What Protégés and Mentors Report Helped or Hindered the Outcomes of Mentoring Relationships: An Adapted Critical Incident Technique Study

by

Sarah Louise Buydens
B.A., University of Victoria, 2002
M.A., University of Victoria, 2009

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies

Supervisory Committee

What Protégés and Mentors Report Helped or Hindered the Outcomes of Mentoring Relationships: An Adapted Critical Incident Technique Study

by

Sarah Louise Buydens
B.A., University of Victoria, 2002
M.A., University of Victoria, 2009

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Timothy Black, Supervisor
Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies

Dr. David de Rosenroll, Departmental Member
Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies

Dr. Norman Amundson, Outside Member
University of British Columbia
Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, and Special Education

Abstract

How to best conduct a mentoring relationship has been confounded by the lack of a consistent definition of "mentoring" and the scarcity of studies addressing how to achieve a positive outcome. This study contributes new, operationalized definitions of "mentoring," "mentor," and "protégé," and a modified version of the Critical Incident Technique and the Enhanced Critical Incident Technique, called the Adapted Critical Incident Technique (ACIT), which is more consistent with a qualitative methodology. The researcher interviewed 18 self-described mentors and protégés to obtain 207 quotes about what critical behaviours helped or hindered mentoring relationship outcomes. Independent judges confirmed the placement of quotes into 13 categories of behaviours that helped mentors and protégés to reach the mentoring goals and 10 categories of behaviours that hindered the mentoring outcome. The findings contribute to an increased understanding of the foundation upon which mentors and protégés in all fields may potentially build better programs and training under the guise of mentorship.

Keywords: Mentoring definition, how to mentor, mentoring relationships, Enhanced Critical Incident Technique, Adapted Critical Incident Technique, mentoring, mentor, protégé.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Acknowledgements

Thank you, Dr. Tim Black, for your guidance throughout my master's and PhD. You have been the corner stone of my graduate studies and the source of much of my knowledge as a researcher. Thank you for believing in me, supporting me, and investing your time in me. Thank you for being personal, personable, and for the laughter we shared throughout the years.

Thank you, Dr. David de Rosenroll, for co-teaching with me throughout my PhD. Co-teaching with you has been one of the highlights of my education; it's been a precious gift and a highly influential educational experience. Thank you for enacting an excellent example of *playful seriousness*.

Thank you, Dr. Norm Amundson and Dr. Nancy Arthur, for your encouragement and positive words, for sharing your expertise, and for making me a better researcher.

Heartfelt thanks goes to Elizabeth Holland, Dr. Lucinda Brown, Christine Selder, and Crescent McKeag for your support, humor, and assistance to "get through it all."

I am grateful to my Grandmothers, Phyllis and Clarisse, for the value that they placed on education. This was the catalyst that, passed down through my parents, enabled me to earn a PhD. Thank you for creating the ripple that allowed me to dream a dream this large. My reality has been radically shaped by your unprecedented *hope for better*.

Ab imo pectore (from the bottom of my heart) thank you to my parents, Jean and Gerry, who have been an incredible source of love and support in every imaginable way.

Corey: What incredible support and love you have shown me. Thank you for standing by my side and being *fide et amor* (faithful and loving) through the ups and downs of my degree. Thank you for holding the light when I could not see and for being ready to dance with me in celebration. *Ab imo pectore*, I could not have done this without you.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background to the Study

"Learning begins where learning left off," said one of the outstanding mentors in my life. Neither she nor I knew then, that her encouraging phrase would eventually lead me down my own learning path in search of what helps, or hinders, mentoring relationship outcomes. That path has led me to re-examine the origins of mentoring, the body of research on mentoring, and finally, to question the very definitions at the heart of the mentoring construct. Ultimately, it led me back to questioning why my own mentoring experience was so successful, what behaviours make a mentoring relationship work, and what can make it fail.

Mentoring programs are common-place and are found in many sectors of workplace and leisure activities (Karcher, Kuperminc, Portwood, Sipe, & Taylor, 2006), yet surprisingly little is known about how to reliably produce a successful mentoring outcome, or what behaviours positively or negatively affect an outcome. Part of the challenge is that the literature lacks a consistent, operational definition of what is meant by the term "mentoring" (Armitage & Burnard, 1991). When researchers have not operationally defined a construct, or if their definition is ill formed, then research related to that construct becomes difficult to interpret and apply. In the realm of mentoring, this is a substantial problem, as many organizations have significant amounts of financial and human resources invested in these mentoring programs (Villar & Strong, 2007).

Carr (March 8, 2016) included an extensive list of mentoring programs on his web site (www.mentors.ca), and Ehrich, Hansford, and Tennent (2004) noted more than 300 formal mentoring programs around the world for businesses, police and the military, church and spiritual groups, athletic organizations and educational institutions. Mentoring relationships

exist for senior citizens, graduate students, employees, government workers, entrepreneurs, internship and co-op students, teachers, prisoners, parents, artists, CEOs, executives, and farmers among many others (Carr, March 8, 2016). For example, organizations such as NASA, Sarah Lee Bakery, General Electric, Hallmark, and Proctor & Gamble all have mentoring programs (Carr, March 8, 2016).

The research on mentoring is abundant, with authors having written over 8,000 articles on the subject as of 2010 (Sambunjak, Straus, & Marusic, 2010). Allen and Johnston (1997) stated that more than 500 articles were published on mentoring between 1987 and 1997. Also, despite the proliferation of literature on mentoring, the lack of an agreed-upon definition of the construct, makes it challenging to interpret the research data as a whole (Armitage & Burnard, 1991).

Researcher Context and Positioning

My Master of Arts thesis on the lived experience of women in the Canadian Forces (Buydens, 2009) catalyzed my interest in mentoring research. Most of the themes from my thesis involved women reporting negative experiences, such as people calling them a “slut” or a “lesbian” (p. 82), people seeing them as less capable than men (p. 83), and people treating them like “dirt” (p. 87). The participants also shared how relationships with certain individuals had had a positive impact on them, wherein they felt supported, encouraged, accepted, and included. I found it fascinating that one positive relationship could make such a remarkable impact and I wanted to better understand the positive relationships that the participants had described.

It was during the course of my research into positive relationships that I came across the subject of mentoring and its many benefits. Although I had experienced mentoring as a relationship that could positively enhance learning outcomes, I suspected that it could also have a

negative impact. I knew that if I were to investigate the topic, I would want to look at both sides so that I could examine the positive and the negative components of mentoring relationships and how these components influenced the relationship outcomes. As the current study evolved, I saw that mentoring had the potential to assist people in many environments from work, to personal life, to being a client in counselling, but it was from my own early experiences that I began to really connect with, and consider, the concept of mentoring.

My first experience with mentoring was an example of the good side of mentoring and its positive effects. In my elementary school, in grade one, I was assigned a "buddy." Her name was Theresa and she was in grade five at the time. Theresa's role was to show me around the school, make me feel welcome, and help me integrate into the school environment.

We played together, exchanged cards and crafts, and talked about how school was going. Theresa asked me about who my friends were, what I liked about school and my teacher, and showed me "cool" things such as where to find the bathroom on the second floor. I liked Theresa and was glad she was my "buddy." Our relationship lasted three years, ending when Theresa moved to attend high school.

When I reached grade five, I directly experienced how mentoring can go wrong. When it was my turn to mentor my own "buddy" from grade one, I remember feeling excited about having a "buddy" as I fondly recalled my relationship with Theresa; I thought this was going to be a lot of fun!

When I first met Nancy I asked myself "Was I that small when Theresa met me?" I took my responsibility seriously and wanted to be the best "buddy" ever; I wanted to be there for Nancy just like Theresa had been for me. I imaged that Nancy and I would bond and enjoy each

other's company. It never occurred to me that our relationship would be any different than the one that Theresa and I had shared, but it was.

Nancy and I did not seem to have much in common. She was quiet and always waited for me to initiate everything in our interactions. She showed no interest in playing with me on the playground equipment, did not have much of an opinion about her teacher, classmates, or school, and she did not even want to know where the bathrooms were on the second floor! I found talking with her difficult. Every "playtime" together seemed long and I found I was not looking forward to the next one. When I asked Nancy what she'd like to do in our play time, she brought me books and asked me to read them to her; the same books over and over again. I began to dread our time together.

As my boredom grew, I became less interested in being a "buddy" to Nancy. I recall looking at some of the other buddy-pairs who seemed to be enjoying each other's company and thinking, "I wonder if I can switch and get a different buddy?" When I think back to *why* I wanted to switch, I cannot think of anything "wrong" with Nancy. She was well behaved, polite, and respectful. She listened to her teacher and to me, was compliant and helped, when asked. What I struggled with was that Nancy and I had nothing in common and our personalities did not seem to be a good fit. While I enjoyed talkative interactions where we explored our environment and did things together, Nancy, in contrast, enjoyed quiet time and wanted to sit and be read to. She was not the kind of person I looked for in a "little buddy" and I did not get a sense from her that I was her kind of person either. We did not naturally enjoy our time together. The two of us were not a good match.

After about a year and a half, our school shortened their mentoring-buddy program from three years to one year. This meant my time with Nancy was over and I felt relieved. Our time

together had not been “bad” but it was also not great, and I cannot recall with any certainty, if I had helped Nancy feel welcome or more settled at our school. I do not believe, as a “buddy”, that I had a negative effect on Nancy. However, I do not think I had a positive one either. What did stick with me from the “buddy” experiences was that when mentoring goes poorly, both mentor and protégé may be left with a sense of unease. When it goes well, it opens up a world of possibilities, including second floor bathrooms!

My first mentoring experiences helped shaped my perspectives on the subject. Given that “perspectives precede perceptions” (Wilber, 1998), I recognized that it was important that I, as a qualitative researcher, began my investigation by reflecting on and examining my own beliefs. Bourke (2014) noted, “the concept of self as research instrument reflects the likelihood that the researcher’s own subjectivity will come to bear on the research project and subsequent reporting of the findings” (Bourke, 2014, p. 2). In order to understand how my beliefs impacted my perceptions surrounding the topic of mentoring relationship outcomes, I needed to reflect on my positionality, wherein “positionality is thus determined by where one stands in relation to ‘the other’” (Merriam, Johnson-Bailey, Lee, Ntseane & Muhamad, 2001, p. 411). I began by answering the same demographic questions that I would go on to ask the research participants with the following responses: “I am a married, Caucasian, Canadian woman with European ancestry, who works as both a doctoral-student and a counsellor.” I then articulated the beliefs that I held that pertained to mentoring. I believe mentoring can be a positive, rewarding experience for both mentor and protégé. I also believe mentoring, if not done right, can be harmful to either person or both people in the relationship. Prior to the current study, I made the assumption that participants would bring forth their experiences with different aspects of

mentoring and I would come to better understand the helpful and hindering behaviours of mentors and protégés.

Ultimately, I believe the benefits that can occur in mentoring make it worth pursuing. I value relationships with positive attachments, open communication, and supportive and caring actions and behaviours. I also value goal setting within relationships. I have based my beliefs about how relationships function and what makes a good relationship on my life experiences as well as my understanding of the theoretical frameworks of relationships. There are two main theories that have influenced my beliefs about relationships, attachment theory (Bowlby, 1982) and social learning theory (Bandura, 1977).

In Attachment Theory, Bowlby (1982) posited that a primary attachment relationship from childhood establishes patterns and expectations in subsequent relationships. Infants attach to their caregiver, their attachment figure, as a way to achieve, or maintain, proximity and this results in the child seeking protection and emotional support from his or her caregiver (Bowlby, 1982). However, the quality of the relationship, and the extent to which the caregiver provides protection and emotional support to the child, differs between individuals and relationships. In a relationship with a sensitive and responsive caregiver, the infant will feel that the caregiver is a "safe base." With a caregiver who is absent or inconsistent, the child may feel unsafe. The child expresses certain behaviours, as a result of his or her primary attachment relationship and in response to the caregiver's interactions with the child, which determine the child's attachment classification. Broadly, the four attachment classifications, and relationships that children may have with caregivers are: secure, anxious-ambivalent, anxious-avoidant, and disorganized (Bowlby, 1982).

These first attachment relationships prime a child to interrelate with others and form the base of the child's expectations, in terms of treatment, within subsequent relationships. Attachment, according to Bowlby (1982), is a learned behaviour that is often operating at an unconscious level. Ainsworth (1970; 2015) found that children learned a pattern of attachment depending on their early care-giving environments and their relationships with primary caregivers. Adults repeated their learned patterns of attachment with other adults, expecting others to treat them the same way that their primary-caregivers did in their early childhood relationships (Ainsworth 1970; 2015).

I believe that people have a foundational way of interacting and engaging in mentoring relationships based on their learned-attachment patterns. That is why some people are able to maintain more positive and healthy patterns of interaction than others. In my understanding of relationships, attachment theory also interweaves with social learning theory (Bandura, 1977).

Bandura (1977) stated that learning is not just a behavioural process but also a cognitive process, where people learn from others through observation, imitation, and/or modeling. Learning also takes place when learners observe the consequences of others' behaviours, although Bandura (1977) emphasized that learners are not passive in this process. A learner's cognitions and behaviours have an impact on what is socially learned. Ongoing relationship and the behaviours that people socially exchange influence dynamic patterns of relationships. This means that social learning is an on-going process through-out life and that individuals react and grow based on their interaction with others. In social learning theory, people bring their beliefs, what they have learned in their past relationships about whether they can trust others, and what behaviours are trustworthy, into their current relationships. Every time someone engages in behaviour, the other person can view the relationship in a positive light and develop trust for that

person, or conversely, view the relationship in a negative light and develop distrust. Often, decisions about what is trustworthy or untrustworthy are based on learning that has occurred from previous social encounters (i.e., whether the earlier behaviours lead to outcomes that were favourable (trustworthy) or unfavorable (untrustworthy)). This informs the person about whether it is safe to continue to engage and invest in the relationship or not.

The overarching theme that joins these two theories is that beliefs, formed and based on experiences and learned behaviours, influence relationships and these experiences and beliefs are alterable. If effective relationships are based upon learned patterns of behaviour, I believe a person who is in an ineffective relationship can learn to engage in helpful behaviours and thereby change the relationship dynamic. I believe people can learn the skills needed to form and maintain effective relationships. I further believe that the current study is important because it has the potential to assist others to better understand helping and hindering behaviours in mentoring relationships. Given my belief that people are capable of altering their social behaviours, or learning new behaviours, if someone wanted to alter the outcome of a mentoring relationship, but did not know how to do so, the results of this study might provide some different behavioural options. Mentoring has the potential to be life-changing. I believe knowing what helps or hinders mentoring can assist people in determining how to best behave in order to encourage a positive mentoring relationship outcome.

The problem is that it is unclear what researchers mean when they use the term “mentoring,” in the literature, as there are no adequate operational definitions of the terms “mentor,” “mentoring,” and ”protégé”. If it is true that, “Learning begins where learning left off,” meaning learning continues on the foundations previously built, then this study begins with addressing some of the questions remaining in the literature and research on mentoring.

The Research Problem

In reviewing the considerable amount of research on mentoring, I was unable to find a consistently employed operational definition of mentoring (e.g., Allen & Johnston, 1997; Feeney & Bozeman, 2008; Malmgren, Ottino, & Nunes Amaral, 2010; Tepper, 1995). I also was unable to find a study that queried the behaviours or incidents that either help or hinder a mentoring-relationship outcome. Extracting the definitions present in the literature, and determining their relevant commonalities, this current study was able to contribute to the field of mentoring research by creating operational definitions of the terms "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring." These definitions were used in investigating what behaviours help, or hinder, the outcome of a mentoring relationship.

The Research Purpose and Research Question

The purpose of this study is to conduct research that focuses on establishing an understanding of what may help or hinder the outcome of mentoring relationships. The study uses the Enhanced Critical Incident Technique (ECIT) method (Butterfield, Borgen, Amundson, & Maglio, 2005; Flanagan, 1954) but with a modification I developed specifically for this study, in order to address issues with the application of the ECIT to qualitative research. I call this modified CIT and ECIT the Adapted Critical Incident Technique or ACIT. The research question is: What do self-described protégés and mentors report helped and/or hindered the outcomes of their mentoring relationships? I provide operational definitions of the terms "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring" based on an extensive review of the extant literature.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Origins of Mentoring

The word "mentoring" is associated with the French verb "protéger," meaning "to protect." The term mentor has been erroneously identified as existing within Homer's, *The Odyssey* (e.g., Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992b; Kram, 1985), when in fact the origin lies within *Les Adventures de Telemaque*, by Fénelon (1699). *Les Adventures de Telemaque* is a story that fills in a gap in Homer's, *The Odyssey*, recounting the educational travels of Telemachus. Telemachus' tutor, a man named Mentor, accompanies him. The character, Mentor, is not only a teacher, but also the real hero of the story. Mentor gives speeches and moralistic advice about how to rule and the necessity of altruism, thereby providing guidance to Telemachus in order to help him create a better world. People began to refer to Mentor's behaviours as "mentoring" and anyone who performed similar actions could be referred to as a "mentor." Many of the actions that came to be thought of as mentoring had their roots in the apprenticeship system, which was a system wherein persons who had already mastered a craft, work-task, or profession used mentoring to assist another to do the same (Monaghan & Lunt, 1992).

Historical Apprenticeship System

Traditionally, apprenticeship was a system of training young people to develop the skills needed for competency in work or craftsmanship (Scott, 1912). There are references to apprenticeship-like arrangements in the historical records of ancient Babylon, Rome, and Egypt dating back thousands of years (Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, 2016). In an apprenticeship, learning takes place in a relationship which is governed by specific goals and relationship expectations (Scott, 1912). This is very similar to modern notions of mentoring,

which often refer to a relationship wherein there is greater experience on the part of the mentor that is being passed on to the protégé (Bozeman, 2007).

The apprenticeship system was traditionally governed by craft guilds and resulted in people earning the right to work based upon developing competencies in their craft. However, by the Middle Ages (i.e., 5th to the 15th century) a master craftsman could employ apprentices as an inexpensive form of labour in exchange for teaching them said craft (Scott, 1912). The apprentice's pay would often be room and board, and the master would contract the apprentice to continue working at the conclusion of the apprenticeship. After the apprentice learned and demonstrated enough competencies in the work, as deemed by the master, the apprenticeship ended and the apprentice could join the profession as a fully-skilled worker, earning the full income associated with that craft (Wallis, 2008). A similar arrangement is also seen in modern mentoring where a protégé can be taught until that person has learned and demonstrated skill and knowledge to the mentor, at which time, the mentoring ends (Wunsch, 1994). Some apprenticeships were based on a previously established length of time and not necessarily the successful acquisition of skills (Levene, 2010). This practice is also evident today in time-limited mentorships where the learner is in a placement for a specific period of time. When the time is up, the placement ends, regardless of whether the protégé has achieved a certain skill level.

Completing an apprenticeship changed the apprentice's status to journeyman, and allowed the person to live separately from the master, have a family, and earn a wage working for the master. The word "journeyman" comes from the French word "journée," which means "a period of one day," and which refers to the journeyman's right to charge a full fee for each day's work. A journeyman could submit a piece of work to the craft guild for assessment and, if it was evaluated to be of high enough quality, the journeyman would be admitted as a master to the

guild, thereby becoming a master to others (Wallis, 2008). Becoming a master not only entitled that person to perform all of the tasks of the trade within the area where he or she was certified to supervise apprentices, but also, to become self-employed.

The construct of mentoring gradually shifted away from the apprenticeship system of the Middle Ages to include mentoring in a range of areas wherein there were no external guilds to determine whether a mentor was qualified to teach a protégé. Originally, a master taught an apprentice a skill from which to earn a living (Wallis, 2008), which then evolved to resemble Fénelon's (1699) account of mentoring, wherein the mentor guided the moral development of the protégé in order that he might create a better world. As such, the application of mentoring gradually expanded over time from a work context to one of personal and moral development. The inclusion of mentoring in work as well as in personal development is still evident today with mentoring relationships existing across all aspects of our work and personal lives (Carr, March 8, 2016; Ehrich et al., 2004).

Research into Mentoring

Research on mentoring was sparse until the end of the 20th century (Eby, Butts, Lockwood, & Simon, 2004). Up until that time, the concept of mentoring borrowed from its mythic origins and often referred to the moral teaching of young children, troubled youth, or to a parental or grandparent-like archetypal relationship between an older individual and one much younger (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978).

The influence of Kram's seminal mentoring study. Kram's (1980) seminal work on mentoring appeared to ignite an explosion of research interest in this area. Her work offered a new definition of the term "mentoring" and coincided with the popularization of the concept and practice in the business arena (Ragins & Kram, 2007). Although the term "mentoring" had come

to refer more to personal development than professional development, Kram (1980, 1983, 1985) examined the construct of mentoring in a work context. In her 1985 book, she focused solely on mentoring and conducted in-depth interviews with 18 pairs of younger and older managers involved in what she called "developmental relationships." From the interviews, Kram formulated a descriptive theory of developmental relationships and this description, in turn, formed the basis of a definition of mentoring that would be used by researchers for years to come (e.g., Bozeman & Feeney, 2007; Bozionelos, 2004; Chao, 1997; Eby, 1997; Ragins, 1997; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000).

Kram's (1985) work was a catalyst for further research and, as such, is foundational in the field of mentoring. However, there are issues with Kram's (1980, 1983, 1985) studies that make it debatable as to whether her work should be used as a basis for other mentoring research. Kram (1980, 1983, 1985) interviewed managers in a large public utility company in the United Sates about their experiences in a "developmental" relationship. The sample population initially consisted of 15 randomly selected young managers between the ages of 25-35, who had been with the organization for more than 3 years, and who were currently in the first, second, or third tier of management. It is noteworthy that the selection criteria did not include whether the person was, or had been, mentored. So, though Kram (1980, 1983, 1985) was interviewing people about their mentoring relationships, having been in a mentoring relationship was not an explicitly stated criterion for participating in the study. This raises concerns about whether Kram (1980, 1983, 1985) was studying the same type of relationship (i.e., mentoring) across all participants, as it is unclear if each participant had been in a mentoring relationship. From the initial random sample, only three suitable relationships emerged, however, Kram (1980, 1983, 1985) never specified what it was that made these relationships suitable and the others not suitable.

Given the lack of initially suitable relationships, Kram (1983) asked for "recommendations from personnel staff of young managers who they believed had developmental relationships" (p.611). However, Kram (1983) made no mention as to whether or not she had provided the people aiding in the selection of participants with an explanation of what constituted a "developmental relationship," nor did Kram (1983) discuss how a "developmental relationship" related to mentoring. These recommendations provided 12 additional participants. Of the 15 suitable participants, some identified additional "developmental relationships", making for a total of 18 pairs of relationships investigated.

Kram (1983) singularly mentioned the construct of the "developmental relationship" in the following sentence: "There is considerable agreement among those who have studied mentoring that in order to understand fully the nature and impact of this developmental relationship, it is necessary to examine how it changes over time" (p.609). Kram (1983) does not clarify whether participants in "developmental relationships" are, in fact, in mentoring relationships, as Kram did not provide a definition of the term "developmental relationship." It seems as though she is equating mentoring in work with a developmental relationship, without defining either.

Kram (1983) conducted two interview sessions with the young managers. In the initial interview "the primary task was to review the young manager's career history and to explore relationships with more senior managers that had been important during his or her life in the organization" (Kram, 1983, p.611- 612). The goal of the second interview "was to explore one or two relationships with senior managers that had been important to the young manager's career" (Kram, 1983, p.612). As with Kram's use of the term "developmental relationship," she was similarly unclear regarding what she meant by an "important relationship." Kram did not provide

the list of questions asked in the interviews so it is unclear how the questions explored the topic of mentoring. If a young manager identified an “important relationship" with a senior manager, that person was then contacted to participate in an interview, which resulted in the next phase of the research. The criterion of having an undefined “important relationship” does not necessarily indicate that mentoring was the basis for the manager’s relationship and therefore, it is difficult to know how to interpret the data from the study.

Additional problems with the definitions make it difficult to apply and understand Kram’s (1983) work. Kram analyzed the research interviews “by an inductive process in which tentative hypotheses concerning developmental relationships were suggested and revised as interviews were conducted” (Kram, 1983, p.613). From the interviews, Kram ascertained that it was through experiences called “career functions”, which included “sponsorship,” “exposure-and-visibility,” “coaching,” “protection,” and “challenging assignments,” that the young managers had learned about the organization. As well, Kram asserted that through experiences called “psychosocial functions,” which included “role-modelling,” “acceptance-and-confirmation,” “counselling,” and “friendship,” the young managers developed a sense of competence, confidence, and effectiveness in the managerial role. Kram (1983) did not describe how the constructs of these functions and their components were identified, what was involved in the process of deriving the constructs from the data, if and how the constructs were tested for validity, and how interview material was deemed useful or not useful. Kram’s (1983) work also lacked an explanation of the tentative hypothesis developed prior to the interviews, how she revised this hypothesis (see Kram, 1983, p.613), and finally, how the qualitative analysis was handled in light of this hypothesis.

Given the lack of an identifiable audit trail, the credibility and dependability of the research is difficult to ascertain. Once again, since Kram (1983) did not define any of her terms, it remains unclear as to exactly what she meant by "career" and "psychosocial" functions and their components. Yet, Kram (1983) goes on to use these functions to define "mentoring." She notes that as the themes emerged from the data, they "became the basis for the conceptual model of the phases of the mentor relationship" (Kram, 1983, p.613).

Kram (1983) summarized two outcomes from her research: that mentoring led to career enhancements and that mentoring happened in phases. From the research, Kram concluded that mentoring "has the potential to enhance career development and psychosocial development of both individuals" (Kram, 1983, p.613). It is unclear how the research data led to this conclusion without a more detailed audit trail. Kram also concluded that a mentoring relationship "generally proceed(ed) through four predictable, yet not entirely distinct, phases" (Kram, 1983, p.614), which she called initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. The phases are so general that they could apply to any relationship and therefore they do little to explain what is specific and unique about mentoring relationships. It is challenging to rely upon Kram's conclusions as credible, yet her efforts are often referenced and many researchers have based their work on her study (e.g., Bozionelos, 2004; Chao, 1997; Eby, 1997; Ragins, 1997; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000).

Apples and oranges – The problems with the research definitions of mentoring. Kram's research on mentoring (1980, 1983, 1985) opened the floodgates for additional research in the area. However, it was also the start of considerable confusion regarding the definition of mentoring and its associated terms, a confusion that persists to this day. For example, Haggerty

(1986) claimed that the literature written about mentoring confuses the person, the process, and the activities.

It is difficult to discuss the history of research in the field of mentoring without an understanding of what mentoring actually is. For example, is mentoring synonymous with coaching, teaching, or advising? Cho et al. (2011) provided a list of mentor characteristics that certainly fit with teaching, yet not all teachers are mentors (Cho, Ramanan, & Feldman, 2011). D'Abate et al. (2003) state there is conceptual confusion between the constructs and that some authors argue mentoring and coaching are the same (Sperry, 1996) and others state mentoring is different from coaching (Chao, 1998). The definitions of "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring" have proven to be much more complex and challenging for researchers.

In the research on mentoring one of three problems typically exists: 1. either the researcher does not provide a definition of mentoring (e.g., Allen & Johnston, 1997; Burke & McKeen, 1997; Hall, Draper, Smith, & Bullough, 2008; Malmgren, et al. 2010; Tepper & Taylor, 2003), or 2. the researcher provides Kram's (1983) stages of mentoring as a definition (e.g., Chao, 1997; Eby, 1997; Feeney & Bozeman, 2008; Ragins, 1997), or 3. the authors state their own definitions which are not operationally defined, (i.e., defined so as to make the concept measurable, concrete, and able to be readily distinguished (Houts & Baldwin, 2004)), and which are often ambiguous and unclear (e.g., Bozeman & Feeney, 2007; Eby et al., 2004; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Parsloe, 1995; Tepper, 1995). To show evidence a measure has construct validity, one needs to develop a nomological network for the measure, of which a vital part is having an operationalized construct definition (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). In other words, an operational definition of a construct is a necessary component in establishing construct validity.

In Kram's (1980) dissertation, she identified four phases of a mentoring relationships but did not provide an operational definition, or for that matter, a definition at all, of the term "mentoring." Kram's focused on describing an overview of the relationship trajectory, not on defining it, or explaining how to traverse the phases. What many researchers had credited as Kram's definition, while profoundly influential, only added to the confusion.

Kram's definition of mentoring. Kram did not provide a definition of "mentoring," "mentor," or "protégé" in her dissertation (1980), or subsequent article (1983) however, in Kram's (1985) book she stated that mentoring involves a relationship wherein a senior, or more experienced, person (the mentor) provides two functions for a junior person (the protégé): (a) the modelling of career-development behaviours, and/or advice regarding these behaviours; and (b) personal support, especially psychosocial support. Many researchers have cited this as Kram's definition of mentoring (i.e., Bozionelos, 2004; Eby, 1997; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000), although Kram did not explicitly offer it as a definition, but rather as more of a discussion of the subject from which she extracted certain characteristics. Unfortunately, whether researchers considered it to be a discussion or a definition, it does not provide an effective operational definition of the key construct.

Kram's (1980, 1983, 1985) supposed definition of mentoring, is insufficient for practical use as it is so broad as to apply to many relationships, such as those with teachers, counsellors, friends, or parents. Additionally, its focus on career-development behaviours excludes mentoring relationships that are not career-related such as those in amateur athletic or artistic pursuits. Further, it makes no mention of whether or not there is an exchange of money for this advice or support, or even an awareness on the part of the participants that they are involved in a mentoring relationship.

Bozeman (2007) stated “Kram’s conceptualization of mentoring... (was) the early definition, or, more accurately, the early discussion of the term (and) was entirely suitable for the topic’s 1980s level of explanatory and empirical development (but) subsequent application ... is more troubling” (p.722). What Bozeman (2007) saw as “troubling” was how many authors referenced Kram’s definition (e.g., Bozionelos, 2004; Eby, 1997; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000) and how others based their work upon Kram’s (e.g., Chao, 1997; Ragins, 1997) when the construct under investigation was not clear. Bozeman (2007) noted that Kram’s (1985) “conceptualization of mentoring has been either directly quoted or reworked only slightly in many subsequent studies” (p.721) and that Kram’s work has “influenced subsequent work to a considerable extent” (p. 722). In particular, Eby (1997) , Chao (1997), and Ragins (1997) not only based their work on Kram’s definition, but expanded on it so as to lead to additional confusion about the terms “mentor,” “protégé,” and “mentoring.”

Eby’s definition of mentoring. By the last decade of the 20th century, research on mentoring had accelerated so rapidly that more than twice as many mentoring studies were published during the 1990s than had been published in all the previous years (Eby, Butts, Lockwood, & Simon, 2004). Eby’s 1997 study on alternative forms of mentoring was an excellent example of how Kram’s (1985) work influenced the research that followed.

Eby (1997) referenced Kram’s (1985) definition of mentoring by stating “mentoring is typically defined as a relationship between a senior organizational member (the mentor) and a junior member of the organization (the protégé) that is designed to help the protégé advance within the organization (Kram, 1985)” (p.126). Although Eby cited Kram’s (1985) definition, she did not do so accurately, failing to include aspects of the original where Kram talked about the mentor providing advice, modelling career development behaviours, or providing personal

support. Also, Eby (1997) added the component of the protégé advancing within the organization to Kram's (1985) definition, yet credited the entire definition, including her own addition, to Kram. By using Kram's (1985) definition, it is unclear exactly what Eby (1997) was investigating. As with Kram's definition, Eby's (1997) use of the term mentor is neither operationalized, nor specific enough to separate mentoring from other constructs such as coaching.

Five years later, Eby (2002) referred to Kram's (1985) definition again, stating "mentoring is an intense long-term relationship between a senior, more experienced individual (the mentor) and a more junior, less experience individual (the protégé) (Kram, 1985)" (p.456). Eby (2002), once more, neglected to mention elements of Kram's (1985) original definition, but this time added the element of mentoring being a long-term relationship, again crediting this addition to Kram though Kram's (1985) "definition" of mentoring, never included this component.

Later, Eby (2004) referenced Kram's (1985) definition, yet again, stating, "mentoring refers to an intense interpersonal relationship between a senior, more experienced individual (the mentor) and a junior, less experienced individual (the protégé) whereby the mentor provides career and personal guidance to the protégé (Kram, 1985)" (p.411). Eby went on to state that mentors provide career and psychosocial support but she did not reference Kram (1985) in relation to these aspects. There is no explanation as to why parts of Kram's (1985) definition are included and not others. This makes it challenging to understand the construct as the researcher altered aspects of the definition without explanation, and still, has not clearly operationalized the definition of mentoring nor differentiated it from other constructs.

