysis of the structure of a failed Army Mentorship Program from Major Crapanzano and Major Cook shows a well-crafted mentorship model but subpar execution. The Army Mentorship Program was established in 2000 to encourage leadership beyond the chain of command. Looking through the handbook (Army Command and General Staff College, 2000), the program demonstrated an understanding of mentoring relationships by stating "mentors and mentees must 'self-select' each other" (p. 7). Although the handbook recognizes that mentors and mentees need to be compatible and the relationship is voluntary, the selection process is not characteristic of successful mentoring programs. In successful mentoring programs mentors and mentees are matched through an application process and an interview. The application process is used to ensure the mentor and mentee have similar traits and are compatible.

With mentors and mentees pursuing the same career, finding participants should not be a problem. However, the Army Mentorship Program had poor participation from both mentors and mentees due to a lack of incentives for mentors and mentees. The most the program had to offer to the mentors was "Career Advancement" and "Personal Satisfaction." Although advertising the rewards of mentoring might sway some people into becoming a mentor, it generally takes a material incentive to sway mentors into mentoring (Collier, 2015).

Crapanzano and Cook (2017) did mention that the Army had effective "local mentoring programs." The United States Military Academy at West Point provides an environment similar to universities with ROTC programs. However, the lifestyle of Cadets at USMA is much different than college students. Cadets have the structured life of a Soldier through Physical Training (PT), field training exercises, the chain of

command, etc. First year Cadets are paired with sophomore Cadets to harbor a mentoring relationship. Although the theory is great, mentoring must be completely voluntary between both parties. According to Colonel Everett Spain of USMA, the institution does "not do peer mentoring well" (E. Spain & R. Torres, personal communication, March 24, 2020). and suggested some ideas to improve their mentorship program. He mentioned that a regular, "in depth" session must be conducted at least once a month between the mentor and mentee. Colonel Spain iterated that peer mentorship should focus on molding leadership in mentees rather than career progression. This goal branches out from many university mentorship programs.

Both the Army Mentorship Program in 2000 and USMA's peer mentorship program highlight an interesting point about mentorship: the voluntary aspect. Outside of the military, official mentoring relationships are completely voluntary. The initiative from both mentor and mentee shows the commitment to developing the mentee. The Army pushed senior Cadets and senior officers to mentor younger soldiers, disregarding their input. This led to more "coffee-date" mentoring relationships that acted as informal counseling sessions for the mentee. Although counseling of mentees is not necessarily bad, it does not cover the point of mentorship: guiding the mentee to success.

Cadets are a special demographic among college students, there are about 20,000 Cadets in U.S. universities, characterized by a distinct lack of mentorship. Although Colonel Spain revealed the shortcomings of peer mentorship at the USMA, a model of mentorship for Cadets exists. USMA has the Sponsor Program is designed to help first year Cadets adjust to military-academy life. The new Cadet is matched with senior staff or faculty to help ease this transition. The program is voluntary for both parties; the staff

need to volunteer for the position and the new Cadets must fill out an application (DA form 5434) to participate. The staff then provide guidance and a make "a home away from home" for the new Cadet. No information on the percentage of USMA Cadets who participated was found. The lack of data on peer mentorship in the Army is also a reason this study is being conducted.

Overall, the Army has excelled in informal mentoring processes, however it has fallen short in establishing an organization wide program. The success of West Point's Sponsorship program shows that Cadet mentorship is possible. This process can be adapted to be a peer mentorship program. The Army Mentorship Program serves as a template for units to develop their own informal mentoring processes or "local" programs.

## Best Known Practices in Peer Mentoring

According to Collier (2015), an academic leader in peer mentoring from Portland State University, there are different methods to approach to mentorship. The entire mentoring process can be broken down into three parts: matching, mentoring, and communication. Many universities try to find a model to fit their goals. The National League of Nursing has provided a schema dubbed "Best Practices in Academic Mentoring". This model establishes the foundation of all mentoring programs regardless of end state a program has for a mentee. This model delves into the nuances of successful mentorship programs across all forms of academia. According to the review, the most important parts of mentorship are matching, mentorship of mentees, and integration of campus resources into the program (Nick et. al, 2012).

## Matching

Most mentoring relationships are dyadic, meaning there are two people: the mentor and the mentee. The paramount feature of mentor/mentee relationships is the compatibility of the dyad. This compatibility can be achieved through many matching scenarios. Matching can happen through administrative pairing, mentee selection of mentor, mentor selection of mentee, or the mentor and mentee creating their own relationship. Formal mentoring programs from universities often use administrative pairing, when a third party of faculty pair mentors and mentees from a pool of applications. Although the mentor and mentee selecting themselves seems more desirable, there is no evidence suggesting which method is the most effective (Nick et al., 2012).

Administrative pairing of mentor and mentee is the most common form of matching (Nick et al., 2012). The method has its advantages and disadvantages in making mentoring dyads. The main advantage of administrative pairing is the speed at which it is done. This method also gets a third opinion on the dyad to be formed. The group responsible for the pairing will have to consider the personalities of both parties. This adds a temporary branch of communication to the dyad, which may improve the stability of the developing relationship. The downside to this method, however, is critical: mismatching. Mentor-mentee mismatching is the most common problem in mentoring programs. The root cause of this stems from a lack of purpose and training in the program. In the case of the West Point Sponsor Program, the mentor serves to ameliorate the first-year adjustment reaction in new Cadets. This problem can be solved by involving both the mentor and mentee in the matching process.

It can be easy for administrative groups to overlook the input of the dyad that is about to be matched. Allen's group found that mentors and mentees have a greater understanding of their relationship when they provided insight into the matching process (Allen et al., 2017). An application from the mentee will help the administrative matching process narrow down a mentor through the responses. The application should ask about goals of the mentee, academic major, and basic icebreakers like major, career aspitations, and hobbies. An application allows mentors to get insight on potential mentees. Access to applications, however, will lead to an anchoring effect in mentors. Mentors may potentially define the mentee by their application and form a judgement that may impair their relationship. A preliminary meeting must follow the application when matching occurs to overcome this effect. A meeting will give the dyad more information upon which to build their relationship.

Mentors and mentees will have to be similar in certain aspects. Most mentees are matched with mentors with similar interests. This can be seen in WKU's American Sign Language (ASL) mentoring, in which the mentors assist ASL learners. Mentors in the ASL program are seniors in the program who offer help to underclassmen. They serve as tutors, advisors, and sometimes props for their recitations. Mentors and mentees should be similar in academic discipline, background interests, and personality. Dissonance in these categories will lead to an ineffective mentoring relationship (Eby et al., 2010). This information can be acquired from applications and an introductory meeting with mentors and mentees.