In 2008, Eby expanded the definition of mentoring to include three separate types of mentoring, (a) youth mentoring, (b) academic mentoring, and (c) workplace mentoring, each with its own definition. When defining workplace mentoring, Eby (2008) cited Kram's (1985) definition of mentoring yet again and once again it differed, not only from the original, but even from those cited in Eby's own previous work (i.e., Eby, 1997, 2002, 2004). Eby (2008) stated, "workplace mentoring occurs in an organizational setting and the purpose is the personal and professional growth of the protégé (Kram, 1985)" (p.255). Eby (2008) failed to include Kram's (1985) specification that the mentor be more experienced and provide advice, modelling, and personal support to the protégé, and added that the purpose of the relationship was for personal and professional growth. Also, Kram did not differentiate her 1985 definition as "workplace mentoring" but simply as "mentoring." Eby (2008) extrapolated that because Kram (1980, 1983, 1985) studied the workplace to explore mentoring, Eby could use Kram's definition to define workplace mentoring as opposed to mentoring as a whole.

Though Eby (1997, 2002, 2004, 2008) based her work on Kram's (1985) definition, she also added her own embellishments and credited Kram for the additions, while, at other times not fully referencing all of Kram's (1985) components. It is unclear why Eby deviated from Kram's (1985) original definition. The constructs of "mentoring," "protégé," and "mentor" were not clear in Kram's (1985) work. Kram's (1985) definition was not explicitly stated nor operationalized, but rather put forward as a discussion of ideas, therefore the issues of uncertainty and confusion with Kram's (1985) work were carried forward to that of Eby (1997, 2002, 2004, 2008). As a result, it is difficult to know what Eby (1997, 2002, 2004, 2008) investigated or how to apply the research findings.

Bozeman and Fenney's definition of mentoring. Bozeman and Fenney (2007), in the pivotal article about constructing a useful theory of mentoring, used "mentor" (the person), "mentoring" (the process), and "mentorship" (the activities) interchangeably, as seen in Bozeman and Fenney's Table 1 - Mentoring Definitions (p.723). In the table, Bozeman and Fenney listed various definitions, which were supposed to be definitions of mentoring, and yet seven of the 13 definitions provided were definitions of the term "mentor" not "mentoring." For example, Bozeman and Fenney (2007, p. 723) included Ragins' (1997) definition which stated "Traditionally, mentors are defined as individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing upward mobility and support to protégés careers" (p.484). Likewise, Bozeman and Fenney (2007, p. 723) included the definition from Singh, Bain, and Vinnicombe (2002) who stated "We define mentors as 'individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing upward support and mobility to their protégés' careers" (p.391). Bozeman and Fenney (2007) attempted, in the table of mentoring definitions, not only to examine how other researchers defined mentoring, but to point out the many components and branches within the definitions, as well as to illustrate how there was no consistency between the various definitions. Bozeman and Fenney noted that each definition had a different focus and further remarked that "most of the branches connect to the same conceptual taproot" (2007, p. 722), though they did not state what that "taproot" was.

Bozeman and Fenney's (2007) point regarding the lack of cohesion amongst definitions was correct. However, Bozeman and Fenney (2007) made a mistake in their analysis as they discussed the definitions as if they all referred to the same thing. They confused the terms "mentor" and "mentoring" and collated the definitions of both terms as if they were interchangeable. For clarity, the noun and person in question is considered a "mentor," whereas

the verb “mentoring,” derives from the infinitive form “to mentor” which means acting as a mentor. The verb “to mentor” can be used without an object, both as “mentoring” (e.g., Jane spent years mentoring Ryan), or as “mentored” (e.g., Stephanie did not wish to be mentored by Matthew). Bozeman and Fenney’s (2007) mistake further underscored the claim Haggerty (1986) made that the literature about mentoring confuses and interchanges its terms. Due to this confusion of terms and their definitions in the research literature, it is understandable that authors such as Anderson and Shannon (1995), Donovan (1990), and Little (1990) also called for the operationalization of the mentoring construct in order to achieve some clarity.

To their credit, Bozeman and Fenney (2007) offered their own, more detailed, definition of mentoring: “Mentoring: a process for informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and psychosocial support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or professional development; mentoring entails informal communication, usually face-to-face and during a sustained period of time, between a person who is perceived to have greater relevant knowledge, wisdom, or experience (the mentor) and a person who is perceived to have less (the protégé)” (Bozeman & Fenney, 2007, p.731). Bozeman and Fenney’s (2007) definition included details about the mentor and protégé, as well as the necessity for a perceived imbalance in their respective levels of knowledge, wisdom, or experience. They also stated what is involved in the process of mentoring and how mentoring takes place. Many of these aspects of the mentoring process are measurable, such as whether or not the relationship takes place face-to-face, whether the participants share knowledge, social capital, or psychosocial support during the encounter, and what perception each participant has of the other’s knowledge, wisdom, or experience. This is important because in order to have construct validity one needs to operationalize and translate the components of a construct into observable aspects that can be measured (Cronbach & Meehl,

1955)**.** Having construct validity means one can infer legitimately that the operationalizations in the study are linked to the theoretical constructs on which those operationalizations were based (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). In other words, the reader can link the outcomes of the study and the construct under investigation. Bozeman and Fenney (2007) included observable and measurable components of the construct in their definition, and by doing so they increased the construct validity.

Although Bozeman and Fenney's (2007) definition is an improvement over Kram's (1985) and Eby's (1997, 2002, 2004, 2008) definitions, it is still ambiguous and, therefore, problematic. Bozeman's definition lacks an agreement, or acknowledgment, between the participants that a mentoring relationship is occurring, meaning a person could believe he or she is receiving mentoring, while the "mentor" has no knowledge of it. When investigating a construct such as mentoring, a researcher needs to know all of the components of the definition. If mentoring occurs in a relationship, then the researcher needs to state this in the definition. Also, in order to have construct validity, the research needs to behaviourally operationalize components of the definition. In order to note whether mentoring is occurring in a relationship, the researcher also needs to determine whether both people have agreed to be in a mentoring relationship and have knowledge of their involvement. If research is conducted on a mentoring relationship and the researcher is unclear as to whether both people know they are in a mentoring relationship, then the researcher cannot be certain as to what type of relationship he or she is actually investigating.

In their definition, Bozeman and Fenney (2007) used the word "process" to describe mentoring, as opposed to referring to the mentoring "relationship." A process is a systematic series of actions directed to some end. A relationship involves a connection between two people.

It is unclear how Bozeman and Fenney (2007) see a process as different from a relationship and how they deemed that "process" was a better fit for a mentoring definition. It seems like they are stating mentoring is a set of actions which does not need to happen within the context of a relationship. Also, the researchers need to operationalize the word "process" to ensure that there is construct validity, behaviourally defining how they perceive the "process" of mentoring.

In trying to have a comprehensive definition of mentoring, the most problematic aspect of Bozeman and Fenney's (2007) definition is the exclusion of personal development in their conceptualization of mentoring. According to Bozeman and Fenney (2007) mentoring only involves work and career development and does not expand into moral or personal arenas. This ignores how society traditionally conceptualized mentoring, in the years following its historic roots in the apprenticeship system, and excludes all studies and applications of mentoring that occur outside of a work-related context. Bozeman and Fenney's (2007) efforts are laudable but lacking, with many aspects requiring further clarification and operationalization in order to produce a definition that has construct validity beyond narrowly defined environments such as work.

Other researchers' definitions of mentoring. Other authors have articulated their own definitions of mentoring (see the current study's Table 1: Mentoring Definitions). However, as with Kram's (1985), Eby's (1997, 2002, 2004, 2008), and Bozeman's (2007) efforts these definitions do not differentiate mentoring from other constructs nor do they operationally define "mentor," "mentoring," or "protégé."

When operationally defining a research construct, the variables in the construct need to be measurable, concrete indicators of the behaviour associated with said construct so that it is clear what is part of the construct and what is not (Houts & Baldwin, 2004). For example,

Parsloe's (1995) definition stated, "Mentoring is a relationship that encourages learning" (p.13). Without operationally defining "mentoring", Parsloe's (1995) definition could apply to teaching, or coaching, among many other relationships. It does nothing to differentiate mentoring from these other concepts. Further, this definition fails to offer any measurable aspects of the construct which would identify the behaviours of mentoring.

Tepper (1995) defined mentoring as "relationships (that) facilitate junior colleagues' (protégés) professional development and career progress" (p.1191). As with others in the field, Tepper's (1995) definition did not distinguish mentoring from other constructs, did not operationalize the behaviours of mentoring, nor extend his definition to the possibility of mentoring occurring outside of a work environment. He did not define nor clarify "protégé" beyond equating it with "junior colleague," nor propose what happens to the definition if the protégé fails to advance in his or her career. Additionally, Tepper (1995) did not clarify the behaviours of the protégé in the relationship.

Lankau (2002) also provided a definition, stating, "Mentoring…is…a working relationship that contributes to personal growth and is an important organizational process" (p.780). Once more, this definition could apply to a variety of relationships and therefore does not differentiate a "mentor" from a supervisor, union representative, or helpful colleague. As with the variables in the definitions proposed by Parsloe (1995) and Tepper (1995), Lankau's (2002) variables are neither distinguishable from coaching, teaching etc., nor measurable.

This lack of clarity about the construct of mentoring makes it difficult to interpret the data in mentoring research, and it also makes it difficult to know whether, when comparing studies, one is comparing apples to oranges. Likewise, it makes it difficult to determine how to apply the research, as it is unclear what relationship (i.e., what construct) the research is

investigating and how one might understand the outcomes of the research in relation to the construct. For illustration, consider that there are two, hypothetical, studies on "mentoring" and neither has an operationalized definition of the construct. Both, however, offer a general definition that states, "Mentoring is a relationship where a person learns from someone with more knowledge." In the first study, some of the participants were in mentoring relationships, while others were in coaching relationships, though all participants in the study believed they fit into mentoring relationships based on the definition provided. In the second study, participants were in primarily teacher-student relationships, though again the participants believed, based on the definition for the study, that they were in mentoring relationships. Without an operationalized construct, it is not possible to decipher which participants in the studies spoke about mentoring and which shared about other types of relationships. Likewise, the studies are difficult to compare as they are not actually studying the same construct. With the amount of money, time, and research that has been devoted to studying mentoring (e.g., a single publicly-funded mentoring program for at-risk youth in the United States had a budget of 90 million dollars in 2015 (mentoring.org, 2016)), a consistent, universal, operationalized definition is timely, warranted, and required.

Research into Mentoring Outcomes

Following Kram's (1980, 1983, 1985) influential works, investigators wrote a substantial volume of literature on various mentoring topics, such as the analysis of mentoring functions (e.g., Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992a; Olian, Carroll, & Giannantonio, 1993; Sosik & Godshalk, 2004; Thomas, 1993), and mentor access, (i.e., Who has the opportunity to get a mentor?) (e.g., Goh, 1991; Ragins & Cotton, 1989; 1991). By the 1990s, due to the frequent use of mentoring programs in organizations, many researchers (e.g., Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992b; Dreher &

Ash, 1990; Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1992) called for a further examination of the relationship between mentoring experiences and career outcomes.

The bulk of the research simply examined the benefits of mentoring. Few studies examined what exactly was helping or hindering a positive mentoring-relationship outcome. According to the research, the benefits for protégés included enhanced career mobility (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Kirchmeyer, 2005; Scandura, 1992), increased compensation (Whitely et al., 1992), improved job performance (Wilson, Pereira, & Valentine, 2002), increased counselling doctoral student research productivity (Hollingsworth & Fassinger, 2002), better job satisfaction (Chao, 1997; Fagenson, 1989), increased counsellor student satisfaction and retention (Pearson, 2012) and advances in job-related learning (Hezlett, 2005; Lankau & Scandura, 2002). Mentors also appeared to benefit from the mentoring relationship in terms of career visibility (Zey, 1984), an enhanced sense of generativity (i.e., a desire to contribute to upcoming generations) (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978), and additional organizational learning (Allen & Eby, 2003). Despite a lack of an operationally defined definition of "mentor," "mentoring," and "protégé," the research results show there is some value in "mentoring" from which participants report they have benefited. It is possible that with an operationally-defined construct, the field of mentoring could move forward with more accuracy, making greater strides in understanding how to use and harness the helpfulness of mentoring, while avoiding any unhelpful aspects.

What helps or hinders mentoring. In examining the mentoring literature, I reviewed nine articles examining some aspect of what constituted inferior or superior mentoring and, yet, none of the studies provided an operational definition of the term (e.g., Cho, Ramanan, & Feldman, 2011; Koopman & Thiedke, 2005; Leslie, Lingard, & Whyte, 2005; Rabatin et al., 2004; Sambunjak et al., 2010; Scandura & Scandura, 1998; Straus, Chatur, & Taylor, 2009;

Straus, Johnson, Marquez, & Feldman, 2013; Williams, Levine and Holtzheimer, 2004). Two of the studies were research reviews (Sambunjak et al., 2010; Scandura & Scandura, 1998), while the remainder approached the topic of what helps or hinders mentoring from various angles and perspectives. For example, Rabatin (2004) discussed the components of an effective mentoring relationship, whereas Koopman (2005) examined how mentoring can contribute to faculty career success. Cho et al. (2011) elaborated on the qualities of an outstanding mentor, while Leslie (2005) illuminated the perspective of the protégé by researching what guidance "mentees" were looking for in a mentoring relationship. Straus' efforts (2009, 2013) were attempts at characterising what she described as the mentor-mentee relationship. Straus' 2013 study examined the characteristics of effective mentees and mentors, the actions of effective mentors, and what constituted a successful or failed mentoring relationship. While none of these studies directly targeted what helped or hindered a mentoring relationship's outcome, an in-depth examination of their contributions and failings would be helpful in understanding what gaps in our current knowledge remain.

Scandura and dysfunctional mentoring. Scandura (1998) conducted a literature review to analyze the components of a dysfunctional mentoring relationship. She first identified that very little had been written about relationship dysfunction in a mentoring context and she concluded that mentoring, by a boss or work supervisor, carried with it potential risks such as feeling begrudged, vengeful, or hostile, with the potential for ongoing conflictive tensions, and struggles. Scandura (1998) stated that dysfunction occurs when the relationship is not working for one or both of the parties and used Duck's (1994) definition of unpleasant relationships as a definition of dysfunctional mentoring. Scandura (1998) lists Duck's (1994) definition of dysfunctional mentoring as "...when it is considered that real lives are richly entwined with

begrudging, vengeful, hostile, conflictive tensions and struggles, it will perhaps begin to be realized that one must also start to look at the ways in which people cope with them in life and then theorize about them (p. 6)" (p. 454). Scandura (1998) viewed relationship dysfunction as a continuum from disregard to dislike through to anger and hostility. The key contributions of her work included a list of behaviours that were damaging to the relationship and she suggested that both the protégé and the mentor could suffer damage if they remained in a dysfunctional relationship.

What is unclear in Scandura's (1998) writing is whether these damaging behaviours originated from the protégé or the mentor. Scandura listed behaviours such as "induce powerlessness," behave with a sense of "omnipotence," and "encourage dependence," that seem to imply that these are mentor behaviours, but she failed to clearly indicate who was performing the behaviours and in relation to whom. It would have been helpful if Scandura (1998) had clarified what behaviours protégés specifically engage in that create dysfunction, as well as which behaviours mentors exhibit that are damaging. Likewise, it is unclear in Scandura's (1998) writing how the "definition" of dysfunctional mentoring taken from Duck (1994) is a definition of dysfunctional mentoring. What Scandura (1998) quotes as Duck's (1994) definition is a commentary on the possibility that people may theorize about how to cope in a relationship wrought with negative interactions. Also, the commentary is not specific to mentoring but is applicable to all relationships.

Scandura (1998) related the damaging behaviours to specific potential dysfunctions in the mentoring relationship by reviewing the literature on close personal relationships such as friendships and marriages and looking for models of relationship dysfunction. She concluded that social-psychological models of relationship development were applicable to mentoring and

she mapped a typology of dysfunctional behaviours drawn from both social psychology, as well as the few accounts of problems mentioned in the literature on mentoring. Scandura did not, unfortunately, elaborate on which of the social-psychological models of relationships she used, and then applied to mentoring, nor did she say why she chose any one model over others.

Scandura (1998) analyzed the data and placed it into one of four groups representing potential dysfunctions in a mentoring relationship: (a) negative relationship (e.g., bullies, enemies), (b) sabotage (e.g., revenge, silent treatment, or career damage), (c) difficulty (e.g., conflict, binds), and (d) spoiling (e.g., betrayal, regret, and "mentor off fast track"). She further broke down the groups into those exhibiting problems with psychosocial issues, vocational issues, bad intentions toward the other person, or good intentions toward the other person. She noted a person's intent in the relationship in order to acknowledge that sometimes, regardless of his or her effort, the person does not attain the desired relationship outcome and the relationship does not work. She further recognised that at times this failure in the face of good intentions is situational and at other times it is because the other person is inappropriate for the role.

Scandura (1998) included a definition of "mentor" in the study, citing Kram's (1985) definition of mentoring, propagating the problems I have already outlined. Scandura (1998) quoted and referred to Kram's (1985) work repeatedly in her article, thereby building her conceptualization of mentoring onto the problems associated with Kram's (1985) "definition." Nonetheless, Scandura's study did discuss some of the negative behaviours that can hurt (i.e., cause dysfunction or damage) a mentoring relationship and thereby affect its outcome.

Characteristics of a mentor and a mentee. Sambunjak et al. (2010) conducted "a systematic review of the qualitative literature to explore and summarize the research and summarize development, perceptions, and experiences of the mentoring relationship" (p. 72).

The authors provided a summary of the functions and characteristics of a mentee and "good mentor" (p. 72) and listed various barriers to mentoring. "A total of 8,487 citations were identified, 114 full text articles were assessed, and nine articles were selected for review" (Sambunjak et al., 2010, p. 72). It is not clear what the author's meant by "assessing" an article, and the researchers did not indicate why, or how, they had selected those particular nine articles instead of choosing others. The consensus among the reviewed articles, regarding the desirable characteristics and actions of a "good mentor," was that it was important for a mentor to be sincere, to listen actively, to understand mentees' needs, and to have a well-establish position within the academic community. The researchers did not provide a definition of the term "good mentor," nor differentiate between a "good mentor" and a "poor" one. Also, they did not discuss what exactly they meant by a "characteristic." The authors determined that, while mentoring was a complex relationship, mentees could improve it if they took an active role in its formation and development. They further concluded that mentoring required commitment and interpersonal skills, but that participating in it was worthwhile.

Sambunjak el al. (2010) also noted that there were barriers to mentoring which involved personal factors, relationship difficulties, and structural or institutional barriers. Researchers could consider these barriers as hindering the mentoring relationship, and view the positive mentor and mentee characteristics as helping the relationship. Sambunjak et al. (2010) additionally compiled comprehensive lists of the positive characteristics of a mentor. These included personal qualities such as altruism and empathy; relationship qualities such as mentor accessibility, and the sincere dedication to developing an important relationship with the mentee; and professional qualities such as having knowledge and experience.

As with other research within the field of mentoring, the concern with the Sambunjak et al. (2010) study is that the authors are referencing research from studies that do not define mentoring and do not specifically require participants to actually be in a mentoring relationship based upon a clearly articulated definition. As such, the data in the referenced studies is difficult to interpret, as there is no way of determining if the participants were speaking about mentoring or some other form of relationship such as coaching. The authors themselves commented about the confusion of interchangeable terms such as "mentoring," "supervision," and "role modeling," but, fell short of providing a definition of the terms to resolve the issue.

Of particular concern is the claim from Sambunjak et al. (2010) that, "research in organizational settings has shown that mentoring can be distinguished from other developmental relationships such as leadership (Roosevelt Eleanor, 2008) or coaching (D'Abate, Eddy, & Tannenbaum, 2003) by the broadness of functions it offers" (p.77). If leadership, coaching, and mentoring are different, it would have been helpful if Sambunjak et al. (2010) defined the constructs and articulate those differences. Sambunjak et al. (2010) also reference Roosevelt et al.'s (2008) book to show that mentoring can be distinguished from leadership and coaching, however Roosevelt's (2008) work is also somewhat problematic as it contains some incorrect information. For example, there is an error regarding the reference to the origin of mentoring (i.e., Roosevelt et al. (2008) indicated that "mentoring" comes from Homer's *Odyssey* but it actually comes from *Les Adventures de Telemaque*, by Fénelon (1699)); there is also an error regarding the creation of a definition of mentoring (i.e., Credit was given to Kram (1985) for creating a definition which she did not). Roosevelt et al. (2008) also asserted that, "a core feature that defines mentoring relationships and distinguishes it from other types of personal relationships is that mentoring is a developmental relationship that is embedded within the career

context" (p.5), a statement which ignores any mentoring which occurs outside of a business relationship. Sambunjak et al. (2010) referenced Roosevelt et al.'s (2008) book, though it contains misinformation adding to the confusion around the terminology used in the mentoring field and it does not adequately distinguish mentoring from other forms of teaching or leadership activities.

Sambunjak et al. (2010) cite D'Abate et al. (2003) as the second reference to explicate the difference between coaching and mentoring. D'Abate et al. (2003) did not reference a definition of mentoring and instead used a qualitative literature review to develop a nomological network of 13 common terms relating to developmental interaction. D'Abate et al. (2003) did not differentiate between mentoring and coaching as Sambunjak states. Ironically, D'Abate et al.'s (2003) data, for the nomological network on developmental interactions, was also based on the results of the constructs of mentoring and coaching found in the literature, however, an operational definition of mentoring distinct from other relationships, such as coaching, appears to be lacking. Hence, when Sambunjak (2010) referenced D'Abate et al. (2003) as differentiating between mentoring and coaching, it is unclear what Sambunjak's research was actually investigating.

Sambunjak et al.'s (2010) review of the research on the meaning and characteristics of mentoring in academic medicine did succeed in offering a summary of some of the available notions on the subject of mentoring and mentor characteristics, but ultimately fails in its utility due to the lack of construct validity, endemic to the field, regarding mentoring-related terms and their definitions.

Cho, Ramana, and Feldman (2011) sought to determine the characteristics of outstanding mentors. They analyzed 53 letters written about 10 Lifetime-Achievement-in-Mentorship-Award

nominees and used grounded theory to determine the characteristics of a mentor. Again, they provided no definition of mentor or mentoring. Also, they examined mentor qualities but did not examine the role of protégés (i.e., referred to as "mentees" in this study) in the relationships. The authors found that outstanding mentors exhibited the following: 1. they had admirable personal qualities such as enthusiasm, compassion, and selflessness; 2. they served as a career guide, providing a vision and specific support, to each mentee; 3. they spent a lot of time, on a regular basis, engaging in high-quality meetings with the mentee; 4. they supported the mentee in having a personal and professional-life-balance; and finally 5. they modelled how to be a good mentor, and set policies for high expectations and standards for mentorship. Cho et al. (2011) provided considerable detail regarding each of the themes and listed both the characteristics, as well as the actions, of an outstanding mentor in a work-related setting. One limitation of this study was that there were no criteria specifying what made a person an outstanding mentor, other than having been nominated, and there was no discussion regarding how to differentiate an outstanding mentor from a satisfactory or poor mentor. There was also no definition of mentor or mentoring provided, against which to ensure participants were mentors and not just excellent teachers or bosses. This means that it is unclear as to whether the characteristics and behaviours listed, related specifically to mentoring.

Straus, Johnson, Marquez, and Feldman (2013) also looked at the characteristics of effective mentees and mentors. They listed the actions of effective mentors, as well as investigating what constituted a successful or failed mentoring relationship. Straus et al. (2013) explored 54 participants' views on, and experiences with, mentorship in two formal mentorship programs within the Department of Medicine at the University of Toronto. The programs involved multiple teaching components about mentoring and provided workshops and a tool kit

to assist mentors and mentees to achieve success. The authors did not use a definition of "mentor," "mentoring," "protégé," (i.e., "mentee") in the study nor did they indicate that they used any definition as a criterion for participant selection. The sole selection criterion for participation was whether the person was involved in the formal mentoring program. It is unclear if there was any selection criteria applied in order to gain acceptance into the program.

Straus et al. (2013) listed the characteristics of effective mentors which included being altruistic, honest, trustworthy, and an active listener who was focused on the issues identified by the mentee. The researchers also mentioned that an effective mentor should have the ability to set goals; be accessible; should be able to identify and support the development of potential strengths and skills in the mentee; and should prompt the mentee to clarify if there is any confusion. The study also considered as positive mentor qualities, that the mentor had substantial mentorship and professional experience, as well as that the mentor included his or her network of colleagues and collaborators in the mentorship relationship. The characteristics of effective mentees included: being open to feedback; being an active listener; being respectful of the mentor's input and time; generally showing respect for the mentor; being responsible; coming to meetings with lists of topics for discussion; paying attention to time-lines; and taking responsibility for "driving the relationship."

Straus et al. (2013) noted effective mentor and protégé (i.e., mentee, a term used interchangeably in the literature) characteristics, although the lists of characteristics actually read as lists of behaviours that contribute to a positive relationship outcome. In addition to listing these characteristics, Straus et al. (2013) also specified the actions of an effective mentor which included: providing career guidance (i.e., advising, advocating, networking, creating opportunities, goal setting, career monitoring, and helping mentees navigate institutions);

directing the mentees' activities; offering emotional support, including sharing one's own feelings honestly and encouraging mentees to do the same; focussing on work/life balance; creating opportunities; helping mentees identify potential opportunities, as well as potential pitfalls; and protecting mentees from harsh interactions. The authors also spoke directly about the mentoring relationship. Characteristics involved in a successful mentoring relationship, which may have helped to achieve a positive mentoring outcome, included reciprocity and having a mutually rewarding relationship; mutual respect, including respect for the other person's time, effort, and qualifications; clear expectations of the relationship to which both parties are held accountable; having a personal connection; and finally having shared values with regard to one's approach to research, clinical work, and personal life. Conversely, the characteristics of a failed mentoring relationship included poor communication, lack of commitment, personality differences, perceived or real competition, conflicts of interest, and the mentor's lack of experience.

Straus et al. (2013) identified a number of tactics on the part of the mentor that optimized the mentoring relationships. These included having the mentee feel safe and welcomed in the mentor's office; establishing a communication framework to review what was discussed, so both parties were clear about the action items developed; keeping a list of these action items; optimising meetings by having regular appointments; and having regular communication via e-mail and telephone. It is noteworthy that, although the researchers listed characteristics for both mentor and mentee, they only listed actions for the mentor, leaving out any actions in which protégés could engage to help the mentoring relationship succeed. Also, the authors did not list actions in which mentors or mentees engaged that hindered the relationship.

Aside from the concern regarding the lack of a definition for “mentoring,” “mentor,” and “protégé,” Straus et al. (2013) did not specify their participant selection criteria for their study. Additionally, it would have been helpful to see the criterion for participation in the formal mentorship program from which the authors selected the study’s participants. Also, it was not clearly noted whether mentees and mentors were trained in the workshops about mentoring prior to, during, or after the study.

If participants received training in how to be in a mentoring relationship, then the researchers should have explicitly stated this, as this would have had an impact on the results of the study. For example, if participants received training in formal workshops within the program, to engage in specific mentoring techniques, they may have simply reflected back the characteristics and actions that they had learned, when Straus et al. (2013) asked what was working in their mentoring relationships. This would mean the research would be evaluating whether participants learned what the effective characteristics were in the workshop and were able to report them back. This is different from research based on participants’ perceptions of what were effective characteristics based on their mentoring relationship experiences. This alteration in research focus would shift the understanding of the study, and how to use the results, from one of understanding the effective characteristics in a mentoring relationship to one of evaluating the participants’ understanding of workshop materials. In order to understand if participants had received prior training in formal workshops within the program, the researchers should have shared the materials for the workshops. Further, the researchers would have to have noted the number of participants who attended the various workshops, and to have examined the responses in light of the workshop material to see if participants were simply reiterating this material.

A final concern about the study is how Straus et al. (2013) conducted the qualitative procedures. The authors mentioned, in their discussion, that the sample size was small, which they acknowledged "may limit the generalizability of our findings" (p8). This comes across as a misunderstanding of qualitative research, which, by nature, is not generalizable, but the reader may deem it as transferable. With this confusion of methodology, Straus et al. (2013) would have been prudent to further clarify how they created their categories and defined their constructs. Without this elaboration and without operationalized definitions, the research is an interesting and promising contribution to what may help or hinder a mentoring relationship outcome, but further clarification would certainly enhance it.

Mentoring Relationships

Straus et al. (2013) touched on the characteristics of a positive mentoring relationship while other authors made the relationship itself the focus of their research. Williams et al. (2004) conducted a study where 66 medical residents and five medical faculty members participated in a qualitative focus group to determine the qualities of a mentoring relationship, obstacles to forming a mentorship, and methods to improve the mentorship experience. The researchers concluded that the participants considered mentoring to be a vital component in a successful residency experience. Refreshingly, the study included a discussion with participants about a definition of mentoring and, though the researchers did not put a definition forward, some participants spoke about mentoring as a relationship, based on professional and personal interests, similar to being friends with a supervisor, and which resonated with both mentor and protégé.

Williams et al. (2004) determined that the positive qualities of a good mentor and mentee facilitated "good relationships." The authors suggested that mentor and protégé needed to be

compatible on a personal level. They further suggested that it was helpful if a mentor was an active listener, able to identify potential strengths in the mentee, and able to assist the mentee in defining and reaching goals. It was of further help if the mentee was being proactive, was willing to learn and, yet, selective in accepting advice from the mentor. The authors did not explain what they meant by a "good relationship" and what differentiated a good relationship from a poor relationship. They stated that women and minority protégés reported an improved quality of relationship if they had the same gender and ethnicity as the mentor, whereas for men, gender and race made little difference.

Williams et al. (2004) examined both obstacles and facilitating contributions to developing mentoring relationships. These obstacles included a lack of time, a perceived lack of available mentors in both the private and academic sectors, and the mentors focusing too much on research. The authors also concluded that it was disagreeable to the mentor if the mentee tried to act like a "clone" of the mentor instead of being true to his or her own individual identity and nature. Since, once again, the researchers provided no definitions of the constructs, it is impossible to know if the participants were in mentoring relationships or in a different kind of relationship (i.e., coaching). The authors themselves noted that one participant could not recall if the other person in the relationship even knew if he was in a mentoring relationship, however, the researchers made no further mention as to whether or not any of the other participants in the focus group were uncertain about if their mentors or protégés knew that they were in a mentoring relationship. Because of the uncertainty regarding the nature of the relationships in this study, the qualities that Williams et al. (2004) list as determining a good mentoring relationship, may not refer specifically to mentoring at all, but could be used to describe a number of other

relationships such coaching, or teaching. There was nothing about the results that made them specific to mentoring, as opposed to, for example, beneficial learning relationships.

Rabatin, Lipkin, Rubin, Schachter, Nathan, and Kalet (2004) also focused on the components of an effective mentoring relationship. They recorded 15 hours of mentoring-meetings and analyzed the recordings using qualitative analysis. Three authors coded the transcripts and "used an iterative consensus-building process to identify a common understanding of the salient aspects of the mentoring process and a set of important themes within the mentoring" (Rabatin et al., 2004, p. 569). Then a fourth author independently coded ten randomly selected transcripts. The fourth coder's work was "compared to assess the trustworthiness of the initial analysis" (Rabatin et al., 2004, p. 569). The authors did not discuss how they established trustworthiness in the study, or mention how comparing the two sets of codings assessed the trustworthiness in question. It is also unclear how the authors went from having two sets of codings to one set of themes from the recordings. The authors stated that the results were that mentoring is an intimate relationship built on empathy, trust, and honesty, wherein the mentor sets standards for the protégé and uses extensive questioning, active listening, and frequent feedback.

The authors identified four components of mentoring in their data analysis: 1. number and length of meetings, and the structure of the time spent together; 2. mentor behavioural themes such as the mentor clarifying goals by being direct and respectful, expressing emotions, permitting vulnerability, and showing his or her feelings; 3. interactive qualities such as the mentee coming to meetings prepared, following through on tasks, responding honestly to feedback, and articulating goals; and 4. accomplishments and outcomes of the mentoring such as discovering the value of reflection on one's work, developing a friendship with the

mentor/mentee, improved lectures (which was the expressed goal for the mentee in this mentoring relationship), and other work-related outcomes. The authors concluded that both mentors and protégés benefited from the mentoring experience (Rabatin et al., 2004). The researchers did not offer a definition of mentoring nor list any criteria that they used to determine the type of relationship under investigation. Like so many of the studies reviewed herein, without an operational definition of mentoring and without determining whether the relationship under investigation fits the definition, it is difficult to interpret the data and results from Rabatin et al.'s (2004) study.

Leslie, Lingard, and Whyte (2005) studied the informal mentoring relationships of 10 participants whom they interviewed to determine if, as junior faculty, they were in informal, mentoring relationships. If the interviewee identified that they were in such a relationship, the researchers asked them to describe it and to identify areas in which they were seeking career assistance and advice. The selection criteria was that participants had to have a paediatric position of 0.6 FTE (i.e., over half-time) or greater for 3-7 years in their first faculty position. The authors did not define mentoring for their participants.

Leslie et al. (2005) identified four themes in their data analysis: 1. the qualities sought in a mentor (i.e., that the mentor was the same gender as the mentee, was trustworthy, non-judgemental, accessible, and reliable); 2. the processes by which guidance is obtained (i.e., through collegial working relationships and discussions with senior clinicians as part of the evaluative system in the department); 3. the issues discussed in the mentoring relationship (i.e., career focus, orientation of the organization, transition of role, and work/non-work balance); and 4. the barriers that impede the participants' abilities to receive the guidance they required (i.e., if

the mentor was in a position to evaluate the junior faculty member, or was in a position that could be considered a conflict of interest).

Unfortunately, there are multiple, substantial issues detracting from Leslie et al.'s (2005) study. Participant selection criteria did not include the need to be in a mentoring relationship; for example, in the interviews the participants spoke about getting guidance from coworkers. The authors did not clarify if collegial relationships were considered different from or the same as mentoring. Likewise, Leslie et al. (2005) mentioned that some guidance came from senior clinicians as part of a formal conversation that served as part of the participants' job-evaluation at the hospital, but did not clarify as to whether, or how, this was mentoring. It appears that the participants were talking about relationships where they received guidance, not necessarily mentoring relationships. The use of the word 'informal' in terms of mentoring seems to imply casual guidance, not informal mentoring which typically means outside of a formalised program. These issues make it difficult to establish that the results relate to mentoring instead of to casual collegial guidance; however, the characteristics of a successful mentor appear consistent with the work of Cho et al. (2011) and Straus et al. (2013). Further the information that a mentor is ideally of the same gender as the protégé appears to confirm Williams et al.'s (2004) results for women and minorities. Leslie et al. (2005) also acknowledged that not all mentoring relationships succeed and listed what she called "barriers" to a positive mentoring outcome, thereby adding to Williams et al.'s (2004) "obstacles." As with the other studies, Leslie et al.'s (2005) work would have greatly benefited from an operational definition and from clarifying with the participants themselves that they were in mentoring relationships.

While it is challenging to compare studies and extract the information of what helps or hinders a mentoring relationship when what the researchers are studying is vague and poorly

defined, a picture nonetheless emerges from the totality of the research that there are behaviours on the part of both mentor and protégé that can aid or interfere with a successful outcome.

Koopman and Thiedke (2005) conducted a qualitative study about how mentoring can contribute to the success of faculty. Participants were 13 Chairs of the Family Medicine departments from across the United States. The authors stated that participants felt mentoring was valuable as it was important for faculty development. Half of the participants said that a mentoring relationship had "a significant impact on their careers" (Koopman & Thiedke, 2005). Some participants had mixed experiences with mentoring while some reported that they had had dissatisfactory relationships as the mentee, due to the perception that they had not made progress and had felt vulnerable to an untrustworthy mentor. Notably, a number of other studies (e.g., Straus et al. 2013; Rabatin et al. 2004; Leslie et al. 2005) mentioned trust as an important mentor characteristic.

Koopman and Thiedke (2005) identified a lack of fit between the mentor and mentee as the paramount reason for relationship dissatisfaction. The researchers did not contribute much information about mentoring, other than saying that they recommended it and recognized that not all mentoring was positive. The study was missing quite a bit of information, such as what questions the researchers asked in the interviews and how they had collected, managed, and analysed the data. The authors did not specify what definition of mentoring they used in order to determine if participants were in mentoring relationships. Likewise, they provided no definition to clarify what they meant by "success of faculty," however, the key take-away from a study of department Chairs, wherein the majority cited mentoring as having a significant career impact, is that the ongoing study of what helps and or hinders mentoring outcomes is potentially impactful, and certainly valuable.

The "value" for the study of mentoring is exemplified by the work of Straus, Chatur, and Taylor (2009) who conducted their research on people who had received funding from a government agency in order to facilitate the development of future mentoring programs. Such government funding is commonplace, for example an Alberta Government program created in 2008, called the Alberta Mentoring Partnership, has 100 partners from businesses through government and community agencies, and reports $750,000 in annual funding (Alberta Human Services Website, 2016). Less common are examinations of the programs' efficacies and what helps or hinders the mentoring relationships' outcomes.

Straus et al. (2009) conducted semi-structured interviews with 21 mentees (as protégés are called in this study) and 7 mentors, to study the mentor-mentee relationships of clinician-scientists who had been given specific provincial funding within a medical research program in Alberta, Canada. The researchers selected the participants solely based on whether or not they had received provincial funding and the authors did not require that the participants were themselves in mentoring relationships.

Straus et al. (2009) described their results as centred around the themes of a mentee's self-identification (i.e., selection) of a mentor, versus being assigned a mentor; the role of a mentor; the characteristics of a good mentoring relationship; barriers to mentoring; and potential mentorship strategies. The authors also listed characteristics that facilitated a good mentorship experience, which included the mentor having seniority, being approachable, accessible, altruistic, understanding, patient, and honest. The researchers further noted that various mentor/mentee relationship qualities, such as mutual respect, open communication, confidentiality, clear expectations, and good chemistry between the mentor and mentee, were also important to a positive relationship outcome.

The participants in the Strauss et al. (2009) study reported that they believed that the mentee needed to have a passion for success in his or her career in order for the mentor-mentee relationship to work. The participants also mentioned that commitment to the process of mentoring was required from the mentee and that mentees needed to be in "the driver's seat" to facilitate a successful relationship. Participants said that regular contact between the mentor and mentee was necessary for the mentoring relationships to succeed and some participants believed that written progress reports were useful in order to hold both the mentor and mentee accountable. Other participants thought progress reports were unhelpful. The authors left it ambiguous, in the end, as to what was helpful and what was not, and why some participants listed something as helpful that others thought was particularly unhelpful.

While it may be difficult to operationalize some of the characteristics listed, Straus et al. (2009) needed further elaboration so that their readers could better understand how to apply their concepts. For example, how accessible should a mentor be? On weekends? Or once a week? What did Straus et al. (2009) mean by "altruistic" and what does this look like in action? What does the relationship quality of "clear expectations" pertain to? Does this mean "clear expectations" of the mentoring goals? Or "clear expectations" for how work is conducted on a day-to-day basis? Or "clear expectations" with regard to mentee and mentor roles? And what does it mean to be in the driver's seat? Does this mean the mentee needs to lead the relationship and conversations?

Overall, the study illuminated many interesting characteristics that are beneficial to a mentoring relationship even though it warrants further clarification. It would have been helpful to operationalize mentoring so it was clear what construct was under investigation. Also, it

would have been helpful to have the participants identify that they were in mentoring relationships.

In summary, my review of the literature revealed, few articles which spoke to some aspect of what helps or hinders mentoring, many of which touched on elements which are likely part of a positive mentoring outcome such as what makes an "effective" mentor (Rabatin et al., 2004), the characteristics of a "good" mentor (Sambunjak et al., 2010), or the qualities of an "outstanding mentor" (Cho et al., 2011). Researchers have looked at what protégés wanted to learn from mentoring (Leslie et al., 2005) and how mentoring helped guide protégé's careers (Koopman & Thiedke, 2005). Some authors studied the mentoring relationship to characterise it for the purpose of duplication (Straus et al., 2009). Some researchers tried to determine the actions of effective mentors in order to understand what constituted a successful mentoring relationship (Straus et al., 2013), while others have looked to understand what factors can cause a mentoring relationship to be dysfunctional (Scandura & Scandura, 1998).

Common to all of these studies is a lack of an operational definition of "mentoring," "mentor," or "protégé," leaving a wake of uncertainty and confusion about how to understand, apply, or compare their results. Additionally, the studies did not include participant selection criteria that identified that the participants had been in a mentoring relationship, leaving it unclear whether participants were speaking about mentoring in the first place.

In 1983, Merriam noted that "Mentoring is not clearly conceptualised... The majority of published articles consist of testimonials or opinions" (Merriam, 1983. p.169-170). After careful review of the literature to date, I agree with Merriam (1983). I was not able to ascertain from any of the research reviewed what exactly is meant by mentoring, nor how a mentor and a protégé engage in mentoring. The literature has not clearly or adequately defined the construct of

mentoring resulting in a lack of construct validity. Without construct validity, it is difficult to know if the research results are specific to mentoring and how to apply the results. Therefore, investigators cannot complete additional research without first putting into place a definition that other researchers can validate. To properly measure and research the construct, investigators require a definition of mentoring. With such a long-overdue definition in place and any research participants made aware of this definition, a study of what behaviours help or hinder the outcome of a mentoring relationship can finally shed some light on what is working, what is failing and what is in store for the future of mentoring.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The development of the methodology that I used to approach the complex topic of what behaviours help or hinder mentoring relationship outcomes was a multi-stage effort. My first priority was to establish operational definitions for the key constructs (i.e., "mentor," "mentoring," and "protégé"), which required an intensive and thorough examination of the literature. I then searched for a research paradigm and worldview that would suggest an operational technique for the research itself, and which would optimally assist in co-creating and interpreting the data regarding human behaviour in mentoring situations. I have detailed the method that I arrived at, and my application of this method, at the conclusion of this chapter, but my journey to arrive at this conclusion began with my search for a definition.

In Search of a Definition

Before beginning a study of any aspect of mentoring, I determined that I had to define its critical terms. In order to operationalize a definition of the terms "mentor," "mentoring," and "protégé," I first collected a representational sample of the available definitions of mentoring from the literature (see Table 1: Definitions of Mentoring from the Literature). Table 1 is a list of these definitions by various authors, and while not exhaustive, I could not find an operationalized definition of mentoring in the literature.

When looking for a definition of the terms "mentor," "mentoring," and "protégé," I used the following search terms: mentor, mentoring, mentorship, ment*, mentor relationship, mentor definition, mentoring definition, mentor* construct development, and mentee. When I found an article on mentoring, I used its reference section to identify additional articles that could possibly contain definitions and information about mentoring. The main databases I explored included: Google Scholar, "Search Summon" on the University of Victoria's library website, EBSCO,

ERIC, PsychINFO, PyscARTICLES, Business Source Complete, Emerald Journals, Mint Global, Business and Company Resource Centre, Academic Search Complete, and Humanities Index.

Comparing the definitions of the term "mentoring." Table 1 illustrates the variety in the available definitions of the term "mentoring." There is a lack of consistency between these definitions and considerable ambiguity surrounding the terms employed in their construction. The resulting lack of clarity makes it difficult to deduce what the authors meant when using the terms "mentor," "mentoring," and "protégé," and, subsequently, how to apply the resulting research when the constructs under exploration are vague and vary considerably from author to author.

For example, many of the authors emphasized a relational aspect to mentoring, and yet Bozeman (2007) did not include a relationship as part of his definition. Akinbobola (2011) stated that mentoring included a paternalistic aspect, yet none of the other authors listed paternalism as an aspect of mentoring. Parsloe (1995) defined mentoring as a relationship that encouraged learning but did not explain the behaviours associated with "encouraging." As well, Eby (2002) did not operationalize terms in her definition when she defined mentoring as an intense long-term relationship and then failed to explain what was meant by "intense" behaviourally, or the parameters associated with a long-term relationship.

I created a second table (see Table 2: Categorization of the Elements of the Definitions of Mentoring from the Literature) in order to focus on the commonalities between the definitions and to arrive at a definition that could be operationalized. Table 2 lists the core elements of each definition for ease of comparison. Notably in the list, there are no components common to all of the definitions. This level of variation aptly illustrates the confusion regarding the meaning of the

term "mentoring." Bozeman (2007) did not describe mentoring as a relationship, but rather, as a process. Tepper (1995) described mentoring as serving a role for career advancement, whereas deTormes (2012) made no mention of career advancement when he stated that mentoring is a relationship where the mentor has more experience. The variations in the definition across authors add to the uncertainty about the term.

Comparing the definitions of the term "mentor." As with the definitions for "mentoring," there is no consistent definition of "mentor" in the literature. This is illustrated in Table 3 (see Table 3: Mentor Definitions from the Literature) and Table 4 (Table 4: Categorization of the Elements of the Definitions of Mentor from the Literature). Similar to Tables 1 and 2, Table 3 provides a list of the definitions of "mentor" compiled from the literature, while Table 4 is a breakdown of the core components of the definitions from Table 3 for the purposes of comparison.

No core aspect of a definition for "mentor" repeated across all of the definitions, which illustrates the lack of clarity about this construct as well. The most commonly repeated core aspect was that a mentor needed to have advanced experience, or more experience, than a protégé. Also troubling is that the definitions do not point to behaviours so it is unclear what a mentor does or how mentoring is operationalized. For example, Anderson (2011) suggested that a mentor supports and assesses a student's work, but the author failed to describe how a mentor should support and assess this work. Assessing the work could involve a professional standard or be guided by a mentor's personal preference. Without further clarification, it is unclear how the mentor would judge or assess the student's work. Smith, Howard, and Harrington (2005) stated that the mentor needs to be "interested" in the protégé's career, but they fell short of explaining what "interested" meant and how "interested" would be translated into behaviours. This lack of

clarity makes it difficult to deduce what the author meant when using such terms. There are missing pieces in each definition and no definition clarifies the construct completely.

Defining the term "protégé." Also interesting, given the lack of clarity in defining the terms "mentor" and "mentoring," is the fact that I could not find an operational definition of the terms "protégé," "protégée" (i.e., the female equivalent of protégé), or "mentee" (i.e., a gender neutral term used interchangeably for protégé) in the literature. Commonly, the word protégé refers to both men and women despite being grammatically incorrect (i.e., the proper term, in French, for a female mentee would be protégée). In the literature on mentoring there is an implicit understanding of protégé as the person receiving the mentoring, but I found no operational definition to this effect.

When looking for a definition, search terms included: protégé, proteg*, protégé definition, protégé construct, protégé construct development, protégé relationship, protégé role, mentor*, mentor* construct, mentor* construct development, mentee, and mentor* definition. I reviewed the reference sections of articles on mentoring to identify research that could contain a definition of protégé, though I found nothing. In the search for a definition, the main databases explored included: Google Scholar, "Search Summon" on the University of Victoria's library website, EBSCO, ERIC, PsychINFO, PyscARTICLES, Business Source Complete, Emerald Journals, Mint Global, Business and Company Resource Centre, Academic Search Complete, and Humanities Index.

The field of mentoring needs an operational definition of "protégé" so that the meaning of the term is clear. A path forward from this confusion is to develop an operational definition of all three constructs (i.e., "mentor," "mentoring," and "protégé") on which to base additional research.

The process of construct definition. To study a given construct, such as mentoring, with the intent of measuring an aspect of it, the research must operationally define the construct. An operational definition allows researchers to have clarity about the construct under investigation. This, in turn, aids in validating the data, as it helps to know whether the construct the researcher set out to study was what the researcher indeed studied. This process starts with investigators explicitly knowing *what* they are studying.

Operationalizing a construct involves translating the ideas or components of the construct into behavioural and observable aspects (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). The researcher must engage in the process of defining the construct prior to data collection. Smith (2005a) stated that a researcher must provide the careful specifications of the theoretical construct in question, as a first step in the research process. By knowing what the construct is and the behaviours associated with it, a researcher can hone in on investigating that construct specifically. Without this clarity, what an investigator is actually studying is unknown. As Bryant (2000) stated,

> Imagine, for example, that you created an instrument to measure the extent to which an individual is a "nerd." To demonstrate construct validity, you would need a clear initial definition of what a nerd is to show that the instrument in fact measures "nerdiness." Furthermore, without a precise definition of nerd, you would have no way of distinguishing your measure of the nerdiness construct from measures of shyness, introversion or nonconformist. (p.112)

Cronbach and Meehl (1955) stated that researchers can only infer constructs by observing behaviours and that test performance would be an appropriate measurement of these behaviours. However, when investigators only define their constructs via observable phenomena, this may exclude psychological constructs and postulated variables evolved from psychological theory,

which are often unobservable. For example, Lane (2000) discussed difficulties in defining the construct "quality of life." She concluded that the best that researchers could do would be to use known and common correlates to people in general in all settings, to use fairly well-established reliability, and to obtain the best validity possible, acknowledging that perfect validity was not possible due to the ambiguous nature of the construct. Lane (2000) asserted that if researchers accomplished these criteria, they could consider that the construct as reasonably defined. Given these notions of reliability and validity, investigators may extrapolate that in terms of unobservable psychological constructs or theories, the construct definition still needs to be concrete, explicit, and based on observable behaviours whenever possible. Researchers must attempt to describe and explain the ambiguity within the definition and provide a rationale for this ambiguity.

If researchers cannot define the construct itself using observable measurable aspects, they could measure the inner psychological or emotional states related to the construct by reporting the person's inner state, or by recording a person's disclosure of his or her inner state. It is important to define a construct in a transparent manner, so as to appropriately apply any research based on the construct, with the full knowledge of any deficiencies. With regard to the term "mentor," researchers have used ambiguous descriptions to define the construct. For example, Anderson (2011) described a mentor as "experienced" without specifying what this term means. It is difficult to quantify how "experienced" a mentor needs to be to provide mentoring. There is no specific list of skills, or number of years of experience that makes a mentor experienced enough to be a mentor. It is crucial for the mentor to have more experience than the protégé, so as to be able to teach the protégé new knowledge, but it is difficult to specify how much experience is "enough" as this is a relative amount.

Instead of behaviourally establishing what "experienced" is, a researcher can measure psychological or emotional states in association with the mentor being "experienced." This may mean researchers could rate mentors' or protégés' perceptions, or inner confidence that the mentor is experienced enough to provide mentoring. In the absence of observable and measurable components, adding these aspects to a definition will help to clarify the construct and potentially increase the construct validity. Another option is to state there is no absolute measure of "enough experience." The critical aspect is not how much experience the mentor has per se, but that the mentor has "more experience" than the protégé in the specific area. As such, perhaps the term "experienced" could be replaced with "more experienced than the protégé" which is a relative and more measurable criterion.

Ensuring that a definition of mentoring is measurable and has construct validity. Construct validity refers to whether a scale measures, or correlates with, what the theorised construct (e.g., mentoring) purports to measure (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). In other words, there is construct validity when mentoring is measurable. Construct validity is related to the theoretical ideas behind the trait under consideration (e.g., the aspects of mentoring, including behaviours that make up mentoring). Cronbach and Meehl's (1955) elucidation of the concept of construct validity is the bedrock of modern psychological assessment and is therefore a suitable starting point for the development of an operationalized definition of "mentoring," "mentor," and "protégé." Cronbach and Meehl (1955) explained the process of construct validation as requiring the development of a nomological network (i.e., a representation of the concepts involved in a given study, how they may be observed and how they interrelate). Such a network, a) relates observable properties or quantities to each other; or b) theoretical constructs to observables; or c) different theoretical constructs to one another" (p. 290).

Tables 1-4 represent the beginning steps in developing a nomological network for the construct of mentoring. Table 5 (discussed in detailed later) includes many aspects of a nomological network, specifically how the construct of "mentor", "protégé" and "mentoring" relate and differentiate. In Tables 1-4 I have collated the definitions, terms, and concepts already in use in the literature and the difficulty in defining mentoring is in trying to stipulate the meaning of the construct itself, and not to define the construct by its results. For illustration, it would be incorrect to define mentoring as something that results in a protégé gaining job advancement, as this is a product of mentoring not a definition. Instead, when defining mentoring, it is important to address the boundary conditions of what is mentoring, and what is not mentoring, so the construct of mentoring is explicit and differentiated from other related constructs. Using Table 1: Mentoring Definitions from the Literature, I removed the superfluous components of the definitions to highlight the key elements from each definition of "mentoring" (see Table 2: Categorization of the Elements of the Definitions of Mentoring from the Literature) searching for evidence of this convergence or agreement. I did the same for the definitions found in the literature for "mentor" (see Table 3: Mentor Definitions from the Literature, and Table 4: Categorization of the Elements of the Definitions of Mentor from the Literature).

To further develop a measurable definition of the terms "mentor," "mentoring," and "protégé," I reviewed the core recommendations for developing a measure of a particular psychological construct (e.g., Campbell, 1960; Crocker & Algina, 1986; Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Hopkins & Stanley, 1981; Hoyt, Warbasse, & Chu, 2006; Smith, 2005a; Smith, 2005; Smith, 2005b; Westen & Rosenthal, 2005). The process is as follows:

1. Specify the theoretical construct.
2. Develop a set of items based on theory and a rational analysis of the construct.

3. Deduce testable predictions regarding the relationship between the construct and other empirical measures.
4. Conduct studies of these predicted relationships.
5. Eliminate items that operate contrary to theory and/or revise the theory.

For this study, I have done the first step and have operationalized the terms "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring," derived from an examination of the available literature. I recognised that I needed to operationally define mentoring before I measured it; therefore, I was mindful that I must be able to test and assess any operational definition in the real world in order to determine the effectiveness of the study in examining the topic in question. Crocker and Algina (1986) pointed out that "before any measurement of the construct can be made, it is necessary to establish some rule of correspondence between the theoretical construct and observable behaviours that are legitimate indicants of the construct." (p. 4). This means establishing an operational definition that allows for testable predictions to be made about mentoring, while at the same time, clarifying which observable behaviours are attributed to mentoring and which are attributed to other processes (i.e., What are its boundaries?).

Change the definition and the results change – defining boundaries. I focused heavily on developing the mentoring construct, as it is the basis of this study. Stating its boundary conditions is important for ensuring that the construct is useful, so that we know with some confidence, that X is an instance of mentoring but Y is not (Rosenberg, 2000), in other words, so it is clear what the mentoring process looks like and we know when it is occurring and when it has ended. Additionally, I was mindful of the choice of what language (i.e., word choice) to use in the definitions. The language used alters our understanding of a construct. Definitions are bound by language use and context, therefore the perception of a definition may change

depending on a person's own contextual understanding (Mishler, 1979) of, or experiences with, mentoring. It is important to articulate the boundaries, the use, and the context of a mentoring definition, so that others can transparently recognise what I intended by the term and how this intended definition helped to shape the research outcomes.

In their discussion of a definition of "mentoring," Bozeman and Fenney (2007) provided a mentoring relationship example and then answered a list of questions to better define the boundaries of mentoring, and what makes mentoring distinct from other constructs. This proved to be a useful exercise for Bozeman and Fenney (2007) as it highlighted the difficulty in "developing a concept of mentoring that has some explanatory relevance" (p. 724), especially one that is separate from coaching and apprenticeship. Their list of questions provides an excellent boundary exercise.

To determine the boundaries of my own definitions, I selected questions from Bozeman and Fenney's (2007) list and further expanded on them to help clarify my own definition. Specifically, Bozeman and Fenney (2007) asked the question "Who is the mentor?", which I altered to include the question "Who is the protégé?" I also collapsed their question, "Can groups mentor individuals?" into my answer for "Who is the mentor and who is the protégé?" This question concerned itself with whether or not mentoring can happen in groups. Bozeman and Fenney (2007) asked "Must the mentor and protégé like one another?" which I altered to read "Does successful mentoring involve, or need to involve, liking one another?" I made this alteration to include whether or not "liking" is necessary in "successful mentoring." I also used Bozeman and Fenney's (2007) question "When does mentoring begin and end?" without alterations. Likewise, I used their question "What part of knowledge transmission is mentoring and what part is not?" In addition to using most of the boundary questions from Bozeman and

Fenney (2007), I also referenced the definitions of "mentoring," and "mentor," from both the literature. I further referenced the elements that I had extracted in Tables 1-4, in order to develop additional questions.

The following is a list of 11 boundary-defining questions which I considered when constructing definitions of "mentoring," "mentor," and "protégé" (the basic concepts in questions 1, 3, 6, 9 and 11 are adapted from Bozeman & Fenney, 2007):

1. Who is the mentor and who is the protégé?

   It is important to know the people involved in mentoring and the roles they take in the relationship in order to determine who is involved in mentoring, and who exhibits certain behaviours in the construct.

2. Do mentoring relationships have reciprocity?

   This question helps to conceptualize the flow of knowledge between the mentor and the protégé, to establish what benefits the protégé and mentor experience from each other, and to determine if these benefits are reciprocal.

3. Does successful mentoring involve, or need to involve, liking one another?

   Since mentoring necessitates a relationship, this question helps to determine how relationship aspects such as "liking one another" shape the construct.

4. Do the mentor and protégé need to respect each other?

   This question explores the importance of additional relationship qualities and helps to determine if they are an important part of the construct.

5. Is it mentoring if the protégé shares information with the mentor?

   This question helps to clarify who is sharing knowledge within the mentoring relationship and how to conceptualize information shared by the protégé.

6. Does there have to be a conscious recognition that mentoring is occurring, on the part of both mentor and protégé, for there to be a mentoring relationship?

   This question helps to determine when and how mentoring starts and ends.

7. Can both a boss and a non-supervisor be a mentor?

   This question determines if roles impact mentoring and how to best define the construct in consideration of the multiple roles people can have in relationships.

8. Is trust an aspect of the relationship or can mentoring happen without trust?

   As mentoring occurs in a relationship, it is important to understand if the people involved need to trust each other, or if the relationship can be more transactional and not require an element of trust.

9. When does mentoring begin and end?

   This question targets which actions are associated with mentoring, so as to determine when mentoring has begun, as well as when the actions are no longer associated with mentoring.

10. What are the boundaries between socializing and mentoring?

    This question further explores the boundaries of mentoring within a complex relationship and establishes what mentoring is and which additional components to the relationship may be present that are not part of mentoring itself.

11. What part of knowledge-transmission is mentoring and what part is not?

    This question explores what information participants share within the confines of a mentoring relationship, and determines what aspects of knowledge-transmission may be present in the relationship yet external to mentoring.

The Mentoring Construct – A New Definition of "Mentoring," "Mentor," and "Protégé"

I examined the 11 questions that I had posited in order to better determine the boundaries of the construct of mentoring, again referencing the literature, the definitions in the literature, and the extracted core-elements of these definitions from Tables 2 and 4. In Table 5: Summary of Questions and Definitions, I have listed the questions and corresponding quotes from the new definitions which answer each question. After extensive review, I synthesised clear definitions that explain the concepts "mentoring," "mentor," and "protégé" in behavioural terms. My intention in creating these operational definitions was to provide the boundaries of mentoring, to separate mentoring from other constructs and, most importantly, to provide a measurable construct. As such, I offer the following definitions:

Mentor (noun): a person in a mentoring relationship who both parties perceive as having greater discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience and who:

a) Possesses the desire and skills to pass along his or her knowledge, in regard to the goals, by engaging in a relationship with someone he or she views as a protégé;
b) Is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired outcomes and invests in providing learning opportunities to assist the protégé in obtaining the goals;
c) Is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or a sense of the worth or excellence of) the protégé and who is perceived as "liking, and genuinely likes, the protégé" (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or congenial, to regard with favour);

d) Provides to, and receives from, the protégé, psychosocial support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, praise, attuning to and responding to the protégé's needs) and social cooperation;

e) Is considered by the protégé, and considers himself or herself, as trustworthy to be in a relationship and pass along knowledge.

Protégé (noun): a person in a mentoring relationship who both parties perceive as having lesser discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience and who;

a) Possesses the desire and skills necessary to learn, in regard to the goals, by engaging in a relationship with someone he or she views as a mentor;

b) Is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the mentor and is invested in the activities and process of achieving agreed-upon goals;

c) Makes changes based on the information acquired in the mentoring relationship;

d) Is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or a sense of the worth or excellence of) the mentor and who is perceived as "liking, and genuinely likes, the mentor" (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or congenial, to regard with favour);

e) Provides to, and receives from the mentor, psychosocial support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, praise, attuning to and responding to the mentors needs) and social cooperation;

f) Is considered by the mentor, and considers himself or herself, as trustworthy to be in a relationship and to receive the knowledge;

g) Integrates the information learned in the mentoring relationship and changes or alters behaviours, perceptions, beliefs etc. based on this integration.

To Mentor, or *Mentoring* (verb): a voluntary process involving:

a) Activities created and/or suggested by the mentor in which the protégé must engage to acquire the mentoring goals;

b) Informal communication between a mentor and a protégé for the transmission of knowledge perceived by the protégé and/or mentor as relevant to the goals;

c) Informal communication between a mentor and protégé, for reciprocally transmitting social cooperation, psychosocial support, and respect, and for conveying that the mentor and protégé like one another, in order to continue a commitment to the mentoring relationship;

d) Conscious acknowledgement and commitment to the relationship, and trustworthy engagement in the relationship and the activities that pursue the mentoring goals.

With the constructs operationally defined, and their boundaries delineated, a framework now exists within which to discuss the answers to the 11 boundary questions. This discussion will solidify a comprehensive conceptualization of mentoring before answering the research question regarding what behaviours help or hinder mentoring outcomes.

1. Who is the mentor and who is the protégé? The current study's definition of "mentoring" implies that the role of a mentor and protégé can change, depending on who is receiving the transfer of information. It states that the mentor creates and then suggests activities for the protégé, who then engages in these activities to learn, and thereby meet, the mentoring goals. In other words, the mentor does the teaching and the protégé, the learning.

This study's definition of "mentor," states that "both parties perceive (this person) as having greater discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience." This is because the mentor needs to share this knowledge in order to assist the protégé in reaching his or her goals. Comparatively, in the definition of "protégé," the person acting as the protégé needs to have "both parties perceive (this person) as having lesser discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience." The protégé is looking for information, which he or she needs to acquire from the mentor, in order to reach the protégé's mentoring goals.

The definitions further differentiate the "mentor" from the "protégé," by specifying that the mentor has "the desire and skills to pass along his or her knowledge" and the protégé has "the desire and skills necessary to learn." The definitions distinguish the roles of mentor and protégé by who has more knowledge and who has less knowledge, and also by who has the ability to teach, and who has the ability to learn, said knowledge.

For illustration, a junior therapist is beginning her career in counselling and establishes a mentoring relationship with a senior therapist in order to learn how to become more effective at her job. When looking for a senior therapist to function as a mentor, she needs to find someone with more knowledge about counselling than she currently possesses. It is not enough for the senior therapist (i.e., mentor) to have this greater knowledge, but this person also needs to have the necessary skills to be able to share this knowledge, and to suggest and create activities as a means of educating the protégé. The junior therapist, as the protégé, needs to have less knowledge than the mentor but must possess the necessary skills that will enable her to learn from the mentor. According to the proposed definition, without the imbalance of knowledge and means for transmission and receipt of this knowledge, the mentoring relationship cannot occur. The relationship is bound by the transfer of information for the pursuit of specific outcomes for

the protégé; in this illustration, the junior therapist's pursuit of how she might become a more effective therapist.

A mentor may also learn about him or herself, or the information being shared, through the mentoring role, or may come to think about the information differently as a result of the communication with the protégé. However, the mentor does not acquire more knowledge or skills related to the mentoring goals. Another way of saying this is that the mentor does not learn information from the protégé that would fulfill any goals in the relationship, because there are no learning (mentoring) goals for the mentor. The definitions of "mentor" and "protégé" are dependent on the direction of the transfer of information. If this direction reverses, the roles change and the mentoring relationship focuses on goals specific to the former "mentor." This sharing of skills and knowledge in one direction, which sees the mentor transferring knowledge to the protégé in order to achieve the protégé's specific mentoring-related goals, defines the mentoring relationship. Thus, there is a possibility that two people could function as each other's mentor and each other's protégé in different areas.

Bozeman and Fenney (2007) considered whether mentoring is best conducted in dyadic relationships (i.e., pairs), or if it can occur in groups. The authors determined that mentoring is best in dyadic relationships; however, a single person could have multiple, mentoring relationships, both as protégé and mentor. In that sense, a protégé could potentially have a group of people who individually mentor him or her. The reason why mentoring is best confined to a dyadic relationship is that group mentoring could lead to contradicting advice, meaning it is better to have one mentor providing directions to the protégé. A mentor could, however, have multiple protégés. According to the proposed definition, group mentoring is not possible.

2. Do mentoring relationships have reciprocity? Mentoring relationships have reciprocity with regard to (a) a mutual exchange of psychosocial support, (b) social cooperation, (c) an attitude of respect, and for (d) conveying that the participants in the relationship like one another. The mentoring relationship is not reciprocal with regard to learning the knowledge that is specific to the mentoring goals. This study's definition of "mentoring" specifies that the mentor must create activities, and suggest these activities to the protégé, who must then engage in these activities in order to achieve the mentoring goals. This results in a non-reciprocal transmission of knowledge while requiring reciprocity of responsibility, with both parties being responsible to the other in different ways. The proposed definition of "mentoring" requires that the mentor and protégé reciprocally transmit a sense of social cooperation, psychosocial support, respect, and a mutual sense of liking one another. There needs to be enough positive qualities in the relationship for the participants to stay committed to it and do the work required to achieve the goals within the framework of a relationship.

In the proposed definitions of "mentor" and "protégé," both parties cooperate socially, (i.e., sharing values and behaving in a manner that encourages social harmony) and provide and receive psychosocial support in the mentoring relationship. Psychosocial support, in this context, refers to each person in the mentoring relationship feeling that the other is meeting his or her psychological needs: to be uplifted by the social interaction, to feel appreciated, to feel encouraged and to feel as though his or her psychological well-being is important to the other person and is being attended to. Reciprocal praise, gratitude, words of encouragement, flexibility in scheduling, reassurance and a genuine attention to, and concern for, the other person's psychological state all demonstrate psychosocial support.