## Mentoring

Once the mentors and mentees are matched, a goal-based relationship should begin. Because mentoring is mostly dyadic, much effort must be given to maintain a

stable relationship. Every mentor and mentee dyad will have different interactions, so how can a certain style be preferred over the others? This lies in the definition and mission of the mentoring program. Defining mentorship is problematic at an institutional level. Mentors play many roles to the mentee and can often become confused with coaches (Fletcher & Mullen, 2012). It is important for the mentor-mentee dyad to express their goals clearly with each other to prevent that role confusion.

Establishing an open understanding of the purpose and goals of mentoring is crucial for mentors to successfully guide mentees. This can be done through the mentee personally prescribing goals, whether establishing a rhythm or establishing weekly goals. The mentor should also consider the organization's goals with mentees and aid the mentee by providing direction for goal setting (Allen et al., 2017). Ambition can serve as a guide in the mentoring process. Although ambition will vary among mentees, mentors can use that to help set goals, both broad, or specific.

Reciprocity is vital in any literature relating to mentoring. The idea behind reciprocity is that both members in the dyad will be giving and receiving. From the perspective of the mentor, the mentor will gain things that are not tangible such as self-satisfaction, better interpersonal skills, and a leadership experience. Mentees will have more tangible rewards from the relationship but might become mentors in the future (Nick et al., 2011). In the dyad, however, the mentee must speak openly to mentors to establish a basis of goal setting. This reciprocity can be gained by establishing a collegial relationship, one where both parties share responsibility for the outcome (Wilson, Brannan, & White, 2010). This type of relationship ensures stability in the dyad and paves the way for success of the mentee on academic and emotional levels. When

looking from the perspective of the freshman, the mentor serves as a companion to them. They then use that companionship and expectations from the mentoring to set goals and successfully transition into college.

The goals that mentors and mentees must be time-bound. The dyad needs a committed time to meet as well. Mentors and mentees must establish a time commitment for meetings and goal setting to develop a successful relationship. Mentors need to clarify that the relationship will expire at some time, usually about a year. Setting a cutoff date of formal mentorship allows the mentee to set realistic goals and minimizes disappointment from failure (Nick et al., 2012). The long-term time hack introduces the mentee to long term planning and time management.

Achieving goals is facilitated through an open line of communication. The mentoring literature shows that predetermined times for meetings are paramount in establishing the mentoring relationship (McRae & Zimmerman, 2019). Establishing a routine also aids mentees in adapting to college life from a first-year perspective. When the time commitment is not met or established in the dyad, the relationship will falter into one that is superficial rather than collegial.

### Social Integration into the University

The social aspect of mentoring cannot be ignored. The mentee is typically in a state of confusion when entering college. It is up to the mentor to guide and advocate for their mentee to become engrossed in collegiate culture. The mentor also serves as a social support for the mentee (Nick et al., 2012). As previously discussed, communication is crucial. The dialogue, however, does not need to be centered around the relationship or goals. Mentors can delve into the social life of mentees and give guidance to build the mentee's friend circle.

The mentor should advocate for the mentee to become involved in academia and other extracurriculars. Although academia may be the focal point for some, first-year transition programs can introduce mentees to other clubs, intramurals, teams, etc. to integrate mentees into the university (Collier, 2013). Humboldt State University Retention and Academic Mentoring Program (RAMP) excelled in this aspect. RAMP mentors met with mentees about "Three-Week Theme" agendas set by the administration. Mentees were introduced to various social activities provided by the universities. Mentees in the RAMP cohort were more likely to persist at HSU, increasing the persistence rate by five percentage points to 78% (Humboldt State University Institutional Research & Planning 2013).

Mentees need to be integrated into the university. Collegiality between the mentor and the mentee will help ease the burden of isolation. One practice to encourage open integration is to have an environment that promotes social interaction for the mentee (Boyle & Boice, 2003). This environment can be a communal place in the university such as a dorm or it can be at a venue like a coffee shop. This communal location allows the mentee to find more groups to be in or become more acquainted with an in-group. Boyle and Boice found that after interacting with all the students and faculty at their university, first-year graduate students were able to find a research mentor who matched their interests.

The mentor needs to be the catalyst for mentee integration. For this to occur, the mentor needs to be aware of the resources their university has to offer. Mentors should be well versed in their department and in the resources that are available to all the students such as financial aid and tutoring. Knowledge of these resources will help the mentor

connect the mentee with more people in the university, which in turn encourages socialization. The mentor needs to have these resources readily available for mentees to utilize if they find themselves in need. Additionally, the mentor must know resources for mental health services.

**Role Conflict**

It is important to set the correct boundaries to avoid role conflict. The mentor serves a unique role to the mentee: as an advocate. The mentor can get overwhelmed with connecting school resources, setting goals, and counseling the mentee. At that point, the mentor takes up the role of an adviser or coach. Mentors differ from coaches in their relationship with the mentee. Coaches are trained to treat mentees as a client whereas mentors see mentees as peers. Mentors' implicit obligations to the mentee include making a time commitment outside of class, establishing a work/life balance, and advocating academic excellence (Carmel & Paul, 2015). The key to the mentoring relationship is that both parties see each other as peers. The mentee's feedback serves as a check to the mentor becoming too domineering. The mentee has a variety of options to resolve an overzealous mentor such as terminating the relationship, redirecting goals, or finding another mentor.

The mentor needs to provide psychological and social support. A study of physician mentors showed that their main priority was "motivating proteges," followed by administering "moral support". The mentees ranked the professionalism of mentors who were concerned for mentees very highly in a following survey (Aagard & Hauer, 2003). However, mentors can experience role conflict with mentees in this aspect. The conflict comes from motivating mentees and providing support for the mentee. Mentors

risk acting as counselors or therapists to the mentee. They would either put all their effort in social support or motivation. It is up to the mentor to find this balance by establishing boundaries with the mentee.

**Purpose**

The aim of my project was twofold: (a) establish a sustainable mentorship program in Western Kentucky University (WKU)'s ROTC Program and (b) conduct a qualitative analysis to determine whether peer mentorship increased persistence in the Battalion. The mentorship program was built on the foundations of the best-known practices from post-secondary peer mentorship programs. This included a matching system that would be specific for Cadets because they have a different lifestyle from the normal college population. The analysis determined which best-known practices apply to ROTC programs and the overall efficacy of mentors. Evaluation of mentorship was conducted by surveying mentors and mentees about their experiences.

## ESTABLISHING THE PEER MENTORSHIP PROGRAM

This section provides the model through which mentors and mentees were matched and mentored in the Fall 2020 Semester. To begin, a model for matching was created that catered to the ROTC community. Literature iterates that peer mentors should be in the same "field of expertise" as mentees to get the best pair. All the Cadets are similar in the aspect of becoming future Lieutenants, but we believed that was not specific enough. A refined matching criterion was developed to match freshmen Cadets to mentors in order to compensate the academic side and military side of Cadet life.