In the previous example of the junior-therapist and senior-therapist, both must express that they like and respect one another. They must socially cooperate and they must support each other psychosocially, to ensure that the protégé (i.e., the junior therapist) achieves the mentoring goals. The flow of knowledge is unidirectional: only the junior-therapist receives knowledge from the senior-therapist.

3. Does successful mentoring involve, or need to involve, liking one another? In order for the mentor and protégé to have a relationship fit, it is important that they get along with each other. Liking one another (i.e., taking pleasure in the other person, finding them agreeable or congenial, and regarding them with favour) is a key component of getting along. As such, careful selection by the mentor of a suitable protégé and *vice versa*, will greatly assist the mentoring relationship.

"Liking" is thought of as taking pleasure in the other person, finding them agreeable or congenial, and regarding them with favour. In the definition of "mentoring," informal communication between a mentor and a protégé demonstrates that they like one another. Similarly, the definitions for "mentor" and "protégé" also include both being perceived as liking the other person and genuinely liking the other person in the mentoring relationship. There are two components to "liking" in the definitions: 1. a sense of liking the other person in the mentoring relationship, and 2. a sense of being of being liked in return.

Mentoring relationships also include a degree of psychosocial support, a feeling that one's psychological well-being is important to the other person in the relationship, that the other person "has your back" so to speak. Psychosocial support in the absence of the other components of the definitions would indicate that one has a friend or supporter, not a mentor. Psychosocial support means that each person in the relationship tends to the psychological aspects, or

psychological needs, of his or her counterpart. However, individual needs fluctuate and are variable in any relationship. What is important is not that participants in the relationship determine a list of specific needs, but rather, as a need arises, the other person takes it into account. This perceiving and reacting to needs may include emotional needs (e.g., Is the mentor having a bad day? Is the protégé worried about a sick child at home?), psychological needs (e.g., Is the mentor stressed about an upcoming conference and so rescheduling the meeting would make a world of difference to her? Does the protégé need some additional encouragement to undertake the next activity?), or physical requirements (i.e., Is the chair comfortable? Is the mentor tired and a shorter meeting might be in order? Is the protégé better able to concentrate after lunch than in morning meetings?).

Social cooperation is another key feature of the definition. It refers to the presence of shared social norms and values that encourage social harmony between people. This aspect is different from simply "liking" one another and providing each other with psychosocial support, as two people can like one another and meet some of each other's needs but lack social cooperation. In the example of the protégé-junior-therapist and mentor-senior-therapist, the senior therapist would not agree to the relationship if she did not like the junior therapist and believe they could get along. The senior therapist must also believe that she will have some of her own needs met by the protégé and therefore that the relationship would be worthwhile to start and maintain. The junior therapist is there to learn but will also need to know that the mentor will meet her emotional and psychological needs and support and encourage her in the endeavour. Also, the junior therapist needs to like the senior therapist enough to stay in the relationship and continue pursuing the mentoring goals. Liking one another is critical to the success of the mentoring relationship.

4. Do the mentor and protégé need to respect each other? Respect is included in the definitions of "mentoring," "mentor," and "protégé," as is the perception that the other person is behaving in a respectful manner in return. Respect involves esteem for, or a sense of the worth or excellence of, the other person. A mentor or protégé may try to behave in a respectful manner; however, the other person may not interpret the behaviours as respectful, despite the intention behind the behaviours. Therefore, the definition specifies that it is the perception of respect, as well as the presence of respect, that is important. Respect is essential in the relationship, otherwise the protégé will not see the information the mentor provides as wise or of use, and the mentor will not see value in sharing with the protégé (O'Grady, Hinchion, & Mannix McNamara, 2011). The purpose is not to determine an exact list of behaviours that someone methodically implements, but rather, that through engagement with each other, the mentor and protégé respond in ways that demonstrate levels of respect appropriate to the situation. This may include asking to borrow the other person's possessions, allowing personal privacy, or abiding by personal boundaries that have been set. Likewise, respect can involve listening attentively to the other person, showing interest in what the other person thinks or how they feel, keeping agreements with each other, and being open to feedback.

In the case of the junior and senior therapists, it is common to hear the junior therapist express that she respects the senior therapist's opinion on any given matter and attentively listens to her when she speaks. The junior therapist also perceives that she is respected in turn, when the senior therapist asks her how she would go about handling a certain counselling situation, and then supports her choices; while adding additional information and options should the same counselling situation arise in future. Similarly, the junior therapist feels respected when the

senior therapist gives her personal space in terms of not intruding into her room without knocking and asking if she can enter first.

5. Is it mentoring if the protégé shares information with the mentor? The definition of "mentoring" includes "informal communication between the mentor and protégé for the transmission of knowledge to the protégé, relevant to the goals." The protégé knows less about the mentoring topic than the mentor, and the mentor has no mentoring goals specific to the topic, so the protégé cannot provide information to the mentor to help achieve the mentor's goals as they are not relevant. Instead, if the protégé shares information with the mentor, this is extraneous to the mentoring process.

The definition of "mentoring" requires that there must be "activities created and/or suggested by the mentor, in which the protégé must engage to acquire the mentoring goals," and also specifies that the mentoring goals are achieved via the mentor sharing knowledge with the protégé. The relationship may be dynamic and the participants may certainly share information extraneous to the mentoring relationship, but this is not to be confused with information shared for the purpose of mentoring. It is also important that the information shared, between the mentor and protégé, be relevant to professional or personal development. It is not essential that the information transmitted actually be useable, but rather, that the communicated knowledge be *perceived* to be useful by the recipient.

In the example of the junior and senior therapists, the senior therapist might share information with the junior therapist, which the junior therapist perceives as helpful; even though the junior therapist may not have the knowledge or experience, as of yet, to completely understand the relevance of the information. Contrarily, the junior therapist might teach the

mentor how to use Microsoft Word to write therapy-session notes, but in accordance with the definition, this would not be mentoring behaviour.

6. Does there have to be a conscious recognition that mentoring is occurring, on the part of both the mentor and the protégé, for there to be a mentoring relationship?

According to this proposed definition of mentoring, the participants must acknowledge the relationship as a mentoring relationship, simultaneously committing to the relationship as well as to achieving the mentoring goals. The definition does not consider that it is mentoring if both of the parties involved do not consent to and acknowledge the relationship. Simply calling a relationship "mentoring" does not make it a mentoring relationship, unless it fits the other criteria specified in the definition. The act of consenting to, and acknowledging, a relationship based on these criteria and then proceeding with behaviours that support the criteria, makes the relationship fit within the mentoring construct.

It is possible that people may behave in a way that fits the proposed definitions and yet they do not label their relationship "mentoring." The name itself does not matter but the behaviours of the construct do. So if people are engaging in a way consistent with the mentoring definition but call it coaching, elder guidance, spiritual leader or some other term, then the relationship is still, by definition, a mentoring relationship. The importance lies in meeting all of the criteria of a mentoring relationship as defined herein. Both parties must be consciousness of, and agree to being in a "mentoring-type" relationship for it to be called mentoring or called something else (i.e., learning from an elder) that abides by the boundaries of a mentoring relationship. For illustration, calling an "orange" an "apple" does not make it an apple. Likewise, enjoying eating an orange but not knowing its name or simply not calling it an "orange" does not take away from the fact that it fits the criteria and definition of an orange exactly. The same goes

for mentoring; calling it by another name does not take away from it fitting the criteria of mentoring, and calling something other than mentoring, mentoring, does not make it so. This is the main contribution of an operationalized definition of the construct in research. It allows us to distinguish between different behaviours and also to collate behaviours that are the same, regardless of the name applied to the behaviours.

The majority of research questionnaires focused on mentoring assume the research participant can, and will, identify a mentor (Eby et al., 2004; Ragins et al., 2000). What these questionnaires fail to take into account is whether or not the participant has had his or her perception of mentoring validated by the other person involved in the relationship, and if the relationship fits all of the proposed criteria for being a mentoring relationship. In the case of the junior and senior therapists, the junior therapist approached the senior therapist, asking her if she would be willing to mentor her and explicitly outlining her mentoring goals. Together they determined an appropriate meeting schedule that worked for both of them, and adjusted the mentoring goals in light of the senior therapist's areas of expertise and past experience providing mentoring. They seemed to get along well in the initial meetings, liked each other, and both felt that they would be a good fit, whereupon they both committed to undertaking a mentoring relationship. This relationship seems to fit all the proposed criteria for mentoring, and investigators would consider it as such, even if the participants had called it supervision.

7. Can both a boss and a non-supervisor be a mentor? In the proposed definition, a boss can be a mentor and a peer can also be a mentor. The relationship must meet all of the criteria listed in the definitions of "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring," however, the presence of additional factors, such as being a boss or peer, does not exclude the relationship from being a mentoring relationship. If the relationship meets the criteria and has additional aspects, such as

one of the participants also being a boss or a colleague, the relationship would still be considered mentoring provided both parties acknowledge that they are in a mentoring relationship.

The proposed definition of mentoring stipulates that it is a voluntary process. Stipulating that mentoring is a voluntary process is not to exclude the possibility of receiving payment while functioning as a mentor. The stipulation intends to differentiate between supervisors who have to engage in behaviours that fit the definition of mentoring as part of their job requirements, and supervisors who voluntarily choose to be a mentor. In both cases, the supervisors would receive payment during the mentoring time. However, what determines the difference between the two is that mentoring includes things such as liking and respecting the other person. A superior can mandate a supervisor to teach someone and help them reach his or her goals, but cannot require that the supervisor like or respect someone in a mentoring relationship. Further, a supervisor can be a mentor in an area that is not part of his or her job requirements. The time given to mentoring does not have to be free, but the choice to engage in mentoring needs to be voluntary. For illustration, the junior therapist has a mentor who is also her master's thesis supervisor. The institution pays the mentor to supervise and instruct the protégé on her thesis. However, the institution does not pay the mentor to mentor the protégé regarding the junior therapist's mentoring goal, which is to become a better therapist. The supervisory position of the senior therapist is in addition to her role as mentor, which she has voluntarily assumed.

8. Is trust an aspect of the relationship or can mentoring happen without trust?

Trust is essential in the mentoring relationship. The proposed definition of "mentoring" states that the mentoring process includes "trustworthy engagement in the relationship and the activities that pursue the mentoring goals." Likewise, the definition of "mentor" says that he or she is "considered by the protégé, and considers himself or herself, as trustworthy enough to be

in a relationship and pass along knowledge." The definition of "protégé" similarly requires that the protégé be "considered by the mentor, and considers himself or herself as trustworthy to be in a relationship and to receive the knowledge."

It is essential that a protégé trust that the information the mentor is sharing will be both helpful and relevant. Similarly, the mentor needs to trust that a protégé is seeking information in a truthful manner and engaging in the activities as assigned, in order to reach the mentoring goals. The mentor needs to provide trustworthy mentoring-related information and make efforts to help the protégé reach the mentoring goals. The mentor must believe that his or her actions, and the knowledge he or she has chosen to share, are trustworthy. Likewise, the mentor needs to feel that the protégé is a trustworthy enough individual to warrant the investment of time, energy, and information.

Both mentor and protégé need to be trustworthy to be in the mentoring relationship and they also must act in a trustworthy manner so as to inspire the trust of their counterparts. If either the mentor or the protégé perceives the other as not trustworthy, he or she will likely discontinue the relationship. Also, if either the mentor or the protégé perceives that his or her own behaviour in the relationship is not to be trusted, (e.g., perhaps because the protégé is not truly engaging in the activities provided by the mentor, or perhaps because the mentor knows that the information she is providing may not be accurate) this will eventually be perceived by the other person and will impact the relationship. Anything that negatively impacts the relationship runs the risk of ending the relationship, yet it is not essential to trust the other person in terms of issues not related to the mentoring topic (e.g., if the mentoring is about being a successful therapist, the protégé does not need to trust the mentor's advice about financial investments).

9. When does mentoring begin and end? Mentoring does not begin until the mentor and protégé explicitly acknowledge that they are in a (mentoring) relationship that adheres to these behaviours, and the mentor begins to share his or her knowledge. The end of mentoring occurs when the mentor has evaluated the mentoring process, has recognised that the protégé has demonstrated the acquisition of the mentoring goals, and both mentor and protégé have agreed that the goals have been achieved and it is time to terminate the mentoring relationship.

The participants in a mentoring relationship may terminate it when both parties have equal knowledge of the mentoring topic. However, mentoring is not bound to a single area, so there may be a staggered effect as the protégé reaches various mentoring goals. Of course, either party may decide to end the relationship before the protégé reaches the goals, or new goals may arise during the course of the mentoring process. As long as there is an area for the transfer of knowledge, the mentoring relationship can continue.

In the case of the junior therapist, both junior and senior therapist have committed to the mentoring relationship. This is the defining anchor-point for the relationship, but it is the actual practice of sharing knowledge, and beginning the process, that starts the mentoring. The definitions of mentor and protégé include being "a person in the mentoring relationship." This means that engaging in the actions of the process of mentoring are fundamental to being a mentor or protégé. The junior therapist becomes the protégé and the senior-therapist becomes the mentor only when they start sharing knowledge. In this moment their mentoring journey begins.

10. What are the boundaries between socializing and mentoring? The proposed definition of "mentoring" stipulates that communication happens for the purpose of knowledge-transmission relevant to the mentoring goals, but also includes the necessary elements of the mentor and protégé conveying that they like one another and demonstrating reciprocal social

cooperation, psychosocial support, and respect. There may be components of the overall relationship that are social; however, the focus of the mentoring relationship is the sharing of knowledge for the purpose of meeting agreed upon goals.

There needs to be some social exchange in order for the mentor and the protégé to get to know one another and to have enough social endowments (i.e., positive qualities, characteristics, or features) to maintain the mentoring relationship. Mentoring is an informal social exchange that does not develop on command, but rather is a process. For the mentor, the focus of mentoring, as outlined in the definition, is "to assist the protégé in obtaining the goals." Similarly, the focus for the protégé is "to learn the desired outcomes from the mentor." Any interactions and communications that fit within the definitions of "mentoring," "mentor," and "protégé," while promoting and maintaining the mentoring relationship necessary for the transmission of knowledge, are part of the mentoring process.

For illustration, the junior-therapist talks about her weekend hobbies. At first glance she seems to be just socializing, but this communication functions as a necessary social component of the mentoring process. By "getting to know each other" the junior and senior therapist are developing a base for conveying that they like one another, as well as for demonstrating mutual psychosocial support, both important components of the mentoring relationship. The conversation appears extraneous to the topic of mentoring, but it is relevant to the relationship development and therefore relevant to the relational aspect of mentoring. Socializing may happen while being mentored and, while not essential to the transfer of knowledge, it is essential to the maintenance of a relationship connection. A simple method to distinguish between what is unnecessary socializing, which could delay, muddy, or interfere with, the mentoring process, and what is helpful socializing, for the mentoring purposes of reciprocal social cooperation,

psychosocial support, respect, and for demonstrating a liking for one another, is to ask the question periodically, "Is this relevant to maintaining the mentoring relationship?"

11. What part of knowledge-transmission is mentoring and what part is not?

The focus of mentoring is the sharing of knowledge specific to the mentoring goals. While the protégé and the mentor may share other knowledge, if that knowledge does not relate to the mentoring goals, or to the establishment and maintenance of the mentoring relationship, then it is extraneous to the process.

In the example of the junior and senior therapists, the senior therapist/mentor may teach the junior therapist/protégé about how to change a car tire, which has nothing to do with the junior therapist's goal of becoming a better therapist. This shared knowledge would be outside the bounds of the mentoring. A further example is that the junior therapist might share information about her upcoming birthday and the kind of activities she likes to do to celebrate. If the senior therapist responds by giving her a birthday gift, this may serve the mentoring relationship by conveying a sense that the mentor likes the protégé.

The definitions of "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring," and the discussion of the above questions, delineate the boundaries of the respective constructs. I provided the definitions to the current study's research participants, in order to clearly identify whether they had engaged in relationships that fit the definitions, and to ensure that they had clarity about the constructs under investigation. With a solid sense of what constitutes mentoring, I was then better able to design my investigation of what self-described protégés and mentors report helped and/or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationships, and I began my search for an appropriate paradigm.

In Search of a Paradigm

The choices that I have made for the particular methods used in the current study derived from certain philosophical underpinnings, an understanding of which informed both the context and constraints of the research undertaken. From an understanding of broad empiricism, necessary to the operationalization of the definitions used, as well as to assuring the validity and usability of the data, through to determining a method of inquiry and a conceptual framework that allowed the best interpretation of the qualitative nature of the results, I began my endeavour with a clear sense of the purpose of the study. I then searched for a paradigm that would focus the research in order to ascertain the best means to target, answer, and interpret the research question. The background of this search, its development and the choices that resulted in the final methodological decisions, establish a clearer perspective on how I pursued this research question and why its findings are persuasive.

Wilber's eyes on perspective, the road to broad empiricism and all valid knowing. Though generally familiar to all researchers, in keeping with the current study's focus on the clear understanding of definitions, empiricism is a process of deriving verification for assertions through direct experiential evidence, data, or confirmation (Wilber, 1998). The scientific method, based on empiricism (Wilber, 1998), is a body of techniques for investigating phenomena, acquiring new knowledge, or correcting, and integrating previous knowledge.

Wilber (1998) differentiated between narrow and broad empiricism, using the term "narrow empiricism" to refer only to the methods used to investigate the physical (i.e., sensory derived) sciences. Broad empiricism, in contrast, searches for experiential evidence for assertions, but the evidence could come in the form of sensory (i.e., from the physical and sensorimotor world), mental (i.e., such as from logic, mathematics, phenomenology,

hermeneutics, or semiotics), and spiritual (i.e., from mysticism or spiritual experiences) perceptions. Wilber (1998) argued science cannot only mean empiricism in the narrow sense because that would rule out mathematics and logic; therefore, the scientific method must be based upon broad empiricism and be inclusive of all ways of collecting knowledge. This is of particular relevance in the current study because the answers to the research question regarding what helps or hinders the outcome of mentoring relationships, are dependent upon the collected experiential reports (i.e., knowledge) of those who have participated in such relationships and shared through verbal communication (i.e., hermeneutics).

Wilber's right "eye." Wilber (1998) discussed acquiring knowledge, and evidence for the knowledge, through "eyes" and "perspectives." He distinguished these "eyes," used to acquire knowledge, as either; (a) the "eye" of the flesh (i.e., related to sensory experiences such as sight, touch, taste etc.); (b) the "eye" of the mind (i.e., related to mental experiences such as mathematics, logic, and hermeneutics etc.); or (c) the "eye" of contemplation (i.e., related to spiritual experiences such as satori, nirvikalpa samadhi, and oneness with Spirit etc.). Wilber (1998) further defined the means by which his three different "eyes" collect their knowledge.

Wilber (1998) stated that the "eye of the flesh" is "monological," wherein a person investigates an object (e.g., a rock, or a process such as oxygen flow through the lungs) and observes the object, but does not have to speak to it, create a mutual understanding with it, nor seek to understand the object's internal experience. To investigate this object the researcher would use his or her senses for learning and data collection. Researchers equate Wilber's (1998) "eye of the flesh" with narrow empiricism, whereas broad empiricism also includes Wilber's "eye of the mind," and the "eye of contemplation."

Wilber (1998) defined the "eye of the mind" as necessarily "dialogical," wherein a person had to be spoken with (i.e., engaged in dialogue) in order to understand that person's internal experience. Data regarding the internal experience of a person could be co-constructed through numbers (e.g., using a Likert scale to rank agreement with statements about internal experience), or through words (e.g., a Critical-Incident-Technique interview). Wilber (1998) considered any research attempt to understand internal meaning through symbols (e.g., music, words, numbers), also as "dialogical" as it would incorporate a translation of the person's internal experience in order to create a mutual understanding. Wilber (1998) referred to the "eye of contemplation" as "translogical" wherein the person engages in gaining knowledge that transcends the logical, the rational, or even the mental. He defined it as a formless mysticism by which a person gained knowledge and evidence of the spiritual domain.

Wilber (1998) was very specific that an investigator had to be using the correct "eye" to acquire the information available and to verify this information with evidence from that "eye's" domain. He maintained that a person could not learn about the function of oxygen flow through the lungs (i.e., which would necessitate using the "eye of the flesh") from spiritual practice (i.e., by using the "eye of contemplation"), nor could a researcher learn about a person's inner experience of being mentored (i.e., which would require Wilber's (1998) "eye of the mind") through a sense of smell (i.e., necessitating the "eye of the flesh").

Each method of generating information demands experiential evidence, not dogma or unverifiable conjectures. Therefore, if a researcher wants to answer a specific research question, it is important to use the appropriate "eye," which will provide the experience and evidence to investigate the phenomena. To investigate the research question "What do self-described protégés and mentors report helped and/or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring

relationship?," I decided to explore the topic through Wilber's (1998) "eye of the mind," as it looks to gain information about an inner experience through a dialogue. In the case of the current study, the dialogue was with participants who reported that they had had the experience of a mentoring relationship.

Wilber's perspective on "perspectives." Wilber (1998) also discussed acquiring knowledge, and its supporting evidence, through what he termed "perspectives." According to Wilber (1998), perspectives come before perceptions, meaning that a perspective determines what we are able to see and understand, by creating an array of perceptions based on the perspective. He further described "perspectives" as not only preceding perceptions, but as limiting what is perceived. He categorized these "perspectives" as either: first-person, second-person, or third-person.

Wilber (1998) asserted that each perspective discloses different sets of information, and that each perspective impacts the perceptions one can gain while taking that perspective. He defined the "first-person perspective" as that of the person who is speaking, noting that it involves the immediate experience of self in relation to both the outside world and the inner self. This perspective is concerned with a person's experience in the moment, as well as the "present" experience of his or her self and excludes the person from taking the perspective of another. This is a useful perspective for the purposes of a study on mentoring outcomes, as a protégé could report his or her immediate experience of the mentoring relationship, including feelings, body sensations, and automatic thoughts.

Wilber (1998) described the "second-person perspective" as that of the person who is spoken to and affirmed that one could only understand this perspective in the context of another person. Participants experience "second-person perspective" only through dialogue, which

involves one or both people understanding another's experience. Wilber (1998) further described it as the sense of having a shared meaning (e.g., from this perspective a person might say "When I listen and understand the other person better, I have a sense of "we"). The perspective of seeing and experiencing this shared "we," makes the rest of the world the object of the people sharing the perspective.

The "third-person perspective," Wilber (1998) defined as that of the person spoken about, wherein the "object" becomes awareness itself (i.e., being aware of the self in the process of being aware of oneself and another). An example of this is being aware of one's self speaking to another, "watching" yourself at the same time as an object, and experiencing the events unfolding through that lens. When in the "first-person perspective," an individual is not aware of the information gathered through watching themselves in the third-person. The "third-person perspective" might include taking the perspective of the facts involved (e.g., time, location, emotions etc.) and seeing what roles are being played, what behaviours exhibited, and what is being communicated. An example of "first-person perspective," is biofeedback to lower one's heart rate. Phone surveys about experiences at a grocery store represent a "second-person perspective," and an engineering analysis of a proposed highway overpass that looks at the resources available, stakeholder's opinions, and engineering standards is an example of a "third-person perspective."

The choice of research methodology is dependent on which of the different "perspectives" and "eyes" would best lead to the information being sought. Each implicates a different set of research methods. For example, autoethnography (i.e., writing to self-reflect on one's experiences) is a technique arising out of the need for a "first-person perspective." Critical Incident Technique (i.e., a qualitative approach to directly amassing data from reported "critical"

behaviours) derives from a "second-person perspective," while systems analysis (i.e., the use of mathematics to analyze and optimize a system by deconstructing it into its functional components) requires a "third-person perspective."

No one perspective is inherently better than another, rather, each simply reveals different information about that which is under investigation; also, investigators can only obtain certain information through certain perspectives. The current study posed the research question "What do self-described protégés and mentors report helped and/or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationship?" The research method to answer the question best aligns with Wilber's (1998) "eye of the mind" and "second-person perspective," as my investigation required dialogues, along with a sense of shared meaning, in order for me to be able to understand the participants' experiences.

Wilber's all valid knowing. Wilber (1998) also concerned himself with how knowledge gained through the use of the different "eyes" or "perspectives" could be validated (i.e., determined to be accurate). He distinguished three methods for scientifically attaining evidence for any given assertion. He called these methods "strands of all valid knowing," and asserted that "a paradigm is not merely a concept; it is an actual practice, a technique taken as an exemplar for generating data" (Wilber, 1998, p. 159). The three "strands of all valid knowing" are:

> (a) an instrumental "injunction": an actual practice, exemplar, paradigm, experiment, or ordinance that comes in the form "if you want to know this, do this"; (b) "a direct apprehension": the experience of the domain brought forth by the injunction, as in a direct experience or apprehension of data; and (c) "a communal confirmation/ rejection": checking the results (data or evidence) with others who have adequately completed the injunction and apprehensive strands (Wilber, 1998, pp. 159-156).

In other words, a paradigm (i.e., an experiment, as Wilber asserted that a paradigm was "an actual practice" (Wilber, 1998, p. 159)), leads to data, which must be checked by a group and either confirmed as accurate, or rejected.

Wilber's (1998) "strands" are perhaps best understood through examples. Consider that a researcher is performing a quantitative experiment (i.e., an "injunction") using the monological "eye of the flesh" (i.e., investigating by observation) to study the flow of oxygen through the lungs. This would involve following an established protocol for assessing oxygen flow, including collecting and comparing numerical scores about the oxygen flow-per-minute, as well as oxygen saturation percentages, respective percentages of different gases in the air, and the volume and weight of the lungs. Alternatively, another researcher could be performing a qualitative "injunction" using the "eye of the mind" and "second-person perspective" to suggest the use of Critical Incident Technique interviews to explore what helped produce desirable outcomes in an emphysema-patient mentoring program. Both examples use a different injunction and provide information to answer the specific research question. The data in the two examples, one a quantitative study and the other a qualitative study, cannot be meaningfully compared. Researchers can only meaningfully compare data with other data generated by the same "injunction." Recall that Wilber's (1998) notion of an "injunction" follows the format "if you want to know this, do this," specific to the knowledge one is trying to gain. The "injunction" to learn one thing may not be helpful in learning something else.

The second part of Wilber's (1998) three "strands of all valid knowing" is the apprehension of data. This is the immediate experience resulting from the "injunction." For example, the researcher reads the numerical data and interprets it using statistical analysis, whereupon this interpretation becomes a representation of the oxygen flow through the lungs.

The investigator directly apprehends the data derived by the "injunction." The researcher who co-constructed the data in the interviews with participants from the emphysema-patient mentoring program would take the data back to the participants to determine if the representation of the data fits the participants' experience. The participants are the only people, other than the researchers, who have adequately completed the "injunction" and "apprehension" strands, so they are the only ones who can evaluate the validity of their personal data and, therefore, complete Wilber's third strand of confirming or rejecting the data.

Wilber's (1998) three "strands of all valid knowing" served me well when selecting a research approach (i.e., an "injunction) that would permit me to apprehend the data I was seeking and to ultimately have the data validated by those who had undergone the "injunction," the participants and me. To answer the question, "What do self-described protégés and mentors report helped and/or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationship?", the "injunction" relied on the act of reporting (i.e., "the eye of the mind," "the first-person experience with a third person reflection" co-constructed using "the second person perspective") to produce the data. The researcher and participants could then confirm or reject the data to obtain a measure of its validity. Those familiar with the method (i.e., the supervisory committee) would then validate the methodology. With a definition of mentoring in place and Wilber's (1998) "strands of all valid knowing" providing the paradigm for the current study, all that remained was "everything else." This "everything else" was the all-encompassing worldview that determines a researcher's framework of attitudes and ideas, and from which the research assumptions, justifications, decisions, and interpretations would flow.

In Search of a Worldview

Researchers use a conceptual framework or worldview (commonly and mistakenly referred to as a paradigm (Wilber, 1998)) in their research. A worldview is a way of thinking about and making sense of the complexities of the world. It is the "basic set of beliefs that guides actions" (Guba, 1990), a metaphorical net containing the researcher's ontological, epistemological, axiological, methodological, and rhetorical assumptions (Morrow, 2007). Creswell (1998) noted that all researchers approach their areas of study, either consciously or unconsciously, with a certain worldview, encompassing a fundamental set of beliefs or philosophical assumptions, that guides their process of scientific inquiry. Creswell (1998) stated that these assumptions are related to one's beliefs about the nature of reality or knowledge (i.e., ontological assumption), how knowledge is generated (i.e., epistemological assumption), and the process by which the researcher will find this knowledge (i.e., methodology) in order to answer the research question. A researcher must then decide on the language of the research (i.e., rhetorical method) with regard to the literary structure and style of the study (Creswell, 1998). Throughout the research process, a researcher looks at what role his or her values (i.e., axiological assumptions) play in the study (Creswell, 1998). These assumptions are the lenses through which the researcher conceptualizes the research question. Therefore, it is essential that a researcher clearly states his or her assumptions and worldview at the outset to better understand the context of his or her study.

Arriving at a worldview: qualitative vs. quantitative inquiry. The two main worldviews of qualitative and quantitative inquiry have differing assumptions about how to study and understand phenomena. A qualitative study uses "an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words,

reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting" (Creswell, 1994, p. 6), and, as such, has a set of assumptions about how phenomena is to be studied and understood. A quantitative study, by comparison, "is an inquiry into a social or human problem… measured with numbers" (Creswell, 1994, p. 7).

Qualitative and quantitative methodologies have been referred to as paradigms (Guba & Lincoln, 2005) but others have argued with this definition (Wilber, 1998). For example, Kuhn's (1972, 1970) representation of a paradigm was misunderstood to mean a worldview, however Kuhn did not define "paradigm" merely as a concept or worldview, but as an actual practice, (i.e., an injunction, a technique, a method) for generating or gathering data (Wilber, 1998). The concept of a "scientific paradigm," according to Wilber (1998) and Kuhn (1972, 1970), refers not to a worldview, but to a methodology by which one obtains certain information. Therefore, qualitative and quantitative orientations to methodology are different practices or "injunctions" for exploring research questions, in addition to also representing different worldviews. Qualitative research itself is conducted from within a range of worldviews and each present with different goals (Haverkamp & Young, 2007).

The methodology and method chosen to investigate a phenomena depends on the researcher's purpose for the specific investigation and his or her foundational philosophy-of-science (Haverkamp & Young, 2007). Different philosophy-of-science worldviews (i.e., beliefs and assumptions about science) align with different methods and outcomes. Quantitative research typically uses a positivistic or post-positivist worldview, while qualitative research may use an interpretive/constructivist, realist/post-positivist, or critical/ideological worldview among others (Creswell, 1994; Haverkamp & Young, 2007). Clearly, a researcher may choose between

qualitative and quantitative inquiry but must then further define his or her worldview within these main branches.

The research question "What do self-described protégés and mentors report helped and/or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationship?" fits a qualitative research design, as it focuses the research on understanding the inner experiences of protégés and mentors. Further, participants shared what behaviours helped or hindered the mentoring outcomes verbally through language, which resulted in co-constructed data. After examining the worldviews offered within a qualitative context, I selected the interpretive/constructivist worldview as most useful to study answer my research question.

Research within an interpretive/constructivist worldview. Interpretive/constructivism is concerned with how the social world is interpreted, understood, experienced, and produced (Mason, 2002). Interpretive/constructivism is subjective, stating that how we come to know and experience reality is through our perceptions, and social transactions, such that knowledge and meaning are co-created. Researchers cannot directly observe the knowledge and meaning derived from within this framework, but rather, they can only infer or interpret it.

I decided on the use of interpretive/constructivist worldview for this current study, because it is grounded in a relativist ontology, which posits multiple, equally-valid social realities (Piantanida & Garman, 2009). In this worldview, knowledge or meaning emerges through interaction between persons and is thereby co-constructed. The researcher's own values and biases are assumed to exist and to assist in the co-construction of the data (Morrow, 2007).The ontological assumption of this worldview is that reality is subjectively experienced by individuals and, therefore, is shaped and interpreted by individual perspectives. This, in turn, results in multiple perspectives, subjective experiences, and perceptions of reality that are

interpreted through a social lens (Creswell, 1994). As Wilber (1998) noted, perspectives come before perceptions, meaning perspectives determine what we are able to see and understand.

In an interpretive/constructivist worldview, the co-construction of knowledge by the researcher and participants means the participants share information about their experiences and perspectives, and the researcher interprets this knowledge through his or her own contextual lens. This is also thought of as taking the "second-person perspective" (Wilber, 1998) and involves an interpretative process in order to understand the experiences expressed. This process is comprised of the participants using symbols (i.e., words, art, numbers etc.) to describe their experiences and the researcher comprehending and interpreting these symbols. The process combines the perspectives of the researcher and participants, and ultimately those of the audience interpreting the study; each interprets and makes sense of the symbols through his or her own perspective and personal context. These experiences and perspectives are relative with no one true (i.e., better or best) experience or perspective.

In the interpretive/constructivist worldview, a single, perfect, legitimate, perspective, that the researcher must seek, does not exist. However, all interpretations of reality, or an experience, are not equally valid as there are better or worse interpretations of every text (Wilber, 1998). For example certain perspectives may be more or less well-informed. Some people may have more experience, or more insight into the experience, and share a more comprehensive detailing of the experience, which results in a better-informed perspective than someone whose perspective is limited, shallow, or uninformed. Using Wilber's (1998) terminology, the "community of the adequate" (Wilber, 1998) who experienced the "injunction," can establish if the interpretation is good or bad.

The current study - Integrating Wilber and the interpretive/constructivist worldview.

The focus of the current study is the co-construction of information with participants (protégés or mentors) who have experienced behaviours that helped or hindered the outcomes of a mentoring relationship. Integrating Wilber's (1998) work, on "eyes', "perspectives" and the "strands of all valid knowing," with the interpretive/constructivist worldview, I used Wilber's (1998) "eye of the mind" and applied his dialogical meaning (i.e. second-person perspective) to the data. I asked participants to share information from first, second, and third-person origins. I also expected that, as a researcher subscribing to the interpretive/constructivist worldview, I would experience first-person and second-person perspectives during the interviews, which would, in turn, shape the questions asked and the data derived, resulting in co-constructed data. I engaged in the third-person perspective in terms of looking at the research data during transcript analysis to take the perspective of the facts involved (e.g., what actions and behaviours the participants exhibit and what they are communicating).

I used the epistemology (i.e., how I acquired knowledge, or came to know and understand the phenomena of what helps or hinders mentoring relationship outcomes) of dialogue and the shared, mutual understanding of language (i.e., verbal symbols) with the participants as they reported their experiences. I co-constructed the knowledge along with the participants which we filtered through their and my own perspectives and contexts. I restated my understanding of the participants' reports as they were unfolding in the moment, in order to confirm my perception of this co-constructed knowledge. I carefully analyzed the interview transcripts for richer knowledge and engaged with the data for prolonged periods in order to construct deeper meanings.

Consistent with an interpretative/constructivist worldview, the axiological assumption evident in this study was that the research was value-laden. The presence of values arose when I chose the topic (as I valued investigating this topic). I have made apparent my values, so that others reading the research can understand the context through which I conducted the study. This allows the reader to judge if the research outcomes are relatable to his or her own context. The entire process of the study was inductive, as I identified emerging categories during the research process. The study was context bound and the outcomes were for the purpose of generating understanding. The co-constructed data was descriptive (i.e., thick, rich) and dependent upon the perspectives and experiences (i.e., context-bound) of the participants and researcher. The results were categories that were representations of the co-constructed data.

As this study was not quantitative, positivistic, or post-positivistic, I was not searching for objective or generalizable truths. Instead, following an interpretative/constructivist worldview, and the philosophical hermeneutics therein, my purpose was to broaden my viewpoint (and that of the reader), to fuse my understanding with that of the participants leading to a deeper understanding, rather than the generating facts. My ultimate intention was to create a dialectical understanding of the phenomena of what behaviours help or hinder mentoring relationship outcomes. The accuracy of this understanding was evaluated by Wilber's (1998) "community of the adequate," which for this study, meant that the accuracy of the information was evaluated by the participants, described in following sections.

The Critical Incident Technique and the Enhanced Critical Incident Technique

The Critical Incident Technique (CIT) is a qualitative research method that consists of "a set of procedures for collecting direct observations of human behaviour in such a way as to facilitate their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad

psychological principles" (Flanagan, 1954, p. 327). Flanagan (1954) developed the CIT to collect observable data using positivistic assumptions (i.e., assumptions based on the scientific method). Researchers have previously employed the CIT in qualitative research to co-construct retrospective self-reports with participants (Butterfield et al., 2005) and it lends itself well to an interpretive/constructivist worldview. The primary use of the CIT is as a tool to create a functional description of an activity; to determine the aim, or objective of that activity; and finally to discover what helps or hinders the success of that activity (Butterfield et al., 2005).

The word "critical," in the CIT, refers to an incident (i.e., an event, a happening, an occurrence) where the purpose or intent of the act or event seems fairly clear to the observer and where its consequences are sufficient to leave little doubt concerning its effects. The word "incident" has been further defined as "any observable human activity that is sufficiently complete in itself to permit inferences and predictions to be made about the person performing the act" (Flanagan, 1954, p. 327). I have briefly summarized the "technique" of the CIT as follows: the researcher obtains first-hand reports of incidents that impacted an outcome's success or failure. Through the co-construction of data and its subsequent sorting into patterns and categories, the researcher identifies the *perceptions* of what assisted in the outcome's success or failure.

The Enhanced Critical Incident Technique (ECIT) (Butterfield et al., 2005) is a revision of the earlier CIT technique adapted to use qualitative assumptions. The term "ECIT" was coined by Butterfield, Borgen, Maglio and Amundson (2009) to refer to an amalgamation of the original components of the CIT from Flanagan (1954) and additional components from Butterfield et al. (2005). The additional components of the ECIT are: 1. the inclusion of contextual questions at the start of the research interview, 2. questions regarding wish-list items (i.e., questions regarding

what the participant believes would have been helpful to the critical incident should they have been present at the time including, people, support, information etc.), and 3. nine credibility checks.

How does ECIT work? The essence of the ECIT is as follows: (a) only simple types of judgments are required of the research participants, meaning any judgements required are relevant to the conditions and actions observed by the participants; (b) only reports obtained from qualified participants are included, meaning people who have observed or experienced the activity are included in the study and people who have not had direct experience observing or engaging in the activity are excluded; and (c) all observations are evaluated by the participants in terms of an agreed upon statement of the purpose of the activity, meaning there is clarity about the purpose of the observed activity (Flanagan, 1954).

Consistent with CIT, in ECIT there are five major steps: a) ascertain the general aims of the activity to be studied, b) make plans and set specifications, c) data collection, d) data analysis, and e) data interpretation (Flanagan, 1954). In more detail, the five steps and directions for their completion, common to the CIT and the ECIT, as described by Flanagan (1954), Butterfield et al. (2005), and Twelker (2008) are:

1. *Identify the General Aims of the Study.* Identify the research question and general statement of objectives. In examining the success or failure of an activity, formulate a description of successful behaviour in a particular situation. Form a functional description of what precisely is necessary to do and not to do in the activity, and/or in the participation in the activity, for said activity to be successful or effective. In other words, determine the activity under investigation and the standards and expectations of the outcome. It is necessary to know what the activity is, how it is performed, and for what

end result, in order to determine if the person or the activity was effective or ineffective. To that end, this step requires the researcher to define the purpose of the activity and the purpose of the research study.

2. *Make Plans for Specifications and Procedures.* Plan the procedures for obtaining records of the critical incident observed by the participants (recall that a "critical incident" is one that has the effect of either helping or hindering an outcome). Next, determine the participants' selection criteria for the study. Establish what to tell the participants about the purpose of reporting the information. Determine specific standards to tell the participants about what activities and behaviours the researcher will observe and speak about in the study. Ask participants to relay information about incidents that made a significant contribution to, (i.e., either helped or hindered), the general aim of the activity. For example, participants could be asked to relay only extreme incidents of helpful or hindering behaviours, which would provide a clearer demonstration of the behavioural effects than a less obvious or extreme example. Flanagan (1954) stated, "it is well known that extreme incidents can be more accurately identified than behaviour which is more nearly average in character" (p. 338).
3. *Collect the Data.* It is better to collect incidents that are fresh in participants' minds whenever possible. If applicable, conduct training sessions with any research assistants so they know how to explain to the participants precisely what type of incidents the participants should be talking about in their interviews. State the purpose of the study to participants and ask questions, inviting the participants to recall all relevant information pertaining to the activity in question. Record and classify all recollected behaviours and

their stated effects (i.e., results). Collect the data via interviews, questionnaires, or any other means of recording.

4. *Analyze the Data.* The purpose of the data analysis is to summarize and describe the data to identify emergent patterns. Formulate the categories in a manner that relates to the behaviours under investigation, or to the desired outcomes of the research. It is helpful to arrange the data in a way that allows for easy review and reference. Usually, though not always, this may mean sorting a small number of incidents into tentative groups related to the frame of reference selected. Continue to further refine and define each category as you continue sorting. Review the categories and redefine as required. Divide the broad categories, once filled, into subcategories and place the incidents that seem to describe the same behaviour together. Define these subcategories and continue to sort the incidents until the incidents and categories match.
5. *Interpret and Report on the Data.* This involves three stages: (a) determine the frame of reference, (b) form the categories as relevant to the frame of reference, and (c) determine the level of generality or specificity used in reporting the data. Report the relevance and meaning of the research. Disclose any biases and limitations for the study.

Recall that Butterfield et al. (2009) used two additional enhancements to Flanagan's (1954) CIT, in ECIT, in addition to recommending the use of nine credibility checks. The additions are: (a) the inclusion of contextual questions in the interview to provide background information for the ECIT data, and (b) the inclusion of questions regarding what the participants would have preferred to have had happen in the critical incident, in addition to what helped or hindered the situation. These preferences are termed wish-list items and include things such as people,

support, information etc. that were not present at the time of the original experience, but that the participant believes would have been helpful had they been present.

An outline of the general steps of the ECIT for the current study. I have detailed an outline of the general steps taken in the current study. These steps follow the five original steps in the CIT, as described by Flanagan (1954), Butterfield et al. (2005), and Twelker (2008), along with two additional steps (i.e. making the technique the ECIT) described by Butterfield et al. (2009):

1. *Identify the General Aims:* I identified the precise activity I wished to investigate, as well as the purpose of the study. I stated my research question and constructed definitions of "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring" for use in the participant selection and for the participants' use in their reporting of their critical incidents.
2. *Make Plans for Specifications and Procedures:* I specified in writing the standards regarding what to tell participants about what activities and behaviours to report. I discussed all standards and specifications with participants prior to asking the interview questions (see Appendix A: Preparation for the Mentoring Research Interview). I detailed the methods that I used to obtain records of the critical incidents.
3. *Co-constructing the Data**:*** I clearly stated the purpose of the study to all participants. In semi-structured interviews, I then asked the participants to recall and share all relevant information pertaining to mentoring. I made audio-recordings of the interviews with the explicit knowledge and permission of the participants.
4. *Analyzing the Data:* I transcribed the participants' reports and then asked them to validate the transcribed quotes for accuracy. I aggregated and categorized the validated data.

5. *Interpreting and Reporting:* I interpreted the data through taking part in the interviews, wherein I co-constructed the data (i.e., wherein knowledge or meaning emerges through the interaction) with the participants. I included demographic and contextual questions in the interviews in order to ascertain participants' background information. In the interview, I asked participants for wish-list items, about what they wished had been additionally present in the relationship. I transcribed and analyzed the data, engaging with other researchers about both the data and my interpretations. I then took the data back to the participants for verification, edits, and additions. I reported on the relevance of the research, along with researcher "biases" (i.e., perceptions and experiences that might impact the study), and the limitations of the study.

A more comprehensive description of these steps and a breakdown of exactly what was done and why, is included in the methodology section which concludes this chapter. However, it is helpful to understand the general application of the ECIT in the current study in order to better contextualize it in relation to some of the difficulties which have traditionally plagued the application of both the CIT and the ECIT, particularly as they pertain to a qualitative worldview.

Problems with the application of the CIT and ECIT to a qualitative worldview. The CIT and the ECIT methods belong within the cluster of qualitative methods (Butterfield et al., 2005; Woolsey, 1986), despite Flanagan's (1954) original positivist language used to describe the CIT. The problems with the application of the CIT and ECIT arise when there are inconsistencies in adhering to one worldview with regard to the research assumptions. This results in a confusing and contradictory synthesis of qualitative and quantitative epistemologies. When research displays such fundamental inconsistencies, the study results are difficult to

interpret. These inconsistencies likely originated from the context in which the CIT and its offshoot, the ECIT were first developed and subsequently applied.

Creswell (1994) described positivism as a philosophy of science based on the worldview that there is valid knowledge (i.e., truth), which is derived from sensory experience (i.e., that which can be observed using the five senses), analyzed through mathematics, reason or logic, and which forms the only source of all authoritative knowledge. At that time, investigators used quantitative research synonymously with positivism (Creswell, 1994), as researchers chiefly used positivism in quantitative methods (Egon, Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Although researchers now consider the CIT to be a qualitative research method, Flanagan (1954) initially posed the CIT as a scientific tool to help uncover existing realities (or truths) so he could measure, predict, and alter them within a job setting. These ideas were rooted in a positivistic worldview (Butterfield et al., 2005) and shaped the language used to describe the technique. Flanagan (1954) developed the CIT during a period when scientists used the positivist approach to scientific investigation as the primary philosophy, long before the "linguistic turn" (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000) in post-modern approaches. Therefore, it is understandable that Flanagan (1954) used positivist language in his original discussions of the CIT.

Despite its positivistic roots, investigators can use the CIT and ECIT within any worldview (Butterfield et al., 2005) and easily modify them. For example, researchers have used the CIT as an investigative tool with an interpretive stance (Butterfield et al., 2005; Chell, 1998) by co-constructing qualitative data with rich descriptions of co-constructed knowledge. A number of researchers in the counselling field have used CIT with a qualitative stance (e.g., Britten, 2014; Chou, Kwee, Buchana, & Lees, 2016; Holloway & Schwartz, 2014). Butterfield et al. (2005) further supported that both the CIT and ECIT were applicable to qualitative

worldviews by determining that both techniques fit with the five major qualitative traditions of: (a) focus, (b) origin, (c) data-collection methods, (d) data analysis, and (e) narrative forms, each of which is addressed below:

a) The CIT and ECIT's *foci* are on critical events, incidents, or factors that help promote or detract from the effective performance of some activity. The information for the focus comes from direct observation or self-reports (Butterfield et al., 2005). Although Flanagan (1954) put emphasis on direct observation versus retrospective self-report, he also acknowledged that qualitative self-report could be used. He spent time gathering evidence supporting the accuracy of recalled incidents, suggesting that accuracy could be deduced from full, clear, and detailed descriptions of self-reports given by participants (Butterfield et al., 2005).

b) Congruent with qualitative research traditions, the *origin* of the CIT (and therefore of ECIT, as one is simply an extension of the other) is its application in the fields of industrial and organizational psychology.

c) The *data-collection method*, called data co-construction in an interpretive/constructivist worldview is primarily through interviews where words and open-ended questions are the means of "collecting data" and the researcher engages in co-constructing the data with the participants (Butterfield et al., 2005).

d) Butterfield et al. (2005) noted that the *data analysis*, called co-construction and shared understanding of data in interpretive/constructivism, of the CIT also supported qualitative traditions researchers conducted it by determining the frame of reference, forming the co-constructed data into categories, and determining the specificity or generality of the categories. Researchers perform the data analysis inductively.

e) The *narrative form* is that of categories with operational definitions and self-descriptive titles (in interpretive/constructivism this refers to rich descriptions of the themes from the co-constructed data with supportive participant quotes).

Applying a qualitative worldview, Flanagan's (1954) original description of the CIT, might be changed to something more in line with, "a set of procedures for co-constructing understanding(s) of human behaviour in such a way as to focus the understanding(s) on the participants' perspectives on what actions, thoughts, beliefs, and ideas would help or hinder, or were helpful or hindered, in a given specific context." The very flexibility of the CIT and ECIT techniques has also fostered some confusion. There are examples of using the CIT in qualitative studies but then applying techniques, to create greater reliability and establish greater objectivity with the data, which are in alignment with quantitative, positivist philosophical assumptions, not worldviews consistent with qualitative research (i.e., Butterfield et al., 2009; Bedi & Alexander, 2009).

Butterfield et al. (2009) used credibility checks to increase the credibility of their data. The authors used independent judges to place incidents into categories. They then checked their rates of success in accurately categorizing the incidents, as an indication of greater objectivity. They also correlated participation rates in the categories. They asserted that higher participation rates implied a greater degree of the accuracy of the categories. These strategies are consistent with positivist assumptions and attempts to establish the qualitative data as objectively valid. Objectivity in research is inconsistent with qualitative assumptions, where reality is seen as co-constructed with multiple points-of-view. In a qualitative worldview bias is to be expected and objectivity is not possible.

Likewise, Bedi and Alexander (2009) used computer software to try to remove researcher bias and subjectivity in their qualitative CIT study, stating “many qualitative research methods inadvertently examine the client's perspective through the lens of researcher - or counsellor - derived constructs and categories, thereby blurring practitioner and client perspectives” (p. 1). Bedi et al. (2009) encouraged the use of multivariate concept-mapping “to provide more trustworthy accounts of the client's experience” (p. 1) instead of “an indirect and biased portrayal of client experiences” (p. 1). Bedi et al. (2009) stated multivariate concept-mapping is optimal in order to “minimize the biasing effects of investigator - or counsellor imposed connotations and understandings” (p. 1). Bedi et al. (2009) further explained that the use of this computer program meant the resulting categories “are more empirically grounded than many other categorization research methods” (p. 1). It seems Bedi et al. (2009) were stating that research derived through qualitative measures is less trustworthy, as it is biased, and that conducting qualitative research that utilises some quantitative assumptions, such as objectivity, is more trustworthy and more empirical.

The concern is that Butterfield et al. (2009) and Bedi et al. (2009) suggested using analysis and credibility-check techniques that are quantitative in nature within a qualitative study. When researchers are unclear about the epistemology and ontology of their study, it is difficult to know how to understand, or apply, the study’s results. Also, their examples meant it was difficult for me (and perhaps others) to understand how to apply the CIT and ECIT to a qualitative study, as their philosophical assumptions were inconsistent. As a result it became apparent to me that I would need to modify the ECIT to address these inconsistencies and to make it applicable to a qualitative worldview. I renamed this new version of the CIT and the

ECIT, the Adapted Critical Incident Technique (ACIT), to reflect the exclusion of the components of the ECIT that did not fit with a qualitative epistemology.

The Adapted Critical Incident Technique (ACIT). The ACIT is a logical adaptation of both the CIT, which was Flanagan's (1954) original positivist description of this investigative technique, and the ECIT, which is the updated version of the CIT that Butterfield et al. (2005) developed as a qualitative tool. In creating the ECIT, Butterfield et al. (2005) created epistemological inconsistencies by combining positivist and interpretive/constructivist assumptions in the method. In addition, subsequent researchers (e.g., Bedi et al., 2009; Butterfield et al., 2009) have also not been consistent with their application of the ECIT under one worldview. In order to avoid these problems with internally contradictory applications of the ECIT, I made sure to utilize the components of the ECIT that fit exclusively with a qualitative design and were philosophically consistent with both qualitative methodology and interpretive/constructivist assumptions.

The ACIT differs from the ECIT in several ways. The ACIT eliminates Butterfield et al.'s (2005, 2009) validity check titled, *Independent extraction of critical incidents.* This check requires an independent verification of whether or not a participant's quote qualifies as critical. The intent of using another researcher to independently extract critical incidents from the data is to clarify from the pool of co-constructed data which incidents are critical. The essence of *independent extraction of critical incidents* is to consult with another researcher in order to clarify any ambiguity, and in particular, to clarify any ambiguity regarding what incidents are critical. However, this check is inconsistent with an interpretive/constructivist worldview, which holds that only the participant can evaluate an incident as helping or hindering an outcome, and therefore, the step is not part of the ACIT.

During the research process I clarified which incidents were critical at a number of points. First, prior to the interview, I explained what constitutes a critical incident and asked participants to generate a list of critical incidents to bring to the interview. Second, I explained again what made an incident critical, and asked participants to only share critical incidents during the interview process. And finally, I asked the participants to state, yes or no, whether the incident was critical to the outcomes of the mentoring after they shared an incident. These checks enabled me to have clarity about the criticalness of the incidents.

Although I regularly consulted with my supervisor throughout the research process to answer any questions and clarify ambiguity that I encountered as a researcher, I subscribed to Wilber's (1998b) three strands of all valid knowing to analyze the data. That is, only those who directly participated in the injunction (the research) could confirm or reject the data (Wilber, 1998b). In the present study, the data was co-constructed in the interview between the participant and me; only we identified incidents that were critical or reject incidents that we agreed were not critical. Since I reviewed and examined each incident with the participants, there was no need to utilise the *independent extract of critical incidents.* Using an independent professional to "extract" the critical incidents was not only unnecessary, it did not fit with my epistemological stance of "co-creating" critical incidents with the participants, rather than by an outside source.

Additionally, the ACIT eliminates the ECIT's requirement for *wish-list items.* Wish-list items (Butterfield et al., 2005, 2009) are things the participant thinks may have helped produce a positive outcome, but that did not exist at the time of the original experience, such as the presence of different information, more supportive contacts, additional work opportunities etc. The epistemological assumption (i.e., the process of how one comes to know, or understand, a reality) underlying the CIT and its derivative ECIT, is based on documenting *in vivo* observed

behaviours, or asking participants to recall observed behaviours. Asking participants to divulge their opinions, or wishes, deviates from this epistemology. Also, asking participants for wish-list items is asking for a list that may have no merit, as there is no evidence these "items" would help or have any impact at all, on the mentoring relationship outcomes.

Asking for wish-list items is more in keeping with the research question "What do mentors or protégés *hope* might help, or might have helped, the mentoring relationship outcomes?" Therefore, asking for wish-list items in the ECIT is like having a study inside another study, both with different epistemologies: one based on observable behaviours that helped or hindered mentoring relationships and the other advanced by opinion-based, potential possibilities. Since the epistemology for considering wish-list items would necessitate a change from the analyses of recalled-retrospective behaviours to the analyses of un-proven wishes, this would result in a significant epistemological divergence. Although future research exploring wish-list items would be interesting, my focus was exclusively on individuals' experiences of mentoring.

I also found it unclear how I would go about establishing the validity or credibility of wish-list items. In terms of applying Wilber's (1998) three "strands of all valid knowing," Wilber's "community of the adequate" for validating the data would be the participants, who could only validate the accuracy of the wish-list items as being those shared in the interview, but could not speak to the actual efficacy of these items as experienced in a mentoring relationship. Independent judges could validate the categories into which I had placed the wish-list items, but there would be no way for the dissertation community, or the larger research community, to validate the process of the research. Therefore, although I collected the wish-list items during the interviews, I ultimately determined that they were not relevant to the research question and have

not included them in my description of the ACIT or in the results of this study. Since the CIT and ECIT are techniques for recording a participant's recollection of observed behaviours, rather than a participant's retrospective preferences, wish-list items are inconsistent with both the CIT and ECIT techniques and their underlying epistemologies, and are therefore not part of the modified ACIT.

I adapted Butterfield et al.'s (2005, 2009) validity check component called, *cross-checking* in the ECIT because it was inconsistent with Wilber's (1998b) three "strands of all valid knowing" which state that only those that have participated in the research (i.e., Wilber's "injunction") can confirm or reject the data. The ACIT recognizes that having the participants confirm or reject the categories would introduce additional elements of bias and so independent judges specially trained in the "injunction" perform the cross-checking of the categories. Finally, the ACIT differs from the ECIT in that it does not consider Butterfield et al.'s (2005, 2009) credibility check of *participation rates* is an indication that a category is valid or generalizable. The ACIT uses the participation rate data only to determine if participants' quotes are well represented by a given category.

Rationale for the fit of the ACIT method and the research question. The ACIT was the best methodology for the current study's research question, as the ECIT was designed to determine the critical requirement for a specific occupational group or activity to succeed, or to determine the cause of why it is not succeeding (Flanagan, 1954). The ACIT, eliminates components of the ECIT that are incompatible with qualitative epistemologies but still follows the basic tenets of the CIT and ECIT.

Flanagan (1954) stated that the CIT can be used "to obtain valid information regarding the truly critical requirements for success in a specific assignment…(by) making a systematic

analyzes of causes of good and poor performance" (p. 329). Butterfield et al. (2005) said that both the CIT and the ECIT can be used to investigate what helps or hinders a specific activity or event (Butterfield et al., 2005). Exploratory by nature, the ECIT is an appropriate fit with a study when a researcher wants to learn what helps or hinders a little-understood event, incident, factor, or psychological construct (Butterfield et al., 2005). The ECIT, with the modifications necessary to produce the ACIT, was therefore an ideal technique to employ in the current study, whose intent was to determine what helps or hinders the outcomes of mentoring relationships.

Method

General overview. I applied broad empiricism; an interpretive/constructivist worldview; and Wilber's (1998) "eye of the mind," "second-person perspective", and three "strands of all valid knowing"; to a qualitative methodology and to the ECIT, in order to construct the current study and to determine the validity of the findings. For the first strand, the "injunction" (i.e., practice, exemplar, paradigm, experiment, or ordinance that comes in the form "if you want to know this, do this" that is Wilber's (1998) method of gathering data) I conducted semi-structured interviews using the ACIT. Wilber's (1998), second strand, "direct apprehension," was co-constructed data in the interviews, transcribed, and organized into categories in the data analysis.

Wilber's (1998) third strand, "communal confirmation/rejection" was three-fold: (a) I asked participants to confirm or reject the accuracy of the quotes transcribed from the information shared and co-constructed in the interviews; (b) I asked independent judges, in a card-sort process, to accept or reject the accuracy of the categories by percentage of rater-agreement with the categories I had already assigned; and, (c) I asked my dissertation committee members to confirm or reject the accuracy of the use of the ACIT.

I gave the participants the opportunity to confirm whether or not they felt that the quotes represented the experiences they shared, or did not represent the experiences they shared, as well to alter, add to, or delete part or all of the quotes. I asked seven independent judges to confirm or reject the accuracy of the categories. My dissertation committee members were able to evaluate the accuracy of using the ACIT by reading my dissertation and examining it in the defence. The purpose of the communal confirmation or rejection process was to check the results with others who have adequately completed the injunction and apprehensive strands and to establish whether the results were good or bad, accurate or false, interpretations (Wilber, 1998).

Participant selection. Participants included six self-described mentors and twelve protégés who self-identified as having been in a mentoring relationship and who fit the screening criteria. The screening criteria used to determine participant suitability included: (a) the ability to speak conversational English so as to participate in the research fully; (b) to be available for face-to-face interviews during the data-collection time-period; (c) the ability to offer detailed descriptions of the experiences being investigated; and (d) self-identifying as a protégé and/or a mentor, and having engaged in mentoring in accordance with the definitions of "protégé," "mentor," and "mentoring," employed in this document.

I used two types of purposeful sampling, (a) convenience sampling, and (b) snowball sampling. Convenience sampling is the use of participants who are readily available within the timeframe and location of the study (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2005). I emailed an invitation letter (Appendix B: Invitation Letter) and poster (Appendix C: Invitation Poster) notifying people in my network about the study. I also sent emails, with posters attached, to associates as well as others via a listserv in the department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies at the University of Victoria. I placed posters at a local gym, in the University of Victoria hallways,

and in nearby coffee shops. Additionally, I relied on word-of-mouth transmission to advertise that I was recruiting for the study.

I also made use of snowball sampling, which is an emergent strategy that involves asking participants to recommend others suitable for the study (Gall et al., 2005). It was a useful method for broadening the number of participants, as to my knowledge, at least one person participated based on the recommendation of another who had also participated.

I requested that people interested in participating in the study identify themselves by contacting me by phone or email. I then sent them an email outlining more information about the study (Appendix D: Letter of Invitation to Participate). In this email, the potential participants were asked to read the provided definitions of "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring," as well as the participant selection criteria, and to identify, by yes or no, if their relationships fit the mentoring definitions and if they fit all of the selection criteria. Once people emailed a positive confirmation to those questions, I asked all participants who indicated that their relationships fit the definitions and who fit the selection criteria, to collaboratively choose a time and date for the first interview.

Prior to the interview, I sent participants details about how to prepare ahead of time (Appendix A: Preparation for the Mentoring Research Interview). Specifically, I asked participants to think ahead about incidents that fit the research question. I asked them to come to the interview with a minimum of two examples of "helping" incidents and two of "hindering." I did this to encourage participants to think about the mentoring relationship prior to the interview and to pre-identify information relevant to the study. Asking for this preparation focused the interview time and helped with efficiency. I invited participants to contact me prior to the meeting if they needed further instructions about the examples I was looking for, however, no

one contacted me and all participants arrived with some form of notes about “helping” and “hindering” incidents. I also provided directions, parking details, and my personal contact information for the day of the interview.

Data-collection procedures. I reviewed with and asked each participant to sign a consent form (Appendix E: Participant Consent Form) at the outset of the first meeting, one copy of which I retained and one of which was given to the participant. I then started the audio-recorder and commenced the interview.

Interview questions acted as prompts to help participants recall and recount the incidents (Appendix F: Semi-Structure Interview Questions). The focus of the incidents was to identify what behaviours helped or hindered the mentoring relationship outcomes. During the interview, I offered additional prompts to encourage each participant to identify the following (from Flanagan, 1954): (a) the specific behaviour(s) involved in the incident; (b) that the incident was observed by the participant; (c) that all relevant factors in the incident were identified; (d) that the participant made a definite judgement regarding the “criticalness” of the behaviour (i.e., a judgement regarding whether the behaviour had the effect of either helping or hindering an outcome); and (e) the participant specified why he or she believed the behaviour was critical.

Participants identified what behaviours they had directly observed. I also prompted participants to tell all of the behaviours involved in the incident(s), until the participants expressed that they had stated everything critical about the incident(s). During the prompts, I asked the participants to focus on the behaviours of the other person but it was apparent that many people really struggled with that directive. It was natural for the participants to want to discuss their interpretation of the actions, or to add in contextual information instead of just stating the behaviours. As a result, I repeatedly had to remind people to focus on the behaviours,

or I had to at least make sure the participants were stating the actual behaviours in between the comments regarding context and interpretations.

In addition, participants had to explicitly state that the incidents (and their component behaviours) had made substantial impacts in helping or hindering the mentoring outcomes. I also asked the participants to discuss why the incidents were critical in terms of helping or hindering. Explicitly stating that an incident was critical, and why it was critical, in helping or hindering a mentoring relationship outcome, accomplished two things. First, it served as a check that the incident was indeed critical and second, when the participants provided information about why they felt the incidents were critical and had impacted their mentoring relationship outcomes, they provided more intimate and detailed information. This information greatly aided in my decisions regarding category formation and classification of incidents as indeed "critical".

I acknowledge that in asking participants to specify why they believed certain behaviours were critical (Flanagan, 1954), I was, in fact, asking participants to interpret behaviours. The reporting of observed behaviours fits the epistemological assumption of the ECIT, whereas asking participants to interpret meaning is not in alignment with the epistemology of the ECIT. As such, I carefully managed this data and treated it as additional context about the incidents and as superfluous to the research data of observable behaviours. Though I was aware that these interpretations fell outside the epistemology of the ECIT, I found it helpful to have this information, as it provided context and frequently helped illuminate, or in some cases identify, the key behaviours. Some participants only elaborated on, or clearly identified, the key behaviour, as an addendum when reflecting on why he or she believed the behaviours were critical. I asked participants to continue to state all critical incidents until they had no more to share and I continued to interview new participants until data saturation was reached.

Data saturation. In the interview process it is important to continue interviewing new participants until no new material surfaces, called data saturation (Creswell, 2008). Flanagan (1954) wrote about what he termed "exhaustiveness," stating that participant interviews should continue until redundancy in the data occurs and all new material has been exhausted. I determined that the material had reached data saturation when participants stopped stating incidents that introduced new categories, and that did not add or enhance previously formed categories. Once the material became redundant, I stopped seeking additional participants. The material reached data saturation after I interviewed six mentors and 12 protégés.

Data aggregation/convergence of categories. The purpose of data aggregation in the CIT is to create categories that summarize and describe the data in a useful manner (Flanagan, 1954). Since the ACIT is an enriched version of the CIT, the stages of data analysis are the same for both techniques. Flanagan (1954) recommended three stages in data analysis: (a) determine the frame of reference; (b) formulate the categories; and (c) determine the level of specificity in reporting the data. I found Flanagan's (1954) description of how to conduct the data analysis to be somewhat ambiguous. As a result, I used Butterfield and Borgen's (2009) prescription for data analysis to fill-in the particulars of how to complete it.

Butterfield et al.'s method for data aggregation. The following method is a combination of Flanagan's (1954) and Butterfield et al.'s (2005) methods for data aggregation, as outlined in Butterfield and Borgen (2009):

1. Determine the frame of reference based on how the data will be used.
2. Formulate the categories by grouping similar incidents.
3. Determine the level of specificity or generality used when reporting the data.

Butterfield et al. (2009) went on to state that after these three decisions have been made and the interview has been transcribed, the following steps may be employed to analyze the data:

1**.** *Organize the raw data***.** Print the transcription and put it in a binder with tab dividers to separate each interview.

2. *Identify the critical incidents and wish-list items.* Starting with the first interview, use a coloured pen to highlight any text that appears to be a critical incident that helped an outcome, supported by an example which describes the incident, along with its importance or its impact on the mentor or protégé. Make note of items that appear to be helping or hindering the critical incident.