A hierarchical model was developed to determine what was the most important criterion in pairing. The following model details the criteria with which mentors and mentees were paired:

1. Academic Discipline
2. Personal Interests/Hobbies
    a. Fitness
    b. Home Leisure (video games, Netflix binging, board games, etc.)
    c. Outdoor Recreation
    d. Music
        i. Playing and instrument
        ii. Favorite genre of music
3. Demographic Information

Academic discipline was defined as being within the same academic field. This means that matching by major was prioritized over anything else. If a mentor and mentee did not share a major but were in the same discipline (e.g., Mechanical Engineering and Electrical Engineering; Economics and Accounting; English and Creative Writing), a match would take place. This style of matching considered similar coursework in the potential pair. Cadets who are matched by academic discipline would have very similar lifestyles in terms of academic coursework and Cadet lifestyle. Seventy-two percent (72%) of Cadets were matched by major or academic discipline.

If a match could not be made within academic discipline, personal interests of the mentee were compared with the mentors. Because ROTC emphasizes career development

into specific branches of the Army such as Infantry, Armor, Aviation, etc., a freshman's interest in certain aspects of the Army can align with those of mentors. This is enough similarity between the two parties to make the match. Matching in this style would not account for academic lifestyle between the mentor and mentee. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of dyads were paired using this style of matching.

Cadets who could not be matched by academic discipline were matched by personal interests. A sub-hierarchy of personal interests was quickly created to address this issue. The hobbies and personal interests of mentors and mentees categorized in the following way:

1. Fitness
2. Home Leisure (Video Games, Netflix binging, board games, etc.)
3. Outdoor Recreation
4. Music
    a. Playing and instrument
    b. Favorite Genre of Music

Unlike the matching criteria, no hobby took priority in matching. This means that mentees who enjoyed lifting were not the at the top of the list to be matched. This heuristic facilitated the matching for the administrative team. Favoritism was a risk when matches were deliberated upon. Bias could allow poor matches, which may ultimately end in the freshman Cadet dropping the program. The risk of bias was mitigated by strictly following the criteria for pairing.

Demographics played into the compatibility of mentor and mentees, but not as much as we thought. This will be discussed in the Results section. Demographics in this context refers to the age, gender, and hometown of the applicants.

The execution of mentorship was performed primarily face-to-face. The rationale behind this was to maximize Cadet integration within the Battalion. COVID-19, however, caused changes within that plan. Mentors were trained to conduct virtual mentoring meetings over Facetime or Zoom in case the mentee did not feel comfortable meeting face-to-face. If pairs elected to meet face-to-face, mentors had to abide by WKU's COVID health regulations. E-mentoring presented an alternative to the public health crisis, and the university provided every student with a Zoom account. The benefits of face-to-face mentoring could not be ignored; mentors were given the choice to conduct mentor meetings in person or over Zoom. The medium of mentorship was not recorded with the dyads, only the meeting times were noted.

Additionally, mentors in ROTC were recruited and trained for the incoming freshmen. The mentors were all enrolled in the military seminar class, MIL 490. Mentors were trained in an hour and a half seminar in late September of 2020. Mentors received additional training in segments in MIL 490. Skills that were taught were active listening, open communication, confidentiality, boundary setting, and how to utilize campus resources. Campus resources is a broad term, so we refined it to three categories: academic resources, physical fitness resources, and miscellaneous resources.

Academic resources are places where a mentee can find tutors for specific classes, writing centers, and where professors are located. The physical fitness resources were essential due to the fitness requirement of ROTC. One such example is that all mentors

learned the university dietitian's contact information. Miscellaneous resources included computer labs, ID replacement, and mental health centers on campus.

Recruiting of mentees and matching was simultaneous. Applications were sent to the mentees following the third week of class. Freshmen Cadets completed their first physical fitness test (PT test) at this time. This coincidentally encouraged Cadets to seek a mentor in hopes of improving their fitness and PT test score. The application included questions about academic major, knowledge of ROTC, hobbies and interests, and demographic information.

Mentors were also given an application to be a mentor. The application got accountability of a total headcount of mentors and gauged their commitment. Cadets who did not fill out an application were not considered in matching. Mentors filled out the same information as the mentees apart from a picture of themselves in the application. The pictures were then presented to the potential mentees so they could connect a face with the names of the mentors. Decisive to the matching process was the deliberation among the administrative team. The team provided objectivity in the matching process. The team consisted of three Senior Cadets, who were mentors, well versed in the matching criteria of the program. The Cadets were also mentors attending a seminar class with the soon-to-be mentors. The team considered all potential matches and deliberated the benefits and drawbacks. The group deliberated over a week to maintain objectivity when considering the matches.

A week after applications were submitted, matches were completed. A total of 11 matches were made. There were 10 dyads and one triad among the mentors and mentees. The triad consisted of two mentors and one mentee. The two mentors split their roles in

order to prevent giving confusing advice to the mentee. One mentor spoke with the mentor about academic issues and the other focused on integration in the ROTC program.

Mentors were instructed to meet with their mentees once a week during the Fall 2020 semester. Meetings were tracked by the mentor using a spreadsheet to indicate when they met. No detail was given about meetings to adhere to Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and maintain confidentiality. If a mentor failed to meet on their planned date, the administrative team confronted the mentor about meeting on an alternate date. Regardless, mentors and mentees met at least once a week. The purpose of the spreadsheet was to keep mentors accountable with their mentees.

## METHODOLOGY

At the end of the semester, both parties were given a survey to measure satisfaction about their experience. The survey aimed to answer the following questions for mentees:

1. Do you feel like a member of the Battalion? What makes you feel that way?
2. What were your initial impressions about your mentor? What are they now?
3. What characteristics do you believe make a successful mentor?
4. How has PT gone for you this semester? Did your mentor help you improve in PT? If so, how?
5. What have you accomplished this semester that you are proud of? Did your mentor help you accomplish those goals? If so, how?

Mentors were asked the following questions:

A. List 2 SMART Goals set between you and your mentee and why you set them.
B. What were your initial impressions about your Mentee? What improvements have you seen in the mentee?
C. What characteristics do you believe make a successful mentee?

D. What challenges did you face with your mentee? Were you able to overcome them? If so, how? If not, what did you learn?
E. What do you recommend we change about the process?

The survey was constructed to gain a better understanding on the effectiveness of mentorship on the freshmen. The questions for the mentees were written to indicate any intentions of persisting to the second semester and to continue doing ROTC. Responses to the first question were coded in "yes", "no", and "indifferent" depending on the wording of the response. A "yes" response would mention some attachment to the Battalion with elaboration. Positive responses would be like "I feel like a member of the Battalion". A "no" response contained an answer that showed no desire to continue with the program. Indifference was coded from responses that gave no indication of attachment or intentions to leave the program. Mentee responses were coded in this fashion and then run through a chi-square analysis to determine if there was a significant attachment of freshman Cadets attached to the Battalion.