Also make note of wish-list items (i.e., recall that "wish-list items" represent what the participant would have preferred to have had happen in the critical incident, such as the presence of people, support, information etc.). Note where the participant did not mention an example, or the impact, of an incident or item, so that he or she can be followed-up, regarding the missing information, in the second interview. Repeat this process with a different coloured pen for critical incidents that appeared to hinder an outcome. Proceed to the next interview and repeat the process.

3. *Create the categories.* It is necessary to have determined how the data will be used before creating the categories, as the purpose for which the data will be used alters the formation of categories.

a) Create a text document for each participant with headings for helping and hindering critical incidents and wish-list items. Electronically copy the helping incidents, placing a participant number, code, or name, in parentheses at the start of each critical incident or wish-list item.

b) Examine the helping critical incidents for themes. Create a new document for categories being formed and copy and paste the critical incidents and wish-list items under these tentative categories. Repeat this process for the hindering critical incidents and the wish-list items.

c) Create a working table to track the number and name of new categories when working on each interview. This table will be used to help determine "exhaustiveness" (Flanagan, 1954).

d) Move onto the second transcript and so on and placing items that fit, into the existing categories and creating new categories as required. As the process continues, rename and refine categories to fit with the material generated and the level of specificity to be used for reporting the results.

4. *Continue to place incidents into categories until the critical incidents and wish-list items for all but 10% of the interviews have been sorted and categorized.* Title the categories with something self-descriptive and write an operational definition for each category. Place the final 10% of the critical incidents and wish-list items into the established categories.

How I aggregated the data. Taking Flanagan (1954) and Butterfield and Borgen's (2009) ideas for data aggregation, I formulated a plan that worked for me, as discussed and outlined below. This involved the following:

1. *I organized the raw data and identified critical incidents:* I typed each participant's transcript into a separate document and used a numerical pseudonym to identify him or her. The first document for a participant contained all of his or her incidents and wish-list items, as well as the raw and unedited version of what each participant said during the

interview. I created a second document, for each participant, in which I only documented critical incidents. Wish-list items and non-critical incidents remained on record in the first document, for later reference, although ultimately I did not consider wish-list items as relevant to the study and I excluded them from the results.

A few participants identified some incidents as not "critical" when I asked them to describe "What was critical about this incident?" I subsequently deleted the incidents in the second document. Despite re-directing the participants during the interview to focus on the other party's (i.e., either mentor or protégé) behaviours, a few participants reported incidents that focused on the participants' actions and not those of the other party in the mentoring relationship. I also removed these from the second critical-incident document as they did not fit the research question. I saved all of the information remaining in the second document and also transcribed it into a third document.

In this third document, I refined the quotes to exclude extraneous information which was not helpful in answering the research question (e.g., personal opinions, un-related context, identifiable information such as people's names etc.). I used the refined quotes in the third document as the final quotes from which I formed categories. During the communal-confirmation stage of the data validation, I asked independent judges, to accept or reject the accuracy of these categories. I additionally refined a few quotes to exclude superfluous contextual information, during this data-validation stage, which served to make the behaviours of the quotes clearer. My purpose in refining the quotes was to remove extraneous information, which was distracting from the behaviours of the critical incidents.

The following is an example of an unedited quote which I refined to include only the behaviours in the critical incident performed by the party that the participant had spoken about. I removed the components that are underlined from the final quote as I considered them to be extraneous information (i.e., the mentor's behaviours, background to the scenario, opinion):

> I was trying to help the protégé remain calm around her mother. The idea was to help the protégé manage herself enough to make family gatherings tolerable for her. There was a wedding and the protégé came to the wedding but couldn't come in the door of the wedding reception. She was crying and couldn't get herself to come into the room because her mother was inside. I made a suggestion to the protégé and with some orchestrating we were able to come up with a solution so she could come inside the building and participate. The next time there was such a function, the protégé came to me two months ahead of time and said to me "Let's try to come up with some ideas now to make this a workable situation". She spoke frankly to me and told me honestly what she thought. I said to her "So, what do you imagine will happen at the next function?" She said "I'm going to skulk in and then skulk out." She spoke to me with such honesty and presented as being really willing to craft a solution ahead of time that would work. I then said to her, "What I imagine is that you're going to come and you're going to sit for the whole thing and everything is going to be fine". We then spoke about how both of us were not happy with each other's suggestions. But with all of the cards on the table, we were able to work proactively together to come up with a compromise and a solution that would work. As a teenager she acted with a high level of

> honesty to craft a solution. The solution was that she would stay glued to John, and that he could take her home instantly if she needed to but that he would act as a safe anchor. She approached me and talked about what she was wanting to do, telling me honestly what she thought, and was willing to engage in a workable solution that made some sense to the both of us

The final quote, with the additional components removed, is as follows:

> The next time there was such a social function, the protégé came to me two months ahead of time and said, "Let's try to come up with some ideas now to make this a workable situation". She spoke frankly to me and told me honestly what she thought. We then spoke about how both of us were not happy with each other's suggestions. But with all of the cards on the table, we were able to work proactively together to come up with a compromise and a solution that would work.

2. *I created categories:* After transcribing the interviews, I interpreted several categories or patterns and I made note of them. Butterfield et al. (2009) suggested forming categories after transcribing the first interview and placing quotes from further interviews into those categories. I chose not to follow this suggestion, as it seemed the categories formed from the first interview would then shape how I would view the data in the other interviews. Instead, I chose to conduct all interviews for the protégés, transcribe them, and then form categories. This meant every interview had equal weight in terms of creating the categories. I did the same thing for the mentors' data and categories. I found it easier to see all of the data, look for patterns, and then cluster themes and ideas together, when I

had all of the data from all of the categories in front of me. I interpreted the themes and idea clusters into categories.

3. *I tracked the categories:* I created an Excel spreadsheet where I placed the category groupings along the left-hand side. I noted each participant with a colour and a number code. I placed the participants' numbers, in their respective colours, along the top of the Excel file. I put each participant's quote under that participant's number.

As the categories were written on the left-hand side, I moved quotes up or down the excel columns to the fit within the appropriate category. If a quote did not fit within a grouping, I stored it at the bottom of the excel spreadsheet, still under that participant, but without a category title attached. Using this system, I could easily see how many quotes fit under a particular category from any number of participants, and could see which quotes I still needed to categorize. This made it easy to see the quotes leftover and helped to further reflect on how to group data into categories. I was also aided in this process by the use of a colour for each participant as it was easily, and visually, apparent how many participants had quotes within a category.

I refined the categories, reading and reflecting on the quotes and moving the category groupings and quotes around, until the quotes under a grouping all reflected the same key behaviour and the category description identified the critical aspect. Since the ACIT is a technique geared to looking for an answer to *what* perceived behaviours helped or hindered an outcome, it made sense to answer my research question by looking for behaviourally specific things a person could *do*. Therefore, when forming the categories, I made sure that my category descriptions reflected a prescriptive listing of what the mentor or protégé did behaviourally to create the perception of a positive or negative

outcome in the relationship. Once the categories were created, and the category definitions written, I moved onto credibility checks.

Data validation. I employed broad empiricism as the standard for addressing the accuracy of the data, or as Wilber (1998) put it, the data's validity. From the perspective of Wilber (1998), the use of the three "strands of all valid knowing" is all that is needed to validate findings. However, I believe most researchers reading this study will expect to see adherence to credibility checks in alignment with Creswell (2000) and Butterfield et al. (2005; 2009), therefore I also included these checks in the current study. Creswell (2000) outlined nine credibility checks for qualitative research. Additionally, Butterfield et al. (2005; 2009) outlined nine credibility checks for use in the ECIT. All of Creswell's (2000) nine credibility checks and eight of Butterfield et al.'s (2005; 2009) credibility checks were applicable to this study.

Creswell's credibility checks. It was my intention for this study to be accessible to all, and therefore I have incorporated the familiar terms, typically used for credibility checks, into my data validation. However, I have also made an effort to demonstrate how the credibility checks fit within Wilber's (1998) three "strands of all valid knowing." By doing so, I hope to have illuminated the need for adherence only to the three "strands of all valid knowing" in order to ascertain good interpretation and deeper understanding.

Creswell's (2000) credibility checks, along with how I complied with them in the current study, are as follows:

1. *Triangulation* is a procedure wherein a researcher seeks a convergence of data from multiple, different sources of information, to form themes or categories in a study. It is also a systematic process of sorting through the data to find common themes or categories by eliminating overlapping areas. In the current study, I adhered to triangulation by using multiple

participants (i.e., multiple different sources) and analyzing the data across the interviews to form categories that stood on their own and did not overlap with other categories.

2. *Disconfirming evidence* is a procedure whereby researchers first establish the preliminary categories and then search the data for evidence that is inconsistent with, or "disconfirms," the categories' themes. The search for "disconfirming" evidence provides further support of an account's credibility because the reliance on developing themes is not solely based on looking for supporting evidence, but also on looking for evidence that would show the theme as not representative of the participants' experiences and the co-constructed data. In the current study, I sought "disconfirming" evidence during the data aggregation process by looking for statements in the quotes that made the tentative categories invalid. I went through each quote and compared it against a tentative category. I did not find disconfirming evidence for any of the categories.

3. A researcher undergoes *reflexivity* as a procedure to self-disclose his or her assumptions, beliefs, values, and biases, all of which play a role in shaping an inquiry. Describing these early in the research process adds in transparency and provides for an audit trail traceable from the beginning. Disclosure early on also helps researchers to become clear (i.e., as conscious as possible) of their own biases and the influences their biases have on the co-construction of data. In this study, I debriefed regularly with my dissertation supervisor and peers in order to engage in researcher reflexivity throughout the process. I acknowledged my assumptions, beliefs, values, and biases towards the data in the introduction to this document and was mindful of them throughout the research process.

4. *Member checking* consists of taking data (e.g., co-constructed interpretations) back to the participants so that they can confirm the credibility of the information. I gave participants the

opportunity to confirm the findings as being representative of their experiences, or to say that they were not representative of their experiences, and/or to alter, add to, or delete part or all of the findings. Three participants asked a question about one of their quotes, wondering if adding some contextual information would aid the reader in understanding. I repeated the explanation of the purpose of the research, which was to look for behaviours that helped or hindered a mentoring relationship outcome, and also explained that additional contextual information would not provide further clarity in this study. After hearing the explanation, all three participants were satisfied and joined the other participants in confirming the quotes as representative of their experiences, representative of what was shared in the interviews, and by their own accounts "true and accurate."

5. The procedure known as prolonged engagement in the field refers to staying in the field (e.g., the interview) for a time period which is long enough to allow for the co-construction of detailed data. The initial interviews ranged from 1hour to 2.5 hours in duration. I did not limit participants' time, and allowed them to speak until there were no more critical incidents to share. I also spent a considerable amount of time transcribing and analyzing the interviews, and in so doing, I worked with the data for a long period of time.

6. *Collaborating* with participants throughout the process of research provides credibility to the data. This means that by ensuring the participants' views are built into the study, the credibility of the data is enhanced. I collaborated with the participants throughout the initial interviews, where data was co-constructed, as well as through follow-up interviews where participants engaged in "member checking" (i.e., confirming the credibility of the information) and where the participants could provide feedback about their quotes.

7. Credibility of the study is established by individuals external to the research (e.g., readers) who can examine the details and the sequencing of the steps taken in the research, and establish an *audit trail*. Clear documentation of all research decisions and activities means others can examine both the process, and the product, of the inquiry and determine the trustworthiness of the findings. I established an audit trail in the current study by documenting the inquiry process, recording the procedures, and steps taken.

8. Another procedure for establishing credibility in a study is to describe the setting, participants, and themes in a *thick, rich description*. The purpose is to provide statements that reproduce details about the context and events participants have experienced, and to use these details to enhance a deeper understanding. Credibility is established through the reader being transported into the setting or situation being described, as the reader co-constructs his or her own understanding of the findings. I used this procedure in the study by prompting participants to tell me more about the critical incidents and by asking them to elaborate on all of the behaviours that occurred in the incidents. As I elected to not include extraneous contextual information (e.g., opinions, feelings, beliefs etc.) in the final quotes, I made a concerted effort to retain the contextual information, as well as the participants' explanations of what made the incidents critical in terms of behaviours.

9. *Peer debriefing* the research process by someone familiar with the research provides a "second set of eyes" to review the research process and data. This debriefing is an opportunity for the researcher to be asked questions, and receive different perspectives on the research. This further helps the researcher to analyze and understand the data and research procedures. In the current study my dissertation supervisor regularly debriefed me by questioning, instructing, and assisting me throughout the research process.

Butterfield et al.'s credibility checks. Butterfield et al. (2005; 2009) outlined nine credibility checks, eight of which I have applied to this study. I do have concerns with some of these credibility checks as they appear to be rooted in positivism and a desire to generalize the data to the larger population. While I have applied these checks in such a way as to be consistent with an interpretive/constructivist worldview, it is helpful to first review Butterfield et al.'s (2005; 2009) credibility checks, and how I incorporated them into the current study, before examining these concerns in greater detail.

Butterfield et al.'s (2005; 2009) credibility checks are as follows:

1. *Cross-checking* is giving the participants an opportunity to confirm that the categories represent the experiences they shared and co-constructed in the interview, and that the categories make sense to them. The participants then have the opportunity to add, delete, or amend the categories so that they fit the experiences co-constructed in the interview. This is similar to Creswell's (2000) "member checking." I adhered, in part, to this cross-checking in that participants were asked to review their quotes and confirm or reject them as accurate representations of what was shared during the interview, and to alter them to be better representations if they so chose.

Recall that in Wilber's (1998) "strands of all valid knowing" only those who participated in the "injunction" (i.e., the experiment, or in this case the interviews) are able to verify if the data is an accurate representation of the co-constructed meanings. Participants were the only people, in addition to myself, as the researcher, who underwent the "injunction" and are therefore the only "community of the adequate" (Wilber, 1998) who can verify if the data is an accurate representation of the co-constructed meanings from the interviews. Participants, however, are not considered to be Wilber's (1998) "community of the adequate" when it comes

to validating the categories into which I placed the various critical-incident quotes, as they have not undergone the "injunction" of how to do the card sort (i.e., a process by which I had instructed independent judges to accept or reject the accuracy of the categories I had already assigned) and therefore cross-checking did not involve asking participants to confirm the categories.

While I could have instructed participants in the card-sort process, I decided it was better to use independent judges. These judges were at a distance from the study, and from research in general, and therefore brought a fresh perspective to the categories. They had no investment in the research and therefore no discernible bias, so they could view the categories, see if they made sense, and determine whether said categories were representative of the quotes. I wanted this fresh look at the research, so I trained the independent judges in the "injunction" and they went through the process of direct apprehension of the data (in the card sort) and validated the accuracy of the categories. If the fit was poor between the quotes and the categories, I further refined and altered the categories until other independent judges were satisfied that the categories represented the quotes.

Another reason that I chose not to have participants confirm or reject the categories, is that their own biases might have swayed them. In the interview process, some participants had a hard time adhering to the research question, and had difficulty describing only behaviours that helped or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationships. If these same people were asked to alter the categories, they might again have wanted to insert their own interpretations and opinions, rather than focusing solely and impartially on the categorization of the quotes. The "community of the adequate" most appropriate for editing the categories would have been comprised of people who had engaged in the injunction of analyzing and labeling the data,

namely, other researchers. Since I was the sole researcher, I deviated from Butterfield et al.'s (2005; 2009) suggestion regarding cross-checking and I did not have participants confirm or reject the categories. Instead I chose to have other researchers, in the form of the dissertation committee, do this cross-checking.

2. I used *Exhaustiveness* by tracking the point at which new categories stopped emerging from the data, and in this way, I determined that the topic had been adequately covered in the interviews. Exhaustiveness was particularly evident on the Excel spreadsheet of the quotes and categories, as it was easy to see if a participant had added new themes or content that could form a new category. Once no new information was being added, I stopped conducting interviews.

3. I created category titles and their descriptions from the incidents and submitted 25 % of these *incidents to be placed into categories by an independent judge*. As previously mentioned, I asked independent judges to participate in a card sort. The judges were non-researchers who were not directly involved in the research study. I asked the judges to place the critical incident quotes under their respective categories. The purpose of this activity was to have a high rate of agreement between my placement, as the researcher, of incidents into the categories and the independent judges' placements, so as to confirm or reject both the placement of the quotes within the respective categories, as well as the category descriptions themselves. This validated whether the categories fit the quotes and also determined if the categories were sound.

In total, I used nine independent judges. I gave all the judges a different mix of the 52 quotes, each getting 25% of the total for his or her sort. The judges completed their card sorts on the computer where they dragged and dropped the quotes to fit under the various categories. A discussion of the purpose of using independent judges to validate the categories needs to be

handled with care. Butterfield et al. (2009) implied that the higher the rate of an independent judge's placement accuracy, the more "true" the category must be. A belief that research results in "truths" is a positivistic assumption, which involves generalizing knowledge to populations. This is divergent from interpretive/constructivist assumptions which look to validate if the data is an accurate representation of what was co-constructed during the interview. From an interpretive/constructivist point-of-view, the purpose of the research is to share perspectives and to deepen understanding, not to generalize to the larger population.

Butterfield et al.'s (2009) conceptualization is divergent from qualitative research, which considers that something validated is a true representation of the co-constructed data shared during the interview, not as something that is a generalizable truth. The co-constructed data is transferable but not generalizable. Readers of the research determine transferability by making connections between elements of the study and their own experiences. Having independent judges in agreement helps to determine the validity and credibility of the quotes as fitting the categories. This is not to be confused with generalizability.

4. I carefully went over the categories with a researcher who had used the ECIT previously, as well as reviewing the categories with my dissertation supervisor, in order to *submit tentative categories to an expert*. Also, the dissertation committee went over the categories in reading the dissertation. The purpose of having experts in the field review the categories, is to have them state whether they find them useful, are surprised by any of the categories, or whether they find anything to be missing. The credibility of the categories is enhanced by having experts agree on them.

5. *Interview fidelity* ensures a level of consistency and rigor in the research and allows the expert to check to see if the researcher is asking leading questions during the interviews. My

dissertation supervisor listened to a self-selected sample of the interview tapes to ensure that I followed the ECIT method, as adapted to the ACIT, and was faithful to the process during the interviews.

6. *Theoretical validity* looks at whether, within the "community of inquirers," there is a presence or absence of agreement with the descriptive or interpretive terms used. This involves a twofold process: 1. the researcher makes explicit the assumptions underlying the proposed research and scrutinizes them against scholarly literature to see if they are supported, and 2. the researcher also compares the categories against scholarly literature to see if they too are supported.

The purpose of theoretical validity is to make reasonable decisions about the research based on an understanding of relevant scholarly literature. I adhered to theoretical validity in the study and wrote about it at some length in the Discussion section of this document. I explicitly stated my personal assumptions underlying the study in the Introduction section and thoroughly examined the scholarly literature in the Literature Review. This is also in alignment with Creswell's (2000) credibility check of "engaging in reflexivity."

7. The *interviews were audio-recorded* and transcribed. I used the participants' actual words in the quotes.

8. *Participation rates* are calculated by adding up the number of participants who cite an incident in a specific category, and dividing this number by the total number of participants. If the participation rate is 25 percent or greater, the category is considered credible. I adhered to the belief that it is good to see the participation rate in order to see if a category fits multiple participants, and therefore, if there are commonalities. However, I did not subscribe to the idea that the greater the number of people who report a critical incident in the same category, the

greater the likelihood that the category is somehow more important, or valid, as this would be a positivist assumption. The logic behind a positivistic approach is that the more people who are represented by the category, the more valid the category, or that the higher the numbers, the more important the category. However, having a higher number may not mean that the incident is more critical, but rather, more reportable. Another way of saying this is that lots of evidence for something does not mean it is the "best"; it just means it has the most amount of evidence. To believe more evidence equates to being "the best" or a generalizable "truth" is not applicable in an interpretive/constructivist qualitative study as it is a positivistic assumption that fits better with a quantitative design. It can be argued that a category having a higher participation rate means it should be paid more attention to. However, all categories above the 25% cut-off are of interest and, in addition to not being generalizable, there is no advantage to paying more attention to one category over another as I did not ask participants to rate the most important critical incidents, more so, I only asked them to tell me all critical incidents. In a constructivist approach, the participation rate does not matter, as long as the participation rate is high enough to be a category (e.g., 25%), as this approach is not concerned with sample size or generalizability.

Although participation rates do not serve as a validity check in an interpretive/constructivist worldview, I included this information for other researchers who may be interested in reinterpreting the data from this study in accordance with a more positivist worldview, and as noted above, to see if a category fit multiple participants. As such, I determined if the number of participants in a category was over 25%, and thus included multiple participants, but I did not make further assertions about the importance of a category based on a higher percentage.

9. *Independent extraction of critical incidents* involves arranging for a person familiar with the CIT or ECIT to independently identify critical incidents from the interview recording or transcripts. The purpose is to calculate the level of agreement between what the researcher, and an independent coder, think is a critical incident. This credibility check does not appear to fit with the interpretive/constructivist epistemological assumptions used in this study. From an interpretive/constructivist worldview, it is up to the participant to identify critical incidents as helping or hindering, which means that it is inappropriate for someone else to identify the quote as anything else. ACIT reflects that I did not use the independent extraction of critical incidents in this study.

Figure 1. represents the integration of the three "strands of all valid knowing" (Wilber, 1998) with Creswell's (2000) and Butterfield et al.'s (2005; 2009) credibility checks. In the Figure, I identified each aspect of the three "strands of all valid knowing" as applied within the study, along with a brief description of the strand. I also identified the credibility checks that are related to each aspect of three strands.

Figure 1. Three Strands of "All Valid Knowing" and Credibility Checks

---

Instrumental Injunction

An actual practice, exemplar, paradigm, experiment, or ordinance that comes in the form "if you want to know this, do this."

Instrumental Injunction = Research method: the ACIT
Use the ACIT to find out what self-described protégés and mentors report helped and/or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationship. Related credibility checks: Creswell (2000) – 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9;

Butterfield et al. (2005; 2009) – 2, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Direct Apprehension

The immediate experience of the domain brought forth by the injunction, as in a direct experience or apprehension of data.

Direct Apprehension = Co-constructed interviews and resulting categories
Information about critical incidents co-constructed in the interview(s) by the participant(s) and researcher, and data analyzed from the interviews into categories using the ACIT.

Communal Confirmation/Rejections

Checking the results (data) with others who have adequately completed the injunction and apprehensive strands.

Communal Confirmation/Rejections = Participants confirm/reject accuracy of the information co-constructed and the categories/themes; the Committee members confirm/reject accuracy of the use of the ACIT
Related credibility checks: Confirmation: Creswell (2000) – 4 (by participants), 7 (by committee); Butterfield et al. (2005; 2009) – 1 (by participants), 3 & 4 (by committee).

Credibility procedures by Creswell (2000):

1-Triangulation; **2**- Disconfirming evidence; **3**- Researcher reflexivity; **4**- Member checking; **5**- Prolonged engagement in the field; **6**- Collaboration; **7**- The audit trail;

8- Thick, rich description; **9**- Peer debriefing

Credibility procedures by Butterfield et al. (2005; 2009):

1-Cross-checking; **2**- Exhaustiveness; **3**- Placing incidents into categories by an independent judge; **4**-Submit tentative categories to an expert; **5**- Interview fidelity;

6- Theoretical validity; **7**- Audiotape interviews; **8**- Participation rates.

Ethics

The Human Research Ethics Board (HREB) at the University of Victoria approved the ethics application. The HREB also approved a request and approval for annual renewal. Following the standards of the HREB, I put several steps in place to ensure that I maintained the confidentiality of the participants throughout the study. I did not speak about participants by their real names, not even to the dissertation supervisor, nor to the dissertation committee. I scheduled all interviews for different days to ensure that there was no chance of any participants meeting other participants.

I offered participants a variety of locations for the interviews to ensure comfort, convenience, and confidentiality. I held most interviews at the University of Victoria, conducted two interviews at participants' homes and held one interview at my home. I identified participants by a number only on all paperwork and data, except in the case of each participant's consent form which bears that participant's name and signature. I was the only person, other than the participant, to see the signed consent form. I kept the consent forms, along with all other hard data, in a locked cabinet. I kept electronic/soft data in a password protected file.

In alignment with the HREB, I fully informed the participants of the possible risks in participating in the study (see Appendix E: Participant Consent Form, under Risks). In the interviews, I asked participants to speak about aspects that hindered the mentoring relationship. As this could have potentially been a painful topic, I provided the participants with a list of local support resources. To the best of my knowledge, no one felt emotionally upset from the interviews or reported using the list of resources. On the contrary, many participants expressed a

sense of relief and validation in speaking about the hindering aspects of their mentoring relationships and having someone to listen to them.

Chapter 4: Results

The current section presents the co-constructed findings of the research interviews with mentors and protégés. To obtain the final result of 13 categories of behaviours that help, and 10 categories of behaviours that reportedly hinder, a mentoring-relationship outcome (see Appendix H: Behaviours that Help or Hinder a Mentoring Relationship Outcome), I interviewed 18 participants, and recorded a total of 207 critical-incident quotes (i.e., quotes regarding behaviours that either helped or hindered the mentoring relationship outcomes), from both mentors (n=6) and protégés (n=12). The participants were communicative and forthcoming in contributing their experiences, and the ACIT helped me to better co-construct, and later sort, the data into relevant categories, verified by independent judges. In this chapter, I consider the participants themselves, without whose voices this study would not have been possible, their demographics, and other contextual components. I describe the participants' critical incident reports and how many of the participants mentioned similar incidents (participation rates), giving rise to the behavioural categories. In addition, I also offer a concise description of how the independent judging procedure confirming these behavioural categories unfolded. Finally, I let the participants' voices speak directly with quotes that best illustrate each resultant category.

Demographics

Mentors. The self-identified mentors were participants who reported critical incidents about their protégés' behaviours. The mentors did not speak about their experiences as protégés, as I was looking for participants to report behaviours in which the other person in the mentoring relationship helped or hindered the relationship's outcomes. The mentors provided demographic information regarding gender, age, relationship status, ethnicity, occupation, and education. All

mentors in this study were female, the majority Caucasian and over the age of 50, with advanced educational credentials (see Table 7 and 8 for complete mentors' demographic information).

The mentors also reported the number of times they had been in the position of mentor (mean= 10.8), and the length of those relationships, which ranged from one month to 20 years. Additionally, I asked how many times the mentors were protégés in a mentoring relationship, however, in hindsight, this data was not relevant to the current study and, therefore, I did not use it other than to report it in the demographic information tables. I found it interesting to note that one participant had no experience as a protégé but had been a mentor many times. In particular, this participant noted she would have liked to have been a protégé, but felt women were very competitive in her line of work and, therefore, the opportunity had never arisen.

Four of the six mentors said that they would like to be in another mentoring relationship and two reported that they did not want to do it again. When asked why they did not want to be in another mentoring relationship, both related that they had assumed they would one day be the mentors in other relationship, but lamented that they now realized that the time commitment was too much for them, and that they found that the role lacked sufficient benefits, given their current circumstances (i.e., not enough time in their current jobs).

Protégés. The protégés were participants who reported critical incidents about their mentors' behaviours (see Tables 9 and 10 for protégés' complete demographic information). The protégés were younger, on average (mean age 39.7), than the participants in the mentor group and included four male participants and the majority self-identified as Caucasian (9 out of 12).

Members of the protégé group had also participated in mentoring relationships in the role of the mentor and, while the protégés did not speak about their experiences as mentors, they indicated how many times they had been in the mentor role (on average 3.6). The older

participants in the protégé group noted that they have been involved in considerably more mentoring relationships in the role of mentor, than the remainder of the protégé-group, which skewed the average. The average number of mentoring relationship, in which the protégés had functioned in the role of the mentor, would be considerably lower for the protégé-group if the two oldest protégés had instead participated in the study as mentors. All protégés stated they would like to be in a mentoring relationship again but did not specify in what capacity.

Contextual Components

I commenced the research interviews by asking contextual questions regarding how the participants had chosen their mentors or protégés, how and when the mentoring relationships had started, and what the goals of the relationships had been. Butterfield et al. (2009) stated that it was important to include such contextual questions at the start of the research interview in order to provide background information about the participants and to better understand the context of the data. Although I did not use this contextual data in the study, by asking the questions, I provided the participants with a starting place to build rapport and, subsequently, the data acted as a way to focus the interview on specific mentoring relationships. These questions also identified whether the relationships were personal or professional, formal or informal (see Table 7: Number and Type of Mentoring Relationships).

I found that the mentor-participants predominantly spoke about work-based mentoring relationships. These work relationships occurred in various contexts, such as at a senior bureaucratic office, at a science research centre, during work as a fundraiser, and while teaching in a high school. The mentors reported personal contexts for mentoring as well, which included mentoring an extended family member, teaching someone to be a doula (i.e., informally, not in a

formal program), and supporting at-risk mothers as a volunteer in a community Mothering Peer Group.

The protégés predominantly spoke about school, academic, or training environments. The context of the mentoring relationships in these environments included, learning to be: (a) a doula (in a formal program); (b) a teacher in the public school system; (c) a counsellor in a mental health agency; (d) a social worker in a mental health agency; (e) a nurse in a hospital; (f) a clinical supervisor for counsellors working in a mental health agency; and (g) an academic supervisor on a master's thesis or doctorate dissertation. Protégés also had mentoring relationships in work environments, such as when working in a community agency in health promotion, or in health and safety consultation at a large educational institution. One protégé reported mentoring in the context of martial arts and another had experienced it while learning traditional Chinese medicine. One of the more interesting contexts, which demonstrated how mentoring has wide-ranging applications, took place between the protégé and the protégé's former psychologist, who was mentoring the protégé in how to successfully transition out of the military and into civilian life. The contextual questions seemed to relax the participants, familiarize them with the environment and the researcher, and ease them into a comfortable conversation as they related their critical-incident reports.

The Critical Incident Reports

As I had requested in the pre-interview preparation sheet (see Appendix A: Preparation for the Mentoring Research Interview), all self-described mentors and protégé participants arrived prepared to report on at least two critical incidents that helped, and two that hindered, their mentoring-relationship outcomes. Mentors speaking about their protégés provided 84 of the critical-incident quotes, with 57 quotes pertaining to incidents that helped the mentoring

outcomes and 27 quotes representing hindering incidents. This is an average of 9.5 helping incidents and 4.5 hindering incidents from each mentor-participant. Protégés speaking about mentors provided 130 critical incident quotes, with 93 helping incidents and 37 hindering incidents reported. This is an average of 7.8 helping incidents and 3.1 hindering incidents per protégé-participant. Notably, both mentor and protégé participants chose to report more critical incidents that had helped their relationships than those that had hindered the relationship outcome in some way.Although the average number of incidents per participant does not serve as a validity check in an interpretive/constructivist worldview, I included this information for other researchers who may be interested in reinterpreting the data from this study in a more positivist worldview.

Saturation of incidents occurred after repeated prompting to encourage the participants to relate all recollections of self-identified critical incidents. This means that each participant reported he or she had provided all of the critical incidents that he or she was able to recall. The maximum number of incidents a participant shared was 29 while the minimum number of incidents a participant reported was three. Prior to assigning the quotes to behavioural categories, I asked each participant to review his or her quotes, determine if they adequately represented his or her experiences, and change the quotes or remove them if they were not representative.

The Behavioural Categories

Examining the quotes, it became readily apparent that there were commonalities that allowed me to group the critical incidents into categories that best describe the critical behaviours that had helped or hindered the participants' mentoring relationships. I created and labelled these categories, initially forming seven categories from the 57 helping incidents shared by the mentors regarding protégé behaviours. According to the mentors, in order to help a

mentoring relationship succeed protégés should: 1. state explicit goals, 2. seek information, 3. demonstrate integration, 4. prioritize time, 5. show appreciation, 6. bond, and 7. take initiative. I then was able to form five categories from the 27 hindering incidents, shared by mentors regarding protégé behaviours. To hinder a relationship protégés should: 1. have unclear goals, 2. engage in dishonest behaviours, 3. use abusive language, 4. prioritize non-mentoring activities, and 5. ignore advice.

I formed a further six categories from the 93 helping incidents shared by the protégés regarding mentor behaviours. According to the protégés, a mentor, wishing to help achieve a positive mentoring relationship outcome should: 1. demonstrate support, 2. state explicit expectations, 3. teach, 4. model effective behaviours, 5. connect emotionally, and 6. work together (i.e., with the protégé). I then labeled the five categories from the 37 hindering incidents shared by protégés regarding mentor behaviours. To hinder a mentoring relationship a mentor should: 1. criticize, 2. give inadequate instruction, 3. model ineffective behaviours, 4. misinterpret the protégé's needs, and 5. block work-accomplishments.

In total, I formed 12 categories of behaviours that help a mentoring relationship outcome and categorized a further 10 behaviours that hinder a mentoring relationship outcome. This produced a total of 23 behavioural categories. In the formation of these categories, I considered the participation rates for each category but did not solely base my creation of a category on these rates.

Participation rates. From an interpretive/constructivist worldview, a high participation rate in any given category, by no means, implies that the category is more genuine or generalizable, and a participation rate of 100% does not mean the category is "true". Therefore, I encourage readers to consider participation rates only in the context of how the category of

behaviour purportedly affected the mentoring relationship outcome. I calculated participation rates by adding up the number of participants who provided a critical incident in any given category and dividing this number by the total number of participants. If the calculated participation rate was greater than 25%, the category would be considered credible (Butterfield et al., 2005) (see: Table 6: Participation Rates, Categories, and Frequency of Incidents). I retained two categories with less than a 25% participation rate, which I've listed under "Other Category of Interest" in their respective sections: 1. the Use Abusive Language category, under protégé behaviours that hinder the relationship outcome (participation rate of 16.7%); and, 2. the Block Work-Accomplishments category, under mentor behaviours that hinder the mentoring relationship outcome, (8.3% participation rate).

I chose to include the Use Abusive Language category, despite its lower participation rate, because the incident was highly critical and hindering in that the behaviour resulted in the mentoring relationship ending. Similarly, I decided to include the Block Work-Accomplishments category, which also had a lower participation rate, because the incident was highly critical and hindering to the mentoring outcomes. Since the purpose of mentoring is to reach a specific goal, if the mentor is blocking the protégé from accomplishing his or her work in pursuit of that goal, then this will hinder the mentoring relationship outcome, regardless of whether the mentor also engages in concurrent helping behaviours. It is, after all, the pursuit of outcomes that is the primary goal in a mentoring relationship. This behaviour may be underrepresented in the current study, as an artefact of sample size; however, I chose to include it because of the number of separate incidents reported by the single participant, and because of the behaviours' harmful effects on the mentoring relationship. I found it helpful to have my decisions regarding the

creation of these categories and the assignment of quotes as representative of them, vetted by the independent judges.

Independent Judges - Rate of Agreement

Nine independent judges helped me to clarify the behavioural categories and to determine if the quotes that I had assigned to each category were, in fact, appropriately representative of said category. I prepared an electronic card sort by putting 25% of the quotes, randomly selected from the various categories (i.e., from 13 helpful categories and 10 hindering categories), in individual Word files, in order to establish whether or not the quotes were represented well by the categories. I then asked the first of nine independent judges, to select and move the quotes to the category that seemed to be the best fit. I compared where I, as the researcher, had put the quotes, to where the first independent judge had chosen to put them, in order to determine the rate of agreement between us. This was followed by a new card sort representing a randomly selected, new combination of 25% of the quotes, which were placed into the categories by the second independent judge. I calculated the rate of agreement at 67% for both Judge 1 and Judge 2.

When I reviewed the percentage of agreement, and looked at where the judges had placed the quotes, it provided me with fruitful feedback. I noted which quotes Judges 1 and 2 had misplaced (i.e., put somewhere other than my original placement in one of the categories) and which categories seemed to have the majority of the inaccurate placements. From this, I was able to determine that two categories needed further clarification. I also determined that with certain quotes I needed to remove confusing contextual information, as it was distracting the judges from focusing just on the behaviours.

In other words, I was able to see what it was about the quotes and categories that had confused the judges. For example, some of the quotes were too long and the judges were not sure where to place a quote that contained that quantity of information. Removing superfluous contextual information from the quote made the quote shorter, making it much easier to identify the main behaviour and to then assign it to a category. Also, I needed to make the wording of the titles or descriptions of a few categories clearer.

After making these changes, I sent a new card sort (of 25% of the quotes, again randomly selected) to Judge 3, who scored an 86% rate of agreement with my original quote placements. Again, this card sort provided me with excellent feedback. During the card sort, the third judge wanted to determine whether or not an incident was helping or hindering to the mentoring relationship outcome, which was not the goal of the card-sort exercise. The judge refused to sort a quote under one of the "helping" categories, insisting that it should fit under "hindering" despite the research participant, responsible for the quote, having identified the incident as helpful. This impacted the rate of agreement and more importantly, would have had the effect of altering the data.

This judge was not part of the community of the adequate (Wilber, 1998), as she was not able to follow the instructions and participate in such a way as to refrain from altering the data. The methodology of the ACIT prohibits judges from changing the data itself. Based on this experience, I refined the instructions that I sent to the remaining 6 judges, so as to more clearly state the purpose of the activity. I also examined Judge 3's card sort and clarified the description of one of the categories that had seemed to be causing some confusion. I did not alter the intention of the category description, but rather I refined and clarified the wording.

I continued with this process of sending the card sort to subsequent judges and analyzing the rate of agreement, along with their placements of the quotes into the categories, in order to determine if the categories or quotes required any further refinement. I sent a new card sort with the aforementioned adjustments to Judge 4 who scored a 94% rate of agreement and went on to send another new card sort to Judge 5 who scored a 90.4% rate of agreement.

Judge 5 had misplaced five quotes into other categories that should have all fit into the same "teaching" category. However, I decided not to make any changes to the categories or the quotes, because of the high rate of agreement between the judges. I sent new card sorts in sequence to Judges 6-9 who produced agreement rates of 94%, 90.4%, 90.4% and 90.4% respectively. I decided that no further judges were necessary since the last six judges had consistently scored agreement rates of above 90% (see Table 12: Independent Judges and Rater Agreement). Throughout each step of the process and before altering categories or editing quotes, I also consulted with my supervisor in order to clarify my rationale for altering the categories and to effectively incorporate the feedback from raters during each round so that the categories became representative of the data. To better understand the relationship between the quotes (which included behaviours that either helped or hindered the outcome of a mentoring relationship) and the final categories, and to best understand how these reported critical incidents affected the mentoring relationship outcomes, I have provided direct examples from the participants for each behavioural category under the following headings: 1. Helpful Protégé Behaviours, 2. Hindering Protégé Behaviours, 3. Helpful Mentor Behaviours, 4. Hindering Mentor Behaviours.

Categories of Helpful Protégé Behaviours

I asked the mentors to share what they had observed protégés do that helped achieve the mentoring goals. I sorted these protégé behaviours into the following seven categories: 1. state explicit goals, 2. seek information, 3. demonstrate integration, 4. prioritize time, 5. show appreciation, 6. bond, and 7. take initiative. The categories, their descriptions, and some examples of the participants' quotes that gave rise to these categories follow. Note, the quotations are exemplars and do not represent all the data supporting each category.

1. State explicit goals. Mentors reported that it was helpful when protégés stated explicit goals about what they wanted to learn from the mentoring relationship. This included stating expectations for the roles of the protégé and/or mentor, for the mentoring relationship, and for the mentoring process. Six participants each reported a critical incident, with a participation rate of 100%.

Participant 1: "The protégé came up to me and clearly stated, 'These are my goals and what I'm hoping you can help me with.'"

Participant 16: "She handed me a list of her goals. We read them together. She outlined her goals – which were all personal and very specific—and talked to me about what she wanted to achieve and what she was looking forward to learning from me."

Participant 17: "At the beginning of the relationship, the protégé and I met and she had come with specific goals she wanted to accomplish. We sat and spoke about her plan. She had some specific steps for how she and I could accomplish these. And then together we created more steps for how to accomplish the goals."

2. Seek information. Mentors also reported that it was helpful when protégés asked specific questions and sought specific advice or information, related to the mentoring goals. This

category contains 14 incidents, provided by five of the six participants, with a participation rate of 66.7%.

Participant 1: “The protégé came up to me and clearly stated, ‘These are the activities and events I want to ask you about. Can you help me with specific components of these events to help me understand how to make them successful? I have questions for you about your thought process, and what actions you’d take if you were planning these events. In regards to an event you managed, how the hell did you make that happen? You were paying attention to something off my radar screen that I never saw coming. How did you know to pay attention to that? Why did you do that? How did you know to make that phone call before the meeting?’ She’d ask me pointed, specific questions, to understand how the mechanics worked.”

Participant 15: “My protégé would have the best questions. She would come prepared and knew what she wanted from the session. For example, she said, ‘I’m putting together a sponsorship package. This is what we are doing as an organization. This is what I think would be the best tool for me. Is that how you would approach it? How would you look for sponsor prospects? This is what I think.’ She put a lot of thought into her question and her project.”

Participant 17: “She was taking notes while I was talking and she said, ‘Let me get this straight, you are telling me that I need to do this, this, this and this (while looking at her notes). Yeah, that’s a great idea but I have a question because I’m uncertain and need help with this one part because I’m confused about this one thing.’”

3. Demonstrate integration. Mentors further reported that it was helpful when protégés demonstrated to the mentors that they had integrated the knowledge or skills that they had been learning. This category contains six incidents, provided by three participants, for a participation rate of 50%.

Participant 1: “The protégé demonstrated that she was developing and learning from what I had taught her, by making a suggestion to me about how I could facilitate smooth waters, or grease skids at a senior level, in order to make a project happen that she was working on at a lower level.”

Participant 17: “He listened to me make a suggestion and then took the information I gave him and incorporated it into his lesson plan, altering his plan accordingly. And then I saw him teach with those pieces incorporated.”

Participant 18: “I asked her to use specific material, do specific activities, present material in a certain way, teach certain concepts to her students and basically teach her class in a specific way. I was very, very explicit with her in terms of what and how I wanted her to present the material. Not everyone responds well to that. But she listened to me and integrated this information willingly. The next day, she performed exactly as I had asked her to and delivered the class exactly as I requested, and she did it willingly and with a smile on her face.”

4. Prioritize time. Incidents in this category corresponded to the protégés prioritizing time for the mentoring relationship or activities. This category contains five incidents, from two participants, for a participation rate of 33.3%. For example:

Participant 17: “I said to the protégé, ‘You need more detail in your work.’ He said, ‘I don’t have enough time to do that.’ I said, ‘Maybe cut out some of your personal activities?’ That day he stopped playing golf to free up some time and devoted more time to his job. Right away he gave more detail in his work.”

Participant 18: “I had little time and my time was very limited and her schedule was really busy and she had a lot to juggle. But this one time, she came to see me outside regular office hours, prioritizing our work together, and stayed really late to get stuff done.”

Participant 18: “This one time I noticed her stay later than any other worker I’ve ever seen. I asked her, ‘How are you doing with time constraints?’ She said, ‘I’m fatigued. Staying late isn’t easy but this stuff is so important to me that I want to get it done.’”

5. Show appreciation. Mentors noted that it was helpful when protégés expressed appreciation, thanks, or gratitude to the mentors. This category contains three quotes, from three participants, for a participation rate of 50%.

Participant 1: “The protégé said, ‘I appreciate the time and effort you put into our relationship.’”

Participant 15: “The protégé attended a workshop about how to handle major gifts and she followed-up with going for coffee. At coffee she said, ‘Thank you for all of the information.’”

Participant 18: “She was consistent in expressing her gratitude. She always said, ‘Thank you.’ This one time she emailed me a long email to sincerely express her gratitude and to thank me.”

6. Bond. Mentors stated that it was helpful when protégés bonded with the mentor, by talking about their personal lives, asking about the mentors’ personal lives, or sharing positive moments resulting in mentor and protégé laughing together. There are five quotes in this category, from four participants, for a participation rate of 66.7%.

Participant 1: “The protégé and I became closely bonded. The protégé maintained the relationship in a personal way that was outside of the work-information I was sharing. The protégé candidly shared about what was happening in her personal life and demonstrated trust in me. I became a confidante in really personal matters. For example, the protégé was having huge problems with her 9-year-old daughter. It was bad. The child was acting out very badly. The

protégé felt comfortable in talking to me every day about that situation. She wasn't whining, she was sharing because she was comfortable to talk to me about a very painful time with her daughter, and we would talk it through on any given day."

Participant 5: "We were sitting in a stairwell of the building and were talking about 'femaleness', birthing, and the vision of birth as an ultimate powerful expression of female unity. We had this odd sense of intimacy and bonding because we're sitting in a stairwell, and there were no other distractions, and it was a super private, secret place that we were in. We went from having a more distant but collegial relationship, to having this very intense personal conversation, which resulted in being able to have an action associated with it. It was kind of magical."

Participant 15: "We had a genuine, trusting, friendly relationship where we clicked. We were working alongside each other on a project and were talking about fundraising and were very focussed on accomplishing our goals. I mentioned I had to drop my dog off at daycare and the protégé said, 'Oh, what kind of dog do you have? Why do you take her to daycare? Where is the daycare? What do you think – I have a dog, should I be taking her to daycare? This is what I do with my dog. I feel bad for him as I should take him to daycare.' She asked me about my life and shared about her own."

7. Take initiative. Mentors related that it was helpful when protégés took initiative, without direction from the mentors. This initiative could be to produce work independently, to fit into the social or cultural surroundings, or to brain-storm ideas ahead of time. This category has 17 quotes, from five participants, for a participation rate of 83.3%.

Participant 1: "The protégé was in a situation where she had a great idea. The person who could act on the great idea was someone in another branch of the Ministry. So she made an

appointment with the person and went and pitched the idea to them. This was out of her comfort zone, outside of her normal Ministry, but she clearly demonstrated she could take a good idea, take initiative, and had the courage to go and present it. She came back and told me what she had done. That was huge for her and for me."

Participant 15: "After the class, he asked, 'Can we meet for lunch and discuss xyz more?' He initiated asking to meet initially, and then to meet again every two weeks. He took the initiative to ask specific questions."

Participant 16: "The protégé would take initiative to seek out great resources and lesson plans that would appeal to her students."

Categories of Hindering Protégé Behaviours

Mentors were asked to share what they observed protégés do that hindered achieving the mentoring goals. The following five categories (i.e., 1. unclear goals, 2. dishonest behaviours, 3. abusive language, 4. prioritize non-mentoring activities, and 5. ignore advice) represent what the mentors reported protégés had done that hindered these mentoring relationship outcomes.

1. Unclear goals. Mentors reported that protégés hindered relationship outcomes when they either failed to state the mentoring goals and expectations for the mentoring relationship, or stated them in a fashion that was non-specific, vague, or unclear. This category contained three quotes, from two participants, resulting in a participation rate of 33.3%.

Participant 1: "The protégé articulated goals, but they didn't seem personal and important to her. Her goals were general, unspecific, and seemed to come from Human Resources as opposed to her. I asked the protégé about her goals and I asked her, 'What specifically do you want to do?' Her answer was vague and she didn't clarify. This meant our time together wasn't targeted and left the relationship being off-track."

Participant 16: “When the protégé first arrived I asked him, ‘What are you hoping to get out of this experience? What would you like to learn?’ He said, ‘I want to learn to be a teacher.’ I asked him, ‘What specifically would you like to learn because being a teacher is pretty broad?’ He said, ‘I just want to be able to be a better teacher’ and didn’t answer my question. I asked him, ‘Do you have any documentation from your school for your practicum? Can you provide me any documentation so I know what you are supposed to learn? Maybe that will help us get an idea of your mentorship goals.’ He said, ‘I’ll ask my teacher for it.’ He never produced the information, though I asked him three or four times for it. He would reply to my request by saying, ‘I keep on asking but I have nothing to give to you.’”

Participant 16: “The protégé had observed me teaching for a week so I went up to him and asked, ‘Would you like to teach a class? You’ve been here long enough that you can teach something now.’ He said, ‘I am enjoying watching you teach and I feel like I am learning from you teaching the English class.’ So I said, ‘Is that your goal to learn English? Because if it is, then that’s really different from what my understanding is of why you are here. I thought you were here to learn how to teach.’ He replied, ‘It’s a bit of both. I’d like to learn English but I’d also like to learn to be a better teacher.’ So then I asked, ‘Is your goal to observe the teaching process? I'm unclear on your goal. Because if it is to observe, then I am happy to have you just be an observer.’ He said, ‘Well, I should participate at some point and teach a class.’”

2. Engage in dishonest behaviour. Mentors also noted that protégés hindered relationship outcomes when they were dishonest, or misrepresented themselves during the mentoring relationships, when they engaged in deception while initiating, or establishing the relationships, and when protégés asked the mentors to be dishonest. This category contains four quotes, from three participants, with a participation rate of 50%.

Participant 1: “The protégé had an ulterior motive in the mentoring relationship, wanting favours in terms of getting a promotion. The protégé was not transparent and honest with me from the beginning of our relationship. She asked me to directly intervene in her promotion and to advance her career.”

Participant 18: “She showed me she knew nothing about the subject area - she had misrepresented herself when I agreed to take her on as a protégé.”

Participant 18: “She asked me to provide a reference for her for a job. I was surprised because the job was something she didn’t have the correct credentials for, or training in. She asked me to give a reference for a skill-set she did not have.”

3. Prioritize non-mentoring activities. Mentors further related that protégés hindered relationship outcomes when they prioritized non-mentoring activities, to the detriment of the suggested mentoring activities designed by mentors to forward the protégés’ learning goals. This category includes the protégés not doing a mentoring activity, or stating that they did not have enough time to do the mentoring activity. This category has five quotes, from four participants, for a participation rate of 66.7%.

Participant 15: “We met and got some growth. There was a cancellation and 6 months later, we had another coffee. She then cancelled 3 or 4 times in a row. She was busy in her personal life. She just kept cancelling meetings so I couldn't teach her.”

Participant 17: “I asked the protégé to meet me at the end of the day for 30 minutes to discuss what his day looked like tomorrow, so he could prepare properly. He said, ‘I can’t meet with you after school because I’m going to play racquetball.’”

Participant 18: “I asked if she was prepared to learn all of this and do lesson plans, and she said she didn’t have enough time to do it as she had personal things to do instead.”

4. Ignore advice. Mentors offered that protégés hindered relationship outcomes when they continued to "do their own thing(s)" despite the mentors directing, guiding, advising, or telling the protégés what to do. Examples include: ignoring the mentor, doing the opposite of what the mentor asked, doing one's own activities, not listing to the mentor, and ignoring the mentor's directives and advice. There are 13 quotes in this category, from five participants, giving a participation rate of 66.7%.

Participant 16: "We had a dress-code of not wearing jeans, which I told him, and the protégé would always show-up in jeans."

Participant 17: "I critiqued his behaviour and said, 'Listen, you didn't come with a lesson plan today. This is what one looks like. This is how to do one. Come with one tomorrow.' He repeated the same behaviour and came into work without pre-planning his work for the day again."

Participant 18: "She made inappropriate jokes with the students after I told her not to do this."

Other category of interest: use abusive language. One mentor reported that protégés hindered the relationship outcomes when they used offensive and abusive language. This category has two quotes, from the one participant. Recall that I chose to include this category despite a participation rate of 16.7% (although Butterfield et al. (2005) required a participation rate of 25% for a category to be considered credible), as it was clearly highly damaging to the mentoring relationship. The quotes that comprised this category were:

Participant 17: "He lost his temper with me and behaved inappropriately. He yelled, screamed, and swore at me, used disrespectful language and said to me, 'I think you're being fucking unreasonable. I think this is b.s. and you're being a bitch.'"

Participant 17: “He lost his temper with students, yelling, and screaming at them. He yelled at them, called them names in a raised voice, and swore. He said, ‘What are you raised in a barn? Are you a monkey raised in a zoo?’”

Categories of Helpful Mentors Behaviours

In addition to asking mentors and their protégés’ helpful and hindering behaviours, I also asked 12 protégés to share what they had observed mentors do that helped achieve the mentoring goals. Based on the incidents reported by the protégés, I formed in six categories of helpful mentor behaviours: 1. demonstrate support, 2. state explicit expectations, 3. teach, 4. model effective behaviours, 5. connect emotionally, and 6. work together.

1. Demonstrate support. Protégé’s reported that mentors were helpful when they demonstrated support by advocating, praising, encouraging, boosting, and endorsing the protégés. There are 21 quotes in this category, from nine participants, resulting in a participation rate of 75%.

Participant 13: “After a few weeks of mentoring me, she said, ‘You work hard and are well trained. You have such good communication skills. I find you easy to communicate with.’ I told her I was doing a Masters in counselling, and she said, ‘You’ll be fantastic at that job as you’re such a good communicator!’”

Participant 8: “I went to England a week early, prior to my work at the Clinic, to find a school for one of my children. My mentor knew about my plans and that I needed to go a week early. She said, ‘I want to support you. Why don't you stay in our apartment because it is empty?’ She loaned me her apartment to support and help me.”

Participant 2: “The mentor expressed her perception of my competency by saying ‘I trust and respect you... I know you have a ton of skill and experience, so you’ll take what we’ve talked about in this discussion and bring it forward and create a great event or curriculum.’”

2. State explicit expectations. Protégés also noted that it was helpful when mentors stated explicit expectations regarding the mentoring process and activities, the mentoring relationship, and/or the role-expectations for the protégés and mentors. There are seven quotes in this category, from six of the 12 participants, resulting in a participation rate of 50%.

Participant 2: “The mentor approached me to set up times to meet regularly, making sure our schedules meshed enough to make him available to me for structured meetings and ad-hoc conversations. At this time he told me, ‘I have an expectation of a structure, regularity and predictability to our meetings and having access to each other.’ He’d then always show-up at the meetings, and at the end of every meeting, would lead setting up our next meeting by saying, ‘Okay, let’s see when we are set up to meet again. Next Wednesday I have a meeting, so let’s make sure we fit in something another time this coming week.’”

Participant 3: “The mentor came to me face-to-face and said, ‘Okay this is my schedule and this is what I'm doing this week. Here's what you're going to be involved with. You are going to be riding along at this time. You'll be with me for these things. Here are the things you are doing independent of me. Here's what is expected of you. Here are the times we will meet to discuss what’s going on.’ The mentor than said, ‘If something comes up, come knock on my door. Or if something comes up, see me at our meeting time.’ He was clear about what his needs were so that I knew how best to access him and how to use him as a resource.”

Participant 9: “The mentor sat down with me and wrote out a specific structured timeline whereby she said, ‘I want to maximize your input and minimize your stress so I'm going to

provide some guidance to structure your time during this mentorship. If you want to graduate by this date, then you want to have this done by this date, and this done by this date, and your first draft handed in by this date.' She wrote down this timeline and handed it to me."

3. Teach. Protégés further related that it was helpful when mentors gave instructions to the protégés, provided advice, offered guidance or perspective, communicated feedback on protégés' performances, or explained concepts. This category contains 38 quotes, from all 12 participants, giving a participation rate of 100%.

Participant 3: "I was going into a competition and I was going up against a black belt but I thought I could win because I was bigger. My mentor looked at me and said, 'What are you going to do?' I told him what I was going to do and he listened to me and said, 'Okay' and walked off. I walked out there and I was easily dispatched with and I was destroyed within a few seconds. My mentor came up to me later on... and said, 'So, what happened out there?' I was trying to explain myself and he stopped me and said, 'Okay, what did you do wrong?,' and then he said to me, 'So have you realized you can't just go out there and muscle people when they are actually that much more skilled than you? Pure skill and the leverage of skill will get you further than using your size, strength or aggression.' I replied, 'Yes.' He could see through what I was using to my advantage that wasn't actually to my advantage. He not just explained why something was wrong, but he explained what I had to do differently to get it right."

Participant 9: "The mentor gave me a research project and a research article by a former student and suggested that it would be a good template for me to follow for my own research. She emailed it to me and said, 'This will be a specific resource that can guide you. Look at this. It will give you a lot of good information.' For every resource she gave me, she would hand me articles and email links, she would say, 'This is a great way to talk about, or do, X, so use it.'"

Participant 14: “I used to be very wordy in my writing. This one time, my mentor called me into his office and said, ‘How do we get economy of words?’ He then taught me, right then and there how to do it, and how to reduce my wordiness, and how to write more succinctly, and he gave me his work as a template to guide me.”

4. Model effective behaviour. Protégés described the incidents that comprised this category as corresponding to the mentors modelling, showing, or demonstrating, effective skills, behaviours, or knowledge applications, for the protégés to imitate as part of the learning process. This process involved the mentors modelling behaviours and the protégés watching. There are seven quotes in this category, from six participants, giving a participation rate of 50%.

Participant 4: “The mentor quickly wrote a thorough business proposal looking for investors. He brought it out and showed it to me, explaining what he had put in it and why. Seeing his work was such a good learning tool for me.”

Participant 6: “My mentor provided me with opportunities to observe her in couples-counselling sessions and then debrief with her afterwards. This way I could see how she conducted her couples-counselling sessions, as she modelled the skills for me, and I could ask her about it later if I had a question. This way I could really learn from her.”

Participant 11: “I used to report everything about my patients, including all details. I would watch my mentor and she would give much shorter reports and would get actual results with the doctor showing up, indicating he had heard the report, and making an order. The patient would be looked after in an efficient way. Her modelling of a report was crucial to my learning.”

5. Connect emotionally. Protégés mentioned incidents in this category which related to the mentors emotionally connecting with the protégés. This category included conversations about how the mentors or protégés were feeling, any expression of those feelings, or any

communication by the mentors showing an understanding of the protégés' feelings. This category was comprised of 12 quotes, from five participants, with a participation rate of 41.7%. For example:

Participant 3: "My mentor called me at home to tell me my client had committed suicide. He told me what happened in a matter-of-fact way, told me where he was in the process of dealing with the suicide, and took the time to tell me all about the situation. He said, 'It is affecting me emotionally.' He asked me, 'I wanted to check-in; now that I've told you this, what's on your mind?'"

Participant 4: "I had recently turned 20 and decided I was ready to move out from my parent's house. This was a really phenomenal feeling for me at a deep personal level. I told my mentor 'I'm ready to move out of my parent's house,' and he turned to me and was so delighted for me. The look on his face was sheer delight in my strengths and accomplishment. He said to me 'Oh little brother, if I had the money to support you in that I would just give it to you. I'm just so excited about this new chapter in your life.' This was his way of showing his complete support for me. His words meant a lot. It was the start of the transformation, past just sharing information in the mentorship, to him showing support for my personal life as well. I felt like he always had my best interest in mind."

Participant 12: "She knew I was emotionally overwhelmed and said to me, 'What do you need to do to take care of yourself? What can I do to help you? I understand how you are feeling. If you need to come in for a shorter day because you need to address something in another part of your life, than that's okay. If you need to leave early today or take next week off, know that that's okay. I'm here and can take some of the slack if that's what you need, and if that's what would be helpful for you to be able to continue.'"

6. Work together. The protégés reported incidents in this category involving the mentors providing the protégés with opportunities to work alongside the mentors in order to get experience and real-time feedback on their performances. There are six quotes in this category, from six of the 12 participants, resulting in a participation rate of 50%. For example:

Participant 6: "My mentor came up to me and said, 'There's an opportunity to co-facilitate a counselling group. Let's work out which parts each of us will do.' After we figured out which parts we were going to do, we practiced together so we felt prepared to present the material."

Participant 13: "My mentor stayed in the classroom with me while I was teaching. He told me he'd manage the classroom behaviours so I could just focus on teaching, so I could get better at it. He was sitting at the desk at the front of the room, looking around. If a student was talking while I was talking, he'd get-up silently and go stand by a student, or he'd tap them on the shoulder. Sometimes he'd speak-up, but not often. Most of the time he was quiet so he wasn't interrupting my teaching."

Participant 14: "He emailed and said, 'What's your summer like? Let's write-up your dissertation. I was going over it and it's important work, and it needs to be out there... Let's write it together.'"

Categories of Hindering Mentor Behaviours

In addition to encouraging the protégés to describe helpful mentor behaviours, I also asked protégés to share what they had observed mentors do that hindered the mentoring relationship outcomes. From their comments, I noted five categories of mentor behaviours: 1. criticize, 2. give inadequate instruction, 3. model ineffective behaviours, 4. misinterpret the

protégé's needs, and 5. block work-accomplishments. I describe these categories in more detail as follows:

1. Criticize. Protégés detailed incidents in this category related to the mentors directly, or indirectly, criticizing the protégés and/or the protégés' work. This category has seven quotes, from five participants, giving a participation rate of 41.7%. For example:

Participant 2: "The mentor verbally compared me with other protégés and highlighted their strengths and my weaknesses. The mentor said, 'Well X-person did this with what they had and you are only able to do this <motioning that it was something lesser>. Other protégés have taken the initiative to just start programs, or find different things.' There was an indirect dissatisfaction with what I was doing, and the mentor would express this by comparing me with others."

Participant 9: "In our first group supervision my mentor asked me, 'How do you handle it if your client meets the criteria for a DSM disorder? Do you tell them? Do not tell them? How specific do you get?' When I answered, he acted horrified and said, 'If I were your client, I would be horrified if you said that to me.' He said this in front of eight or nine of my colleagues."

Participant 13: "This one time, I spoke-up and gave her some advice to which she replied, "Oh you don't know anything. That won't work.'"

2. Inadequate instruction. Protégés outlined incidents in this category pertaining to the mentors: (a) providing inadequate, or too late, information or instruction; (b) providing outdated information; (c) giving bad advice; (d) inadequately preparing the protégés; or (e) inappropriately leaving the protégés alone (i.e., leaving the protégés to manage a classroom, or

other work-situations, when unprepared to do so). The category contains nine quotes, from six participants, resulting in a participation rate of 50%. For example:

Participant 3: “I came to my mentor with a question. He referred to policy and said, ‘Those are the rules. This is just how it is.’ But he couldn’t explain them because he didn't know and wasn’t able to answer my question in a satisfactory way.”

Participant 9: “My mentor gave me the Impact of Events Scale to do my research with and then she gave me the wrong cut-off scores. I did my thesis and didn't realize that she gave me the wrong information until the end of my thesis.”

Participant 14: “The night before the meeting, my mentor walked into the lab and said, ‘I’ve been thinking we need to add a component to your study.’ I said, ‘Tomorrow is my meeting and I haven’t prepared for this.’ He replied, ‘No, I think this is important.’ The next day in my meeting, I presented this whole new idea to my committee. A committee member said he didn’t like the idea and thought me taking on another component to my research was overwhelming and a bad idea. After the meeting, one of the members said to me, ‘You’re in trouble. You’re supervisor is sending you down the wrong path. He's given you bad advice.’”

3. Model ineffective behaviour. Protégés discussed incidents in this category relating to the mentors: (a) acting immorally; (b) engaging in unethical behaviour; (c) violating rules of conduct; (d) being dishonest; (e) being unreliable; (f) violating standards of professionalism; and/or (g) refusing to apologize when in the wrong. There are eight quotes in this category, from five participants, giving a participation rate of 41.7%. For example:

Participant 11: “I was on shift with my mentor and I think the other nurse made a medication error with one of my patients when I was on break. The nurse filling in for me told my mentor she’d made a mistake, who in turn manipulated the situation. When I came back from

break my mentor told me, ‘I’ll follow-up on the care of this patient’ and she took over the subsequent pain and sleep medication for the patient. The patient wasn’t injured, but the record of medications was altered in order to cover-up the other nurse’s mistake. This was all done so the nurse didn’t have to officially admit a mistake. My mentor modelled to me to lie and cover-up when a mistake was made, and to not talk about errors openly. When I did make my own errors later on, I hadn’t been taught how to own-up to them.”

Participant 13: “My mentor was disorganized. This one time I went into the classroom and the classroom was hell. There was garbage and stuff everywhere. Her appearance was unprofessional. She was wearing jogging pants, running shoes, and had stains on her sweatshirt, and her hair was oily, and in a pony tail. The state of the room, and her appearance, was one of disorganization and being unprofessional. She didn’t make eye contact with me when I spoke with her.”

Participant 14: “My mentor told me a new idea and had me present it to my committee. When another committee member didn't like it, my mentor didn’t say anything. He didn’t support me. He didn’t support his idea. He let me take the fall for his bad idea.”

4. Misinterpret the protégé’s needs. Protégés mentioned incidents in this category characterized by the mentors misinterpreting or misunderstanding the protégés’ wants or needs. This category contains six quotes, from three participants, which is a participation rate of 25%. For example:

Participant 2: “I stated I was interested in working with younger children to my mentor. I also expressed I wanted to experience clients with a variety of ages, genders, and issues. The next week the mentor came to me and gave me 3 cases of 8-year-old boys who all had learning difficulties. This wasn’t what we had agreed to; she wasn't listening to what I needed.”

Participant 13: “I felt like I was the mentor’s counsellor. When we’d drive to and from work together, she’d complain to me about all of the negative things that were happening in her life. There was no exchange. She didn’t want to hear about my life. I had to sit there the whole ride and listen. She was oblivious to what I needed.”

Participant 13: “The first time I was to meet my mentor in person I had driven for hours to see her. I asked to have a good sit-down chat, get to know each other and build a relationship. But instead she spoke to me for 5 minutes and then we were to go for lunch together. She’d invited her friend to come with us. She spent the entire time speaking with her friend and not me. She didn’t make eye contact with me and didn’t smile at me. It's like she didn't understand what I wanted.”

Other category of interest: block work-accomplishments. Protégés communicated incidents in this category that referred to the mentors impeding and interrupting the protégés’ work, taking work away from the protégés, and/or taking away time so the protégés could not accomplish the work. There are three quotes from one participant in this category. Although this resulted in a participation rate of only 8.3% (i.e., less than the 25% participation rate required by Butterfield et al. (2005) for a researcher to consider the category credible), I chose to include it as the behaviour had been clearly very detrimental to the mentoring relationship. For example:

Participant 6: “I gave a speech. My mentor stood over me during the speech and was watching me the whole time. She was very outgoing and would repeatedly interrupt me, mistaking my quieter, more introverted way of giving a speech as not knowing what I was talking about. She just took over during my speech even though I was doing well. This made me lose my train of thought and my focus, because I was just reacting to her interrupting me and taking over.”