The rationale of the first question was also coded. Cadets responded on why they felt attached to the Battalion. Those reasons were sorted into four categories: Camaraderie, Work Environment, Mentor-Related, and Inclusion. Camaraderie was coded from responses that mentioned the Battalion being the reason for persisting. Responses that were categorized in "Camaraderie" had keywords such as "family" and "friends to count on". Mentees who listed the content of ROTC classes and PT for their main reason for attachment were put into the "Work Environment" category. Any response that solely accredited the mentor for persisting was categorized into "Mentor-related". Mentees indicating the welcoming atmosphere of the ROTC program for attachment and being able to participate was classified as "Inclusion". The hypothesis of

this question, *H1,* is that mentorship was the cause of persistence in mentees. The null hypothesis, *N1,* is that there was no influence from outside sources on the mentees decision to persist.

Analysis of the mentor's impact on mentees was also performed. The responses of questions 4 and 5 were coded to show impacts ranging from "positive," "negative," and "no impact." The context of the mentees' responses was the factor in coding. Any praise to the mentor was coded as "positive impact" whereas criticism of the mentor was coded as "negative impact." An example of a positive response would be "I like how my mentor motivated me to achieve Goal X." Negative responses followed the lines of "I did not like how my mentor did X and Y." Any response that did not compliment or criticize the mentor was coded as "no impact". The responses were sorted in the three categories and then put through a chi-square analysis in order to test whether mentorship had a positive effect on the mentees. The prediction for this question, *H2,* was that mentors gave a positive impact on mentees in the Fall semester. The null, *N2*, was that mentors had no impact whatsoever.

Because ROTC has a physical fitness standard, the improvement of mentee's physical fitness score was also considered. Mentees' Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) scores were recorded by mentors. The APFT consisted of push-ups, sit-ups, and a two-mile run. The maximum score in the APFT was 300. The Army had recently implemented a new exam, the Army Combat Fitness Test (ACFT). The ACFT consisted of six events: 3-rep max deadlift, the standing power throw, hand-release push-ups, sprint-drag-carry, leg tucks, and a two-mile run. The maximum score of the ACFT was

600. Because of the drastic change of events and grading standards, a comparison of the APFT gross score could not be compared to the gross score of the ACFT.

Mentees were asked in what events they improved in Question 4 and whether their mentor helped them with that. Responses were coded to "Improvement" and "No Improvement". Responses that reported an increased score in any event was categorized as an "Improvement". No reports of any score improvement or omission of scores were categorized as "No Improvement". The data was put through a chi-square analysis. The hypothesis, *H3,* was that there was physical fitness improvement among the freshmen. The null hypothesis, *N3,* was that there was no physical fitness improvement. The "Improvement" responses were further categorized as whether the mentor had any part in it or not. Any response indicating that the mentor helped was sorted into "PT Plan Established by Mentor". No response accrediting the mentor for their improvement was categorized as "No Plan from Mentor".

The second part of the survey was specifically for mentors. Mentors' goal-setting skills were analyzed. Mentors were asked to list two SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) goals for their mentee and their reasoning behind it. The SMART Goals were sorted into four types: Academic, Fitness, College Transition, and Leadership. The categories of goals are defined below:

- Academic: Goals pertaining to classroom studies and GPA. Improving study habits falls under this category.
- Fitness: Goals pertaining to APFT or ACFT improvement. This also includes weight concerns.

- Lifestyle: Goals pertaining to becoming a better college student such as getting more organized.
- Leadership: Goals oriented in the mentees' desires to take leadership roles in school clubs, Greek Life, or ROTC.

All the goals were sorted and then analyzed to see if mentors preferred to set a particular type of goal. My hypothesis, *H4,* was that academic goals would be set over others because they are relatively easy to set. This was tested by running another chi-square hypothesis with the null, *N4,* being that there is no preference in goal setting.

The efficacy of mentors was also tested. Question 5 asks mentees if they had accomplished the goals set by the mentors. The responses showed which goals were accomplished and which were not. The goals were categorized as "Accomplished" or "Failed" and classified in the same 4 types as *H4.* Percentage of accomplished goals was taken to find which type of goal was the most completed (See Table 1).

**Table 1.** *Table of Hypotheses*

| | |
|---|---|
| *H1* | Mentees will report a positive attachment to the Battalion because they have a mentor. |
| *N1* | Mentees will be indifferent to their attachment to the Battalion after being mentored for a semester. |
| *H2* | Mentors have a positive impact on the development of the mentees within ROTC. |
| *N2* | Mentors have no impact on the mentees' development within ROTC. |
| *H3* | Mentors facilitated improvement in their mentees' physical fitness. |
| *N3* | Mentors' involvement had no influence on the mentees' physical fitness. |
| *H4* | Mentors set more academic SMART goals with mentees due to academic goals being paramount in both adjustment to college life and ROTC. |
| *N4* | Mentors had no preference in what type of goal to set with their mentees from the four categories presented. |

## RESULTS

Mentors and mentees from the university's ROTC Program participants were 11 freshmen Cadets who were mentees and 12 upperclassmen Cadets who served as mentors. Dyads were matched by academic discipline (81%) apart from one triad. Academic Disciplines included STEM (36%), Business (11%), and Social Sciences (53%).

Findings revealed the overall efficacy of the mentors and their effect on mentees' transition into the ROTC program. These included (1) 90% of mentees reported that they

will persist onto their second semester with the ROTC program due to program wide camaraderie; (2) 63% of mentees reported mentors having a positive impact on their time in the program; (3) 72% of mentors played a direct role in the fitness development of their mentees; and (4) mentors set more goals related to physical fitness and achieved most goals they set with their mentees.

### Hypothesis 1: Attachment

Ten of the eleven mentees reported that they felt attached to the Battalion at the end of the semester and they saw no reason for dropping ROTC (see Table 2). A chi-square analysis shows that the mentees' responses were significant and N1 cannot be accepted. Because the sample size of mentors and mentees is small, the standard deviation can be ignored.

**Table 2.** *Persistence of Mentees*

| Category | Number | Percentage | Chi Square | Std Dev | STD DEV percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 10 | 0.909091 | 0.993262 | 4.496913 | 0.40881 |
| Indifferent | 1 | 0.090909 | 0.393469 | | |
| No | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total | 11 | 1 | 1.386731 | | |

Out of the ten who showed an attachment to the Battalion, 50% of Cadets described the "Camaraderie" from the program (see Table 3). The Cadets defended their attachment by stating they "found a new home" and "I have people who care about me". The Cadets who did not state camaraderie as their primary reason for attachment showed attachment in other aspects in ROTC. Thirty percent (30%) of mentees reported that "participating in MIL 101 and volunteer activities" were enough to return for another semester. The other 20% mentioned that their mentor or some other member in the

Battalion, such as cadre (instructors of Military Science classes), made them feel "welcomed" to the program.