Participant 6: “I had worked at a transition house, so I had experience working with family violence. I had a couple who were experiencing family violence, which came up in a team meeting. After the team meeting, my mentor pulled me aside one-to-one and said, ‘You shouldn't be working with family violence. That's my area.’ She was strategic because if she had said it in the team meeting, others would have corrected her. It wasn’t true that I couldn’t or shouldn't work with family violence. She was just really competitive about wanting to have this area of specialization all to herself. She took the couple away from me for no good reason, so I couldn't do the work.”

Participant 6: “My mentor and I were to give a workshop, with her giving the first half and me giving the second half. She spent so much time, and went on and on and on during her part of the workshop, that I didn't have enough time to cover all of my material. I had to be very thrifty and cut out a lot of stuff that I was supposed to cover. She undermined my ability to do what I set out to do.”

In summary, I found the participants to be forthcoming, genuine and interested in contributing to the body of research through their reported experiences. The selection of the ACIT was appropriate to an interpretive/constructivist worldview and helped me to focus the conversations, and sort the data into meaningful categories. A number of the participants reported that they found the experience to be positive and expressed an interest in reading about the outcome of the study.

Summary

This study catalogued 13 categories of behaviours that reportedly help and 10 categories of behaviours that reportedly hinder a mentoring relationship outcome. I collated these behaviours to generate what serves as a functional guide as to how to best conduct a mentoring

relationship (see Appendix H: Behaviours that Help or Hinder a Mentoring Relationship Outcome) from both the standpoint of the mentor as well as that of the protégé.

These results reflect that the participants seemed open, genuine, and interested in contributing to the body of research on potential ways to improve a mentoring relationship's outcome through the reporting of their own lived experiences. Offering the participants pre-interview definitions of the mentoring constructs (see Appendix G: The Mentoring Construct - Definitions) and an opportunity to reflect on, and take notes, regarding their mentoring experiences ahead of time, also seemed to produce a shared clarity and focus. Finally, a number of the participants reported that they found the experience to be positive and expressed an interest in reading about the outcome of the study.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The intent of this study was to determine which behaviours self-described protégés and mentors report as having helped and/or hindered the outcomes of their mentoring relationships. Using the ACIT, a modified version of the CIT and ECIT that I developed so as to be more consistent with a qualitative methodology and an interpretive/constructivist worldview, this study has revealed some unique findings which illuminate aspects of mentoring previously unknown. Also, as a by-product of understanding which behaviours help or hinder mentoring outcomes, this study has produced suggestions for conducting mentoring (see Appendix H: Behaviours That Help or Hinder a Mentoring Relationship Outcome). Finally, the current study contributes operationalized definitions of the terms "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring" that had been lacking in the mentoring literature to date (see Appendix G: The Mentoring Construct - Definitions).

In this chapter, I will discuss these definitions and their implications for the comparison of the current study's findings to the body of literature on mentoring. A subsequent overview of the behavioural findings will contextualize the categories, while in the section on the validity and credibility of the research, I reflect on the current study's compliance with the nine credibility checks of Butterfield et al. (2005; 2009). Further, I have broken down each of the four broad categories of mentor and protégé behaviours, (a) protégé behaviours that help mentoring relationship outcomes, (b) protégé behaviours that hinder mentoring relationship outcomes, (c) mentor behaviours that help mentoring relationship outcomes, and (d) mentor behaviours that hinder mentoring relationship outcomes, into their component subcategories in order to review each finding in terms of its utility and support in the literature. In conclusion, I will discuss the current study's strengths and limitations, its implications for counselling psychology, my

suggestions for individuals interested in mentoring, and the implications of the findings for future research in the field of mentoring.

Definitions

No other study uses the definitions of "mentor," "protégé," or "mentoring" created for this study (see Appendix G: The Mentoring Construct - Definitions). In fact most of the previous research on mentoring did not use definitions at all, or alternatively used Kram's (1980, 1983, 1985) "definition" which was fraught with inconsistencies and which Kram never intended to be offered as a definition. Not having a consistent definition in the mentoring literature makes it challenging to compare the current study's findings with previous results, but despite this difficulty, some unique behaviours emerged that helped or hindered mentoring relationship outcomes, which researchers had never previously specifically mentioned in the literature (see Appendix H: Behaviours that Help or Hinder a Mentoring Relationship Outcome). The definitions used herein are an improvement upon previous definitions because they: 1. are clear and operationalized; and 2. help distinguish and differentiate mentoring from other helping relationships such as coaching.

An Overview of the Behavioural Findings

Mentors, for example, spoke about protégé behaviours that helped the outcome of the mentoring relationship. Categorizing these behaviours, the current study determined that to help the relationship a protégé could: 1. state explicit goals, 2. seek information, 3. demonstrate integration, 4. prioritize time, 5. show appreciation, 6. bond, and 7. take initiative. Mentors also spoke about protégés behaviours that hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationship, and from these quotes the current study determined that a protégé could: 1. have unclear goals, 2. engage in dishonest behaviours, 3. prioritize non-mentoring activities, 4. ignore advice, and as a

category of interest, 5. use abusive language. Additionally, some unique findings emerged from what the protégés had to say about mentors. Protégés noted that to help achieve the mentoring goals mentors could: 1. demonstrate support, 2. state explicit expectations, 3. teach, 4. model effective behaviours, 5. connect emotionally, and 6. work together (i.e., with the protégé). Of these six helpful mentor behaviours, researchers have not previously noted "demonstrating support" and "working together" in the literature as contributing to a positive mentoring relationship outcome.

Protégés also spoke about what mentor behaviours hindered achieving the relationship goals. A mentor could: 1. criticize, 2. give inadequate instruction, 3. model ineffective behaviours, 4. misinterpret the protégé's needs, and 5. block work-accomplishments. While the majority of the hindering actions of mentors have never before appeared in the literature, the finding of the negative consequence of modelling ineffective behaviour supports similar results from previous studies (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Cho et al., 2011; Sambunjak et al., 2010).

In order to further understand these new general categories of helping or hindering behaviours, it is important to remember that each mentor or protégé participant reported observed behaviours from his or her perspective within a mentoring relationship. The interpersonal aspects of the relationship are central to mentoring because it can only occur in the context of such a relationship. Straus et al. (2013) talked about the mentoring relationship needing to be mutually rewarding and include a personal connection. Perhaps what Straus was getting at, but did not explicitly state, was the importance of the relationship itself.

In the current study, mentors and protégés stated they were looking for more than just teaching and integration of knowledge. Participants spoke about the importance of personal gratification and connection, in the form of showing appreciation, bonding, demonstrating

support, and connecting emotionally within the relationship. The presence of this personal gratification and connection not only enhanced the person's experience within the relationship, but also increased the likelihood of achieving the mentoring goals. For the participants in this study, learning was intertwined with the quality of the relationship.

Validity and Credibility of the Research

As this study abides by the procedures for the ECIT and eight of the nine credibility checks Butterfield et al. (2005; 2009) outlined as adapted for the ACIT, it is important to finish addressing the final credibility check of theoretical validity. This check involves a twofold process. The first of which is to make explicit the researcher's assumptions underlying the research, which I discussed in the Introduction to this document and throughout the study. The second component is to scrutinize the current research findings against the relevant literature to see if there is support and justification for the findings in previous research. This second component serves to ascertain whether the findings are in juxtaposition to previous research, or if the findings make sense in light of other research. I have therefore, reflected on the results of the current study, and their implications for future research, by looking at past studies in the field of mentoring, in order to place the current study's results in the context of other research findings.

The majority of this study's findings were unique to the literature while previous research supported the remainder. I have discussed these components and their categories below in greater detail and have also noted where a category represents a unique contribution (UC) to the mentoring literature. Once again, the lack of a common definition certainly complicates comparisons with earlier studies; however, it is my hope that in providing a clear, operationalized definition for the mentoring construct, the current study may have alleviated these complications for future researchers.

Protégé Behaviours That Help Mentoring Relationship Outcomes

According to my proposed definitions, the protégé is not a passive consumer of the mentor's knowledge but an active participant in the co-construction of the mentoring relationship. Despite the necessarily active role of the protégé, the majority of mentoring literature has ignored the potential of the protégé's behavioural contributions to a successful mentoring outcome. As a result, the seven helpful protégé behaviours listed below represent new findings that are interesting, potentially useful, and worthy of further study in the field of mentoring.

1. State explicit goals (UC). Mentoring is a process, a series of changes taking place. It is comprised of the activities that make up the process, while the people involved in the process are the mentor and protégé. At the outset of this process, the protégé must identify that he or she has something to learn. When a learner identifies that he or she wants to learn something, and enters into a relationship to gain this knowledge, it is helpful to know exactly what the learner wants to accomplish. As such, it makes sense that, in a mentoring relationship, it is helpful to have the protégé state his or her goals explicitly. This enables a mentor to know the purpose and focus of the relationship, and to be able to provide the protégé with targeted activities to reach the mentoring goals. One mentor mentioned an example of stating this purpose and focus, when she said that the protégé "outlined her goals – which were all personal and very specific—and talked to me about what she wanted to achieve and what she was looking forward to learning from me." Another mentor noted that her protégé had "clearly stated her purpose, direction and goal," and had told her, "I really want to study with you because so few opportunities exist to study your subject matter in a high school environment."

One of the findings in the current study, which is a unique component of making the mentoring goals explicit, is the stating of expectations for how the mentor and protégé will conduct themselves in the relationship, as well as how they will conduct the process of the mentoring relationship. It is not enough to state the goal without knowing what the other person is willing to do to achieve it, what the mentoring will look like, and how the mentoring will unfold. Otherwise, how will either party know if the other can and will be able to work towards the goal?

In Rabatin et al.'s (2004) analysis of aspects that contribute to effective mentoring, the authors stated that a protégé should articulate goals. It is unclear if "articulating goals" is in relation to the overall mentoring goals, or relates to smaller work-related goals. This is a foundational component that has not surfaced in other literature, although a few authors have made suggestions that I interpreted as supportive of "stating explicit goals." For example, Sambunjak et al. (2010) mentioned that the protégé should take an active role in the formation and development of the relationship. Unfortunately, the authors did not expand this concept and, therefore, it is not clear what they meant by this directive. However, one could read into this statement and see some fit with the protégé forming the relationship through stating goals and expectations.

Williams et al. (2004) stated that the protégé should be proactive, which I presumed to apply to being forthright about goals and expectations. The researchers go on to discuss how a mentor should assist the protégé in defining and reaching goals. Although the authors did not say what actions a protégé would take in regard to this, I inferred that if a mentor is assisting the protégé in this activity, the protégé must be producing some sort of goal for the relationship.

Straus et al. (2009) mentioned that a protégé needs to be in the "driver's seat" to facilitate a successful relationship. Though the authors never clarified what "driver's seat" meant, one might assume that it meant the protégé was assertive and proactive. These protégé characteristics, while not explicitly referring to mentorship goals, certainly fit with this study's findings regarding the importance of stating these goals along with the expectations for the relationship. Similarly, Straus et al. (2013) noted that coming to meetings with a list of topics for discussion and "driving the relationship," were positive characteristics of protégés, both of which are related to the behaviour of stating explicit goals and expectations. Finally, Straus et al. (2013) spoke about the importance of the mentor and protégé having clear expectations for the relationship, to which both parties would be held accountable.

Despite the fact that there is very little literature on the aspect of the protégé stating explicit goals and expectations, the literature does appear to support this finding. As no other study has explicitly stated this category and included that goals regarding the mentoring relationship, expectations and roles are equally as important to the mentoring relationship outcome, I believe it is a unique contribution to the field.

2. Seek information (UC). On a basic level, mentoring is about the protégé learning from the mentor within the context of a relationship. As such, it makes sense that when the protégé seeks information from the mentor, this helps the mentoring outcomes. Seeking information refers to the protégé asking specific questions and looking for advice and information from the mentor. Much of the mentoring literature ignores the protégé but the protégé is not inert, as though absorbing knowledge through osmosis. Instead, the protégé benefits from coming primed for learning, having looked at what he or she does not know, and ready to actively seek information from the mentor to fill in these gaps. If the basis of the

relationship was only the mentor bringing the information to the protégé, there would be no guarantee that the protégé would learn or integrate the information. However, if the protégé is seeking and looking for this information, the findings of this study would indicate that this facilitates mentoring outcomes.

One mentor commented about how helpful specific questions were to the mentoring process, reporting that the protégé had said, "You were paying attention to something off my radar screen that I never saw coming. How did you know to pay attention to that? Why did you do that? …She'd ask me pointed, specific questions to understand how the mechanics worked." Another mentor expressed that the protégé "was attentive and interested in what I had to say… participating fully by asking good specific questions, discussing things with me and listening to my answer intently." Mentors also welcomed it when protégés sought information about a specific situation, such as when one of the protégés said, "I heard that X is how you handle major donation gifts but I was thinking that, instinctively, I would like to approach it and handle it this other way. Can we have a discussion about what you have heard?" Mentors also commented that information seeking was a good use of the time that mentor and protégé had together.

The category of the protégé seeking information is not explicitly apparent in the literature, although two studies mention something similar. For example, Straus et al. (2013) spoke about the protégé coming to meetings with a list of topics for discussion, which is in alignment with seeking information. If a protégé knows what he or she wants to learn, then he or she would likely come to a meeting with a list of questions prepared in order to best target the specific learning goals. Both Straus et al. (2013) and Straus et al. (2009) mentioned that the protégé was in the "driver's seat" in the relationship and I presume that this "driver's seat" refers to the protégé being actively engaged in steering the learning and the mentoring relationship,

however, this is not explicit in either study. An engaged protégé could be actively asking questions and therefore seeking information, but since no study has clearly stated this in the literature, I believe it is a unique contribution to the field of mentoring.

3. Demonstrate integration (UC). Mentoring is about learning, and it is helpful for the protégé to know what he or she wants to learn and then seek information specific to this learning. The mentoring learning process is a series of changes in the protégé's level of knowledge and it is helpful for the protégé to demonstrate these changes so that the mentor can see that learning is occurring. This can be an affirmative feedback loop, wherein the protégé demonstrates that he or she is learning by integrating the knowledge, skills, and instructions provided by the mentor, which can then inform the mentor as to what behaviours are helping achieve the goals. A protégé demonstrating the integration of knowledge also tells the mentor if the effort he or she is putting into the relationship is garnering the desired outcomes and is worth it. As a voluntary relationship, if the protégé does not demonstrate integration and progress, there is the risk the mentor may exit the relationship, as the protégé may not live up to the expectation of learning. Demonstrating the integration of knowledge can take many forms. One mentor observed when the protégé "took the information I gave him and incorporated it into his lesson plan… And then I saw him teach with those pieces incorporated." Another noted when the protégé "performed exactly as I had asked her to and delivered the class exactly as I requested."

One study in the literature describes something similar to demonstrating integration of learning. Rabatin et al. (2004) discussed the benefit of protégés following through and completing tasks. Task completion does not necessarily show an integration of new skills and knowledge; it is more about protégés doing what they said they would do. It is one thing to talk about change, quite another to enact the change so that it is visible to an observer. Given that no

other studies in the literature discuss the protégé demonstrating his or her integration of knowledge to the mentor, this category of behaviours is a unique contribution to the field.

4. Prioritize time (UC). Mentors describe it as helpful when a protégé prioritizes the mentoring relationship or mentoring activities over other things. In other words, at times the protégé needs to prioritize learning from the mentor and fully engage in the mentoring activities in order to reap the most benefits. This means there will be times when the protégé has to sacrifice some time away from other life activities and reprioritize so as to give the time needed to the mentoring activities. Mentors noticed when their protégés made the extra effort to prioritize the mentoring such as when one mentor commented, "I asked her, 'How are you doing with time constraints?' She said, 'I'm fatigued. Staying late isn't easy but this stuff is so important to me that I want to get it done.'" The category of prioritizing time is new to the body of research on mentoring, and as such, is a unique contribution.

5. Show appreciation (UC). Mentoring is a process that happens in a relationship. There have to be enough benefits for the mentor to feel like the relationship is worthwhile or the mentor will not engage in the relationship and protégé will not reach the mentoring goals. It is imperative in achieving the mentoring goals that the mentor remains invested and engaged in the relationship physically, mentally, and emotionally. A protégé can express appreciation, thanks, or gratitude in order to help the mentor feel it is worthwhile to be in the relationship. The ways in which the protégé offers thanks do not matter as long as the underlying message is one of appreciation. For example one mentor recounted how her protégé "was consistent in expressing her gratitude. She always said, 'Thank you.' This one time she emailed me a long email to sincerely express her gratitude and to thank me." No other study has recognised this category as helping mentoring relationship outcomes, meaning this is also a unique finding.

6. Bond (UC). In mentoring, there is personal involvement. Intimacy can evolve over the period of the relationship and result in a sense of bonding. Being bonded means there is a secure sense of the mentor and protégé personally holding together as a unit. Mentors expressed this bonding by saying things like "we had a genuine, trusting, friendly relationship where we clicked," or that the protégé "candidly shared about what was happening in her personal life and demonstrated trust in me." Mentors found it helpful when the protégé not only shared personal information, but had engaged in genuinely getting to know the mentor. It was this level of personal engagement that led to bonding.

In the current research, I used the concept of a "bond" to refer to when a mentor and protégé feel bonded to each other, although they are not necessarily friends. People in friendships say they feel bonded. However, feeling bonded does not always mean there is a friendship (e.g., attachment is an example of being bonded without the presence of friendship). A parent is not necessarily a friend to his or her child, though undeniably a bond exists. One other mentoring researcher spoke about the development of a friendship within the mentoring relationship. In analyzing a year's worth of interactions between a mentor and a protégé, Rabatin et al. (2004) stated that the mentor and protégé had developed a friendship. However, Rabatin et al. (2004) did not talk about a sense of bonding, which the current study represents as a category. As no other study recognises the helpfulness of a protégé bonding in the mentor relationship, this is another unique finding.

7. Take initiative (UC). There comes a point in a mentoring relationship when the protégé needs to go out on his or her own, and be proactive and productive, without input from the mentor. The protégé becomes a competent person in the relationship who can act independently. Mentors identified that it was helpful when a protégé took the initiative in such

ways as producing work independently, fitting into the social or cultural surroundings, or brain-storming ideas ahead of time, without the need for the mentor's direction. Mentors saw the benefits when protégés thought for themselves and could act separately from the mentor. When a protégé took initiative, it showed that he or she was keen and capable of acting on the integrated knowledge, which the mentor could then critique in order to provide feedback. One mentor provided an example of protégé initiative in the following quote, "The protégé was in a situation where she had a great idea. The person who could act on the great idea was someone in another branch of the Ministry. So she made an appointment with the person and went and pitched the idea to them. …She came back and told me what she had done. That was huge for her and for me."

Other researchers in the mentoring literature have noted similar concepts to "taking initiative" in their studies. Rabatin et al. (2004) observed that it was helpful when the protégé came prepared to meetings, which could be seen as the protégé taking the initiative to think of ideas ahead of time. However, the author did not clarify whether the mentor told the protégé to come prepared, or if the protégé thought of this idea on his or her own. As noted previously, Straus et al. (2013) and Straus et al. (2009) stated that it was helpful when the protégé was in the "driver's seat" in the relationship. If the authors meant that the protégé was taking the initiative to direct the relationship, one might consider it a related concept. Since the researchers never defined or explained this concept further, and applying "taking initiative" to their research could be conjecture, I believe that the explicit category of "taking initiative" is an additional unique contribution to the mentoring literature on what protégé behaviours help mentoring relationship outcomes. Regardless of whether or not "taking initiative" is accurately attributable to the

Rabatin et al. (2004), Straus et al. (2013) and Straus et al. (2009) studies, this category is a clearer articulation of the finding.

Protégés do not act in isolation but rather in the context of the mentoring relationship. Mentoring is a dynamic process in which the actions and behaviours of one party affect and alter the actions and behaviours of the other. In the following section, I discuss mentor behaviours that protégés considered helpful or hindering in the mentoring relationship.

Mentor Behaviours That Help Mentoring Relationship Outcomes

The role of the mentor in the mentoring relationship has been the primary focus of a number of notable studies (e.g., Cho et al., 2011; Straus et al., 2013; Williams et al., 2014). Researchers have studied what makes an effective mentor (e.g., Rabatin et al., 2004), what are the characteristics of a good mentor (e.g., Sambunjak et al., 2010), and what makes for an outstanding mentor (e.g., Cho et al., 2011). Despite the fact that researchers have studied mentors' behaviours more often than protégés' behaviours, the current findings add two additional mentor-behaviour categories that contribute to a positive mentoring relationship outcome and that researchers have not addressed in the literature. The remaining four categories of behaviours support previous findings in the literature, which helps to paint a more robust picture of the role of an exemplary mentor from the privileged-insider perspective of the protégé.

1. Demonstrate support. Protégés reported that it was helpful when mentors demonstrated support in the form of advocating for, praising, encouraging, boosting, and endorsing the protégés. Twenty-one quotes formed this category including, "Her support made all the difference," and "Listen, I'm in your corner and I'm with you." Support could also take more specific forms such as when one protégé noted that the mentor "never mentioned 'this is my student' but would always introduce me as her equal. She'd introduce me this way to her

colleagues and students alike, that I was ‘the supervisor’ or ‘co-supervisor’, not ‘her student’. She endorsed me by increasing my status with others.”

A number of authors have touched on some of these aspects of a supportive relationship, although none have explicitly mentioned the word “support.” For example, Straus et al. (2009) noted the importance of having “good chemistry” and the need for a respectful relationship with open communication. Williams et al. (2004) also spoke about being compatible on a personal level and mentioned the role of the mentor identifying potential strengths in the protégé. Identifying strengths may be a way to encourage the protégé and therefore may be an element of support. Another element of support was noted by Straus et al. (2013) who stated that the actions of a good mentor include advocacy. Although these authors are not exactly communicating the need for support in its totality, these ideas are all in alignment with the concept, and involve the mentor seeing the protégé in a positive light and supporting the protégé in some form.

This category is fascinating as it differs from the main focus of mentoring, which is to teach or impart knowledge to achieve a goal. Through this category, protégés are saying they want more than just good instruction. They benefit from someone who believes in them, and in turn, this belief boosts the outcomes of the relationship. For example, one protégé expressed the power of mentor support saying “I told the mentor one of my goals was to network and meet some of the consultants. My mentor thus told his staff he was mentoring me and to expect me to come around and ask for information. He made it so they were available to meet with me and more receptive to sharing their knowledge with me. Without his endorsement they never would have met with me.” In this example the mentor did not impart knowledge but provided support to the protégé which made a big difference.

Cho et al. (2011) read letters written about mentors who were being considered for a mentoring award. The letter writers wrote affectionately about the mentors, saying that they had admirable qualities and behaviours that made them outstanding mentors. These admirable qualities and behaviours included such things as, spending a lot of time with a protégé, providing a vision and specific support to the protégé, and role modelling high standards. Cho et al. (2011) also mentioned that outstanding mentors supported protégés in having a work-life balance by encouraging protégés to keep their work in perspective, balance it with the other aspects of their lives and to not over-work themselves. Having a good work-life balance helped protégés achieve the mentoring goals. In the study, it was clear that spending less time on the mentoring activities, in order to achieve a better work/life balance, was not what positively impacted the goals. It was the support and encouragement of another person that made the difference.

All of these authors touched on elements of support without acknowledging its importance across all aspects of the mentoring relationship. I consider this category to be a better articulated concept within mentoring, but it is not entirely a unique contribution to the literature. Even though other studies have not explicitly stated the benefits of the mentor supporting the protégé, in terms of the mentoring outcomes, these studies have expressed concepts similar enough for me to believe they were approaching the concept of "support". The exact mechanism by which mentor support assists the protégé in achieving his or her goals has never been examined and but this would make for an excellent study in future.

2. State explicit expectations. Protégés in the current study found it helpful when mentors stated explicit expectations for the mentoring process and activities, for the mentoring relationship, and for the roles of both parties. Interestingly, this is the one category mentioned by both protégés and mentors. To be purposeful in learning and the growth of knowledge, there are

benefits to having a focus or goal in the relationship. In conjunction with each goal, it is helpful for both mentor and protégé to know how they will achieve the goal and the process involved in accomplishing it. For example, one protégé expressed how "On the first day, the mentor explained what I was to do and why, and what he was going to be doing and why. He specifically described the purpose of what we are there in the job to do and how we were going to work together in our mentorship."

Other authors have also noted the importance of the mentor stating explicit expectations. Cho et al. (2011) stated that it was important for the mentor to be a career guide who had a specific vision for the protégé. A reader could interpret a vision as slightly different from a goal, but it still represents a target, and its realisation could equate to an outcome in a mentoring relationship. Williams et al. (2004) asserted that it is a quality of a good mentor when he or she assists the protégé in defining and reaching goals. Likewise, Rabatin et al. (2004) maintained that a mentor should set standards for the relationship, while Straus et al. (2009) expressed that the mentor needs to have clear expectations in the relationship. Straus et al. (2013) commented that the actions of an effective mentor include goal setting and having clear expectations for the relationship to which both parties would be held accountable. Other authors have reported the category of having clear expectations for the goals, the process, and the roles in the relationship in other literature (e.g., Kram, 1983; Sambunjak et al., 2010; Scott, 1912) and the current study also supports this.

3. Teach. This is the most apparent and important category that emerged in this study, and yet there is some confusion about it in the literature. Mentoring does not happen without the mentor teaching the protégé, however, teaching is only one component of the mentoring process. Mentoring always involves teaching but not all teaching involves mentoring and many studies

appear to conflate the two. For example, Parsloe (1995) defined mentoring as "a relationship that encourages learning" (p.13) for which teaching comes immediately to mind. Levinson et al. (1978) directly stated, "The term "mentor" is generally used in a much narrower sense, to mean teacher, advisor, or sponsor" (p.97).

Protégés in the current study said it was helpful to the mentoring outcomes for mentors to teach. Teaching came in a variety of forms, including giving instructions, providing advice, giving guidance or perspective, giving feedback on the protégé's performance, or explaining concepts to the protégé. Participants in the process of mentoring conduct it through the experience of learning. The mentor, through the act of mentorship, directs activities to help the protégé learn. A person might be highly knowledgeable, but may make a poor mentor because he or she cannot effectively teach. Similarly, a person with good teaching skills may make a poor mentor if he or she has nothing to teach, models ineffective behaviours, or cannot connect with the protégé emotionally.

Regardless of whether a study used a definition of mentoring or not, the majority of researchers echoed the importance of the mentor doing some sort of teaching. For example, Rabatin et al. (2014) identified that giving frequent feedback was an integral component of being a good mentor, while Straus et al. (2013) reported that advising the protégé, and using prompts to clarify if the protégé had any confusion, were both effective mentoring strategies. Giving feedback, advice, and prompting could all be considered as components of teaching. Cho et al. (2011) listed characteristics of a mentor that could also fit with teaching, such as offering unique perspectives, allowing the protégé to fail, teaching the protégé to think critically, and reading and giving feedback on the protégé's work. Sambunjak et al. (2010) included giving positive feedback, constructive criticism, and resources to the protégé in their list of the actions of a good

mentor. These aspects are all in alignment with teaching and consistent with the information shared by the participants in the current study. For example, one protégé in the current study related "When I had a deadline coming-up for status reports, my mentor…said, 'So, what's the status of the reports? Most of the clinicians here have a hard time getting reports done as well... Let me share with you some of the strategies they have used.'" Another said, "I had a topic area of interest and my mentor sat down with me and walked me through the process of developing a research question and taught me how to approach the topic."

The new definitions of "mentoring," "mentor," and "protégé" (see Appendix G: The Mentoring Construct - Definitions) developed for the current study, acknowledge the importance of the transmission of knowledge to the mentoring process, but also emphasize the necessity of including the other components of mentoring (i.e., imbalance of knowledge, presence of social cooperation, mutual psychosocial support and respect, commitment to the relationship, goal-related activities etc.). Hopefully this will remedy some of the confusion around the mentoring construct for future researchers, their participants and those that find themselves looking to be outstanding mentors and/or protégés.

4. Model effective behaviour. There is a considerable body of literature supporting the efficacy of modeling as a learning strategy. Bandura's (1977) social learning theory explained how people learn through behavioural observation. Just like the children in Bandura's study (1977), who imitated adults beating-up a Bobo doll, protégés watch and imitate their mentors. Protégés identified that it was helpful to the mentoring outcome when the mentor modelled, showed, or demonstrated an example for the purposes of imitation, or the comparison of skills, knowledge, or competence. For example, one protégé recounted that "one member didn't get along with my mentor and my mentor disagreed with some of the critiques the member made. I

watched my mentor model professionalism -- he wasn't defensive at all," while another mentioned "The mentor was discussing the case plan… for where the youth was going to go… The kid was increasingly becoming volatile… the mentor tried to go down different avenues to get the information across but it got to a point where it was no longer a dialogue. The mentor… decided to end the conversation and resume it at another time. He was showing me an example of how to deal with this kid."

It is important to note that in this category the protégé watches the mentor model successful behaviours specific to the mentoring goals. Though modelling effective behaviours unrelated to the goals might help establish the mentor as competent, it is specifically helpful to have the mentor teach the protégé through modelling which directly relates to the protégé's learning goals. Sambunjak et al. (2010) talked about the importance of being a role model to the protégé, however, Cho et al.'s (2011) study of outstanding mentors is particularly interesting because the authors took the concept of modelling to another level. Cho et al. (2011) explained that it was helpful for a mentor to model effective behaviours for protégés, but it was also helpful to model effective mentoring. The authors reported that establishing policies around being an effective role model in the organization is helpful in terms of the overall work environment.

Once again, mentoring is not just about teaching well, but also about demonstrating, through modelling, that the mentor is competent. A mentor, who allows the protégé to observe his or her behaviours, as they relate to the mentoring goals, is offering the protégé another very important way to learn. The importance of the "model effective behaviour" category from this study is supported by other studies in the literature and confirms the value of modelling to the mentoring relationship outcome.

5. Connect emotionally. The protégés in the current study related that the development or presence of an emotional connection benefited the outcomes of the relationships. This is different from "bonding" in that bonding is a process of attachment, which includes connecting emotionally, and which in turn results in a close interpersonal relationship. However, one can connect emotionally without having a close interpersonal relationship. Protégés spoke about connecting emotionally, not bonding, in that they found it helpful when the mentors genuinely asked how the protégés were feeling. When mentors spoke about understanding those feelings, and/or expressed their own feelings this served to deepen the emotional connection. "She knew I was emotionally overwhelmed and said to me, 'What do you need to do to take care of yourself?" and "It is affecting me emotionally… I wanted to check-in, now that I've told you this, what's on your mind?" are examples of the type of conversations that helped to establish or reinforce an emotional connection.

Straus et al. (2013) listed the effective actions of mentors, and included among them the act of connecting emotionally. The authors reported that it was helpful of a mentor to offer emotional support through honestly sharing his or her own feelings, while encouraging protégés to do the same. This means that the literature supports the "connect emotionally" category in the current study. It would make a fascinating future study to delve further into how emotional connectivity helps achieve the mentoring goals, and what protégés and mentors can do to best establish and maintain this important connectivity.

6. Work together (UC). When a mentor wants to work alongside the protégé and share in the work with him or her, the mentor is demonstrating solidarity with the protégé. Showing solidarity implies that the mentor values the protégé as a person and also values his or her work. This goes above the mentor simply teaching or modelling. It is a statement about wanting to

produce an outcome *with* the protégé. Protégés said that it helped them to achieve the mentoring goals when mentors provided the protégés with opportunities to work with the mentors (i.e., both working together).

When protégés were speaking about the incidents in this category, they communicated a sense that they were important enough to the mentors that the mentors wanted to work with them. Protégés reflected on incidents such as "My mentor stayed in the classroom with me while I was teaching… he'd manage the classroom behaviours so I could just focus on teaching, so I could get better at it," and "My mentor … said, 'There's an opportunity to co-facilitate a counselling group. Let's work out which parts each of us will do.'" When working alongside the mentor, the opportunity for feedback and direction from the mentor *in vivo* was particularly helpful to achieving the mentoring goals. Working together also has its roots in the origins of the mentoring construct as derived from the early apprenticeship system.

To my knowledge no other study addressed the importance of this category of helpful mentor behaviours. Studies such as Cho et al. (2011) mentioned the mentor giving instructions ahead of time and then reviewing the protégé's work and providing feedback, but did not address working directly with the protégé. Sambunjak et al. (2010) similarly acknowledged the importance of the mentor helping the protégé to understand how to analyze data and prepare for presentations, but there was no mention of the mentor doing these activities alongside the protégé. Since no other studies have referred to this category, I believe it to be a unique contribution to the body of literature on mentoring.

Protégé Behaviours That Hinder Mentoring Relationship Outcomes

Research