**Table 3.** *Reasons for Persistence*

| Reasons for Yes | Number of Responses | Percent of Mentees |
|---|---|---|
| Camaraderie | 5 | 0.5 |
| Work Environment | 3 | 0.3 |
| Mentor Related | 1 | 0.1 |
| Inclusion | 1 | 0.1 |

## Hypothesis 2: Impact of Mentors

The impact mentors had on mentees was recorded as well. Hypothesis 2 aimed to find the type of impact mentors had on mentees their first semester. Sixty-three percent (63%) of the mentees reported that their mentors had a positive impact in their first semester in ROTC (see Table 4). Thirty-seven percent (37%) of mentees reported that ther mentor had no impact on their first semester or just did not mention their mentee in their development. The chi-square value of this data is significant, therefore N2 cannot be accepted. H2 can be accepted in that mentors did have a positive impact on mentees their first semester.

**Table 4.** *Impact of Mentors*

| Impressions of Mentor | | |
|---|---|---|
| Type of Impact | Number | Chi Square |
| Positive Impact | 7 | 0.969803 |
| No Impact | 4 | 0.864665 |
| Negative Impact | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 11 | 1.834467 |

### Hypothesis 3: PT Development

The role of the mentor in the athletic development of mentees was considered in Hypothesis 3. Seventy-two percent (72%) of mentees showed improvement in one of the events in the ACFT or the APFT over the semester (see Table 5). The eight Cadets who improved physically reported that their mentors were directly involved in their improvement. Mentees stated that mentors "built a plan" for them and some system of accountability. The 28% of Cadets who did not improve in fitness did not indicate whether their mentor created a program to follow. The chi-square value of this data set is significant and N3 cannot be accepted.

**Table 5.** *PT Development of Mentees*

| Pt Improvement from Mentor | | Chi Square |
|---|---|---|
| Improvement | 8 | 0.995322 |
| No Improvement | 3 | 0.916735 |
| Total | 11 | 2.828793 |

### Hypothesis 4: SMART Goal Trends

The nature of the goals set by mentors was analyzed in the Question A. Mentors were asked to set at least 2 SMART Goals with their mentee. A total of 25 goals were set among the 11 dyads/triads (see Table 6). Goals aimed at improving mentees physical fitness (PT) were 40% of all the goals set. Academic goals were second to PT at 36% followed by lifestyle (20%) and then campus leadership (4%). Mentees mentioned whether their goals were accomplished or not in Question 5. 19 of the 25 goals were successfully accomplished, noting that PT-oriented goals were the most achieved (see Table 7).

**Table 6.** *SMART Goals Set by Mentors*

| SMART Goals Set | Number Set | Expected | Chi Square Value | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic | 9 | 8.333333 | 0.029291 | 0.36 |
| Lifestyle | 5 | 8.333333 | 0.171797 | 0.2 |
| PT | 10 | 8.333333 | 0.018566 | 0.4 |
| Leadership | 1 | 8.333333 | 0.801252 | 0.04 |
| Total | 25 | 25 | 1.020906 | 1 |

**Table 7.** *SMART Goals Achieved by Mentees*

| Goals Achieved | |
|---|---|
| Type of Goal | Number Achieved |
| Academic | 5 |
| Lifestyle | 5 |
| PT | 8 |
| Leadership | 1 |

## DISCUSSION

Ten of the 12 mentees who enrolled in the mentorship program made the decision to persist to the next semester. The persistence rate was 83% due to being involved in the mentorship program. Seeing how the original ROTC persistence rate was 50%, this was a significant improvement. The two mentees who did not persist did not list academic reasons for not persisting. Mentees who persisted onto the second semester did not attribute all the credit the mentor; they rather praised the environment and inclusion from their peers in ROTC. The term “camaraderie” was used by mentees when they explained the cause for their attachment and persistence in the program.

Data from Table 3 does not seem to support Hypothesis 1 in which mentorship would be the sole cause of persistence within the Battalion. Although the mentees persisted, it was due to the “Camaraderie” from the program. Mentees responded that

their attachment was not solely due to their mentor, but rather a community effort. This finding is a bit striking when the isolating nature of COVID-19 restrictions are considered. Although peer mentorship can be considered a part of the inclusion felt by mentees, the environment of ROTC seems to be an "x factor" in persistence among the freshmen. Physical training improvement and persistence were connected in the responses. Mentees mentioned that PT was a "shared suffering" or "character building" experience with their peers. The data from Tables 2 and 3 suggest that there was a trend between persistence and PT. After speaking with a few of the cadre in the program, they agree that PT and camaraderie are correlated. Some even argued that the purpose of PT was not to build fitness, but to build teams. More research will have to be conducted on how much PT influences camaraderie among Cadets.

Mentors did have a positive impact with the mentees' development and transition into their first semester in ROTC. Mentees briefly mentioned their mentor impact in their first semester in ROTC. Hypothesis 2 stated that mentors would have a positive impact on their mentees their first semester. The data in Table 4 showed seven of mentees reported that mentors did have a positive impact in their first semester. Four of the mentees did not explicitly state their mentor impacted their first semester. This trend reflects that camaraderie was the staple of persistence among the mentees. Mentees with a positive impact from their mentors reported that mentors were directly responsible for including them. For the mentees who reported no impact, the community of ROTC was accredited for their positive experience. The response could include the mentor, but the answer was not specific in saying who made their experience in ROTC positive.

SMART Goals set by mentors revolved around PT and academics. Although the number of goals set between PT and academics were close, many more PT goals were accomplished. The trend shows two things about the mentors: they have the knowledge and experience to incorporate some sort of fitness regimen in mentees' schedules and slightly valued fitness over academics. The trend of goals set vs. goals accomplished points toward PT being a unifying and developing factor in the mentees' transition. There were not that many lifestyle goals compared to PT and academics, yet mentees persisted with a strong attachment to the Battalion. The favoritism of PT over academics lies in ROTC's foundations. PT is a staple in the program and every Cadet is expected to uphold a standard of physical fitness. This was the rationale from mentors when setting goals with their mentees.

It is worth mentioning that academic and fitness related goals are easier to set than others. Fitness and academics have built-in metrics that mentors and mentees can use to monitor progress. Other life goals, like getting organized or joining a club, lack defined metrics. On the other hand, they seem easier to achieve. All lifestyle goals were accomplished by the mentees. Self-discipline was the crux of the goals, mentors wanted mentees to start using planners and set definitive times to study. To account for this, mentors stated that the goals were accomplished when the mentees could perform without any guidance for a set amount of time. When mentors could a tangible metric like a letter grade, they knew they could develop a habit in mentees. A habit that could be developed was the metric set by mentors. Mentors noted that they took a "hands-on" approach to this.

When it came to PT goals, however, mentors used a lasseiz-faire method with their mentees. Mentors reported that they collaborated with mentees to set up a fitness program to improve their PT test scores and reach weight goals. Mentors understood that mentees were novices at fitness but did not tell them how to follow a program. One mentor reported going to the gym with their mentee to show them how to lift weights. It is surprising that most other mentors did not take this approach. Mentors skipped a step in educating mentees about fitness: demonstration. Although PT goals were the most set and accomplished, it seems mentors did not follow through this goal with as much scrutiny as they did for lifestyle goals. It can be argued that this lies within the self-discipline of the mentee, but the lifestyle goals show that mentees were able to develop a sense of discipline. Because PT is a keystone in ROTC culture, it is curious to why mentors were more lax on this aspect. This could be due to the required PT that the mentee attended.

The goal setting tendencies of mentors are reflective of the culture brought about by the expectations of ROTC. This study did not cover that aspect in any fashion. Although peer mentorship initiated a program-wide culture change directed toward inclusion, it is too early to see the effects in mentees. Avenues of future research include a longitudinal study on the effect of peer mentorship in ROTC culture and the effects of PT and camaraderie felt by Cadets.

Questions 3 and C, asking about the characteristics of a good mentor and mentee, were inconclusive because everyone gave a different answer. The question was aimed to try and find qualities of ROTC-specific peer mentors. A hypothesis was initially made to see if effective communication would be a theme among answers, it was later discarded

after receiving the survey results. The qualities of effective peer mentors have been studied multiple times among different disciplines. The premier qualities of effective mentoring relationships exhibit open communication and accessibility; (2) goals and challenges; (3) passion and inspiration; (4) caring personal relationship; (5) mutual respect and trust; (6) exchange of knowledge; (7) independence and collaboration; and (8) role modeling (Eller et al. 2014). Other than the PT aspect, responses for Questions 3 and C were similar to Eller et al.'s results.

The mentorship program's goal was to ensure persistence in freshmen exhibiting the first-year adjustment reaction. The goals mentors set with mentees culminated to persistence. It was a mistake to categorize goals dedicated to adjustment because all goals set aided the mentee's transition into ROTC. Future iterations of mentorship can replace the "Lifestyle" goals with "Time Management." The main goal was of the program was accomplished, but the program can be refined to make recruiting and mentoring smoother.

**Limitations**

The pool of Cadets for mentors and mentees was small compared to most mentorship studies, with only 10 dyads and one triad. Trends that seem to apply with the sample group may not be applicable to the larger pool of Cadets. In terms of the Battalion, 20% of WKU Cadets participated. This is too small a sample to apply trends to ROTC-specific mentors.

The voluntary nature of recruitment of mentors and mentees showed a volunteer bias. The Cadets who applied to be a mentor were not representative of the entire ROTC population. The same is true for the mentees. Future research would need to expand the number of dyads to get an accurate representation of mentors and mentees in ROTC.

Responses to the survey only identified positive characteristics from the mentees' perspectives. Mentees were asked to elaborate on the positive experience of being mentored. There might have been some pressure from the mentor to leave a positive review. Instead of written surveys, future assessment of mentoring should be individual interviews with both mentors and mentees to ascertain the nature of their relationship. Mentee's input for program improvements should be considered as well.

A problem did arise when the mentors filled out the surveys. Instead of answering each question individually, they wrote an essay that covered their experiences as a mentor. Coding the responses from the mentors was needlessly difficult due to the format of the mentors' responses.

## CONCLUSION

In this project, a peer mentorship program was crafted to increase persistence in Western Kentucky's ROTC program. Freshmen in the program were matched with Junior and Senior Cadets of similar majors. Mentors were tasked with helping mentees transition from high school to college and Cadet life. Key components to this transition were goal setting, connection of campus and ROTC resources, and social support. Many of the mentees who were mentored returned to the program for another semester, improving the program's persistence rate from 50% to 83%. Additionally, mentees reported an atmosphere that promoted camaraderie as the primary reason for persistence. Mentors actively engaged with mentees in setting goals that targeted academic improvement, fitness development, and transitioning into Cadet life. Mentees accomplished 19 out of the 25 goals that were set by mentors, including all transition-

related goals. Findings can be used as a model to develop future mentorship of Cadets and increase the persistence rate of the program. Educators can modify the method of mentoring or matching as needed, thereby reinforcing the attachment between dyads and attachment to the program.

# REFERENCES


Aagaard, E. & Hauer, K. (2003). A cross-sectional descriptive study of mentoring relationships formed by medical students. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 18*(4), 298-302.

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Chao, G. T., & Bauer, T. N. (2017). Taking stock of two relational aspects of organizational life: Tracing the history and shaping the future of socialization and mentoring research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(3), 324–337.

Army Command and General Staff College. (2000). Development of a formal army officer mentorship model for the twenty-first century. *Department of The Army*, 1-99.

Boyle, P., &, Boice, B. (1998). Systematic mentoring for new faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 22*(3), 1-23.

Carmel, R., & Paul, M.W. (2015). Mentoring and coaching in academia: Reflections on a mentoring/coaching relationship. *Policy Futures in Education, 13*(4), 479-491.

Collier, P. J. (2015). *Building an effective peer mentorship program.* Sterling, Virginia : Stylus Publishing LLC.

Crampuzano, R., A, & Cook. A. (2017). A call for an effective mentorship program. *Infantry Magazine*. *106*(2), 9-15.

Eby, L., Butts, M., Durley, J., & Ragins, B. (2010). Are bad experiences stronger than good ones in mentoring relationships? Evidence from the protégé and mentor perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior 77,* 81–92.

Eller, L. S., Lev, E. L., & Feurer, A. (2014). Key components of an effective mentoring relationship: a qualitative study. *Nurse Education Today, 34*(5), 815–820. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.07.020

Fletcher, S., & Mullen, C. (2012). Overviews of mentoring and coaching in S. Fletcher (Ed.), S*AGE handbook of mentoring and coaching in education* (pp. 5-24). SAGE Publications Inc.

Helbig, T., Byrd, A., Davis, L., Estes, S., Foraker, M., Hamlet. S., & Mansur, I. (2020). Student profile in T. Helbig. *WKU Fact Book 2020* (pp 20-58). Western Kentucky University

Humboldt State University Institutional Research & Planning. (2013). Retention and graduation rate initiative report 2013. Retrieved from http://www.humboldt.edu/irp/Reports/Retention_Report/RETENTION_REPORT_2013.pdfpp

Kneipp, L.B., Kelly, K.E., & Cyphers, B. (2009). Feeling at peace with college: religiosity, spiritual well-being, and college adjustment, *Individual Differences Research, 7*(3), 188-196.

McRae, M., & Zimmerman, K. (2019). Identifying components of success within health sciences-focused mentoring programs through a review of the literature. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 83*(1), 69-76.

Nick, J., Delahoyde, T.M., Prato, D.M., Mitchell, C., Ortiz, J., Ottley, C., Young, P., Cannon, S., Lasater, K., Reising, D., & Siktberg, L. (2012). Best practices in academic mentoring: a model for excellence. *Nursing Research and Practice, 2012*.

Ramachandran, R., & Rodriguez, M. (2020) Student perspectives on remote learning in a large organic chemistry lecture course. *Journal of Chemical Education, 97*(9), 2565-2572.

Terion, J., & Leonard, D. (2007). A taxonomy of the characteristics of student peer mentors in higher education: findings from a literature review. *Mentoring and Learning: Partnership in Learning, 15*(2), 149-164.

Tinoco-Giraldo, H., Torrecilla Sánchez, E., & García-Peñalvo, F. (2020). E-mentoring in higher education: a structured literature review and implications for future research. *Sustainability*. *12*(22), 4344.

Wilson, C. B., Brannan, J., & White, A. (2010). A mentor-protégé program for new faculty, Part II: Stories of mentors. *The Journal of Nursing Education*, *49*(12), 665–671. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20100730-08

## APPENDIX A: $\chi^2$ Table of Probability

**Chi-square Distribution Table**

| d.f. | .995 | .99 | .975 | .95 | .9 | .1 | .05 | .025 | .01 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 2.71 | 3.84 | 5.02 | 6.63 |
| 2 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 4.61 | 5.99 | 7.38 | 9.21 |
| 3 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.35 | 0.58 | 6.25 | 7.81 | 9.35 | 11.34 |
| 4 | 0.21 | 0.30 | 0.48 | 0.71 | 1.06 | 7.78 | 9.49 | 11.14 | 13.28 |
| 5 | 0.41 | 0.55 | 0.83 | 1.15 | 1.61 | 9.24 | 11.07 | 12.83 | 15.09 |
| 6 | 0.68 | 0.87 | 1.24 | 1.64 | 2.20 | 10.64 | 12.59 | 14.45 | 16.81 |
| 7 | 0.99 | 1.24 | 1.69 | 2.17 | 2.83 | 12.02 | 14.07 | 16.01 | 18.48 |
| 8 | 1.34 | 1.65 | 2.18 | 2.73 | 3.49 | 13.36 | 15.51 | 17.53 | 20.09 |
| 9 | 1.73 | 2.09 | 2.70 | 3.33 | 4.17 | 14.68 | 16.92 | 19.02 | 21.67 |
| 10 | 2.16 | 2.56 | 3.25 | 3.94 | 4.87 | 15.99 | 18.31 | 20.48 | 23.21 |
| 11 | 2.60 | 3.05 | 3.82 | 4.57 | 5.58 | 17.28 | 19.68 | 21.92 | 24.72 |
| 12 | 3.07 | 3.57 | 4.40 | 5.23 | 6.30 | 18.55 | 21.03 | 23.34 | 26.22 |
| 13 | 3.57 | 4.11 | 5.01 | 5.89 | 7.04 | 19.81 | 22.36 | 24.74 | 27.69 |
| 14 | 4.07 | 4.66 | 5.63 | 6.57 | 7.79 | 21.06 | 23.68 | 26.12 | 29.14 |
| 15 | 4.60 | 5.23 | 6.26 | 7.26 | 8.55 | 22.31 | 25.00 | 27.49 | 30.58 |
| 16 | 5.14 | 5.81 | 6.91 | 7.96 | 9.31 | 23.54 | 26.30 | 28.85 | 32.00 |
| 17 | 5.70 | 6.41 | 7.56 | 8.67 | 10.09 | 24.77 | 27.59 | 30.19 | 33.41 |
| 18 | 6.26 | 7.01 | 8.23 | 9.39 | 10.86 | 25.99 | 28.87 | 31.53 | 34.81 |
| 19 | 6.84 | 7.63 | 8.91 | 10.12 | 11.65 | 27.20 | 30.14 | 32.85 | 36.19 |
| 20 | 7.43 | 8.26 | 9.59 | 10.85 | 12.44 | 28.41 | 31.41 | 34.17 | 37.57 |
| 22 | 8.64 | 9.54 | 10.98 | 12.34 | 14.04 | 30.81 | 33.92 | 36.78 | 40.29 |
| 24 | 9.89 | 10.86 | 12.40 | 13.85 | 15.66 | 33.20 | 36.42 | 39.36 | 42.98 |
| 26 | 11.16 | 12.20 | 13.84 | 15.38 | 17.29 | 35.56 | 38.89 | 41.92 | 45.64 |
| 28 | 12.46 | 13.56 | 15.31 | 16.93 | 18.94 | 37.92 | 41.34 | 44.46 | 48.28 |
| 30 | 13.79 | 14.95 | 16.79 | 18.49 | 20.60 | 40.26 | 43.77 | 46.98 | 50.89 |
| 32 | 15.13 | 16.36 | 18.29 | 20.07 | 22.27 | 42.58 | 46.19 | 49.48 | 53.49 |
| 34 | 16.50 | 17.79 | 19.81 | 21.66 | 23.95 | 44.90 | 48.60 | 51.97 | 56.06 |
| 38 | 19.29 | 20.69 | 22.88 | 24.88 | 27.34 | 49.51 | 53.38 | 56.90 | 61.16 |
| 42 | 22.14 | 23.65 | 26.00 | 28.14 | 30.77 | 54.09 | 58.12 | 61.78 | 66.21 |
| 46 | 25.04 | 26.66 | 29.16 | 31.44 | 34.22 | 58.64 | 62.83 | 66.62 | 71.20 |
| 50 | 27.99 | 29.71 | 32.36 | 34.76 | 37.69 | 63.17 | 67.50 | 71.42 | 76.15 |
| 55 | 31.73 | 33.57 | 36.40 | 38.96 | 42.06 | 68.80 | 73.31 | 77.38 | 82.29 |
| 60 | 35.53 | 37.48 | 40.48 | 43.19 | 46.46 | 74.40 | 79.08 | 83.30 | 88.38 |
| 65 | 39.38 | 41.44 | 44.60 | 47.45 | 50.88 | 79.97 | 84.82 | 89.18 | 94.42 |
| 70 | 43.28 | 45.44 | 48.76 | 51.74 | 55.33 | 85.53 | 90.53 | 95.02 | 100.43 |
| 75 | 47.21 | 49.48 | 52.94 | 56.05 | 59.79 | 91.06 | 96.22 | 100.84 | 106.39 |
| 80 | 51.17 | 53.54 | 57.15 | 60.39 | 64.28 | 96.58 | 101.88 | 106.63 | 112.33 |
| 85 | 55.17 | 57.63 | 61.39 | 64.75 | 68.78 | 102.08 | 107.52 | 112.39 | 118.24 |
| 90 | 59.20 | 61.75 | 65.65 | 69.13 | 73.29 | 107.57 | 113.15 | 118.14 | 124.12 |
| 95 | 63.25 | 65.90 | 69.92 | 73.52 | 77.82 | 113.04 | 118.75 | 123.86 | 129.97 |
| 100 | 67.33 | 70.06 | 74.22 | 77.93 | 82.36 | 118.50 | 124.34 | 129.56 | 135.81 |

# APPENDIX B: ARMY ACFT STANDARDS (AS OF 1 OCT 19)

| Points | MDL | SPT | HRP | SDC | LTK | 2MR | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100 | 340 | 12.5 | 60 | 1:33 | 20 | 13:30 | |
| 99 | | 12.4 | 59 | 1:36 | | 13:39 | |
| 98 | | 12.2 | 58 | 1:39 | 19 | 13:48 | |
| 97 | 330 | 12.1 | 57 | 1:41 | | 13:57 | |
| 96 | | 11.9 | 56 | 1:43 | 18 | 14:06 | |
| 95 | | 11.8 | 55 | 1:45 | | 14:15 | |
| 94 | 320 | 11.6 | 54 | 1:46 | 17 | 14:24 | |
| 93 | | 11.5 | 53 | 1:47 | | 14:33 | |
| 92 | 310 | 11.3 | 52 | 1:48 | 16 | 14:42 | |
| 91 | | 11.2 | 51 | 1:49 | | 14:51 | |
| 90 | 300 | 11.0 | 50 | 1:50 | 15 | 15:00 | |
| 89 | | 10.9 | 49 | 1:51 | | 15:09 | |
| 88 | 290 | 10.7 | 48 | 1:52 | 14 | 15:18 | |
| 87 | | 10.6 | 47 | 1:53 | | 15:27 | |
| 86 | 280 | 10.4 | 46 | 1:54 | 13 | 15:36 | |
| 85 | | 10.3 | 45 | 1:55 | | 15:45 | |
| 84 | 270 | 10.1 | 44 | 1:56 | 12 | 15:54 | |
| 83 | | 10.0 | 43 | 1:57 | | 16:03 | |
| 82 | 260 | 9.8 | 42 | 1:58 | 11 | 16:12 | |
| 81 | | 9.7 | 41 | 1:59 | | 16:21 | |
| 80 | 250 | 9.5 | 40 | 2:00 | 10 | 16:30 | |
| 79 | | 9.4 | 39 | 2:01 | | 16:39 | |
| 78 | 240 | 9.2 | 38 | 2:02 | 9 | 16:48 | |
| 77 | | 9.1 | 37 | 2:03 | | 16:57 | |
| 76 | 230 | 8.9 | 36 | 2:04 | 8 | 17:06 | |
| 75 | | 8.8 | 35 | 2:05 | | 17:15 | |
| 74 | 220 | 8.6 | 34 | 2:06 | 7 | 17:24 | |
| 73 | | 8.5 | 33 | 2:07 | | 17:33 | |
| 72 | 210 | 8.3 | 32 | 2:08 | 6 | 17:42 | |
| 71 | | 8.2 | 31 | 2:09 | | 17:51 | |
| 70 | 200 | 8.0 | 30 | 2:10 | 5 | 18:00 | HVY |
| 69 | | 7.8 | 28 | 2:14 | | 18:12 | |
| 68 | 190 | 7.5 | 26 | 2:18 | 4 | 18:24 | |
| 67 | | 7.1 | 24 | 2:22 | | 18:36 | |
| 66 | | 6.8 | 22 | 2:26 | | 18:48 | |
| 65 | 180 | 6.5 | 20 | 2:30 | 3 | 19:00 | SIG |
| 64 | 170 | 6.2 | 18 | 2:35 | | 19:24 | |
| 63 | 160 | 5.8 | 16 | 2:40 | | 19:48 | |
| 62 | 150 | 5.4 | 14 | 2:45 | 2 | 20:12 | |
| 61 | | 4.9 | 12 | 2:50 | | 20:36 | |
| 60 | 140 | 4.5 | 10 | 3:00 | 1 | 21:00 | MOD |
| 59 | | | | 3:01 | | 21:01 | |
| 58 | | | | 3:02 | | 21:03 | |
| 57 | | | | 3:03 | | 21:05 | |
| 56 | | | | 3:04 | | 21:07 | |
| 55 | | 4.4 | 9 | 3:05 | | 21:09 | |
| 54 | | | | 3:06 | | 21:10 | |
| 53 | | | | 3:07 | | 21:12 | |
| 52 | | | | 3:08 | | 21:14 | |
| 51 | | | | 3:09 | | 21:16 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50 | 130 | 4.3 | 8 | 3:10 | | 21:18 |
| 49 | | | | | | 21:19 |
| 48 | | | | 3:11 | | 21:21 |
| 47 | | | | | | 21:23 |
| 46 | | | | 3:12 | | 21:25 |
| 45 | | 4.2 | 7 | | | 21:27 |
| 44 | | | | 3:13 | | 21:28 |
| 43 | | | | | | 21:30 |
| 42 | | | | 3:14 | | 21:32 |
| 41 | | | | | | 21:34 |
| 40 | 120 | 4.1 | 6 | 3:15 | | 21:36 |
| 39 | | | | | | 21:37 |
| 38 | | | | 3:16 | | 21:39 |
| 37 | | | | | | 21:41 |
| 36 | | | | 3:17 | | 21:43 |
| 35 | | 4.0 | 5 | | | 21:45 |
| 34 | | | | 3:18 | | 21:46 |
| 33 | | | | | | 21:48 |
| 32 | | | | 3:19 | | 21:50 |
| 31 | | | | | | 21:52 |
| 30 | 110 | 3.9 | 4 | 3:20 | | 21:54 |
| 29 | | | | | | 21:55 |
| 28 | | | | 3:21 | | 21:57 |
| 27 | | | | | | 21:59 |
| 26 | | | | 3:22 | | 22:01 |
| 25 | | 3.8 | 3 | | | 22:03 |
| 24 | | | | 3:23 | | 22:04 |
| 23 | | | | | | 22:06 |
| 22 | | | | 3:24 | | 22:08 |
| 21 | | | | | | 22:10 |
| 20 | 100 | 3.7 | 2 | 3:25 | | 22:12 |
| 19 | | | | | | 22:13 |
| 18 | | | | 3:26 | | 22:15 |
| 17 | | | | | | 22:17 |
| 16 | | | | 3:27 | | 22:19 |
| 15 | | 3.6 | 1 | | | 22:21 |
| 14 | | | | 3:28 | | 22:22 |
| 13 | | | | | | 22:24 |
| 12 | | | | 3:29 | | 22:26 |
| 11 | | | | | | 22:28 |
| 10 | 90 | 3.5 | | 3:30 | | 22:30 |
| 9 | | | | | | 22:31 |
| 8 | | | | 3:31 | | 22:33 |
| 7 | | | | | | 22:35 |
| 6 | | | | 3:32 | | 22:37 |
| 5 | | 3.4 | | | | 22:39 |
| 4 | | | | 3:33 | | 22:40 |
| 3 | | | | | | 22:42 |
| 2 | | | | 3:34 | | 22:44 |
| 1 | | | | | | 22:46 |
| 0 | 80 | 3.3 | 0 | 3:35 | 0 | 22:48 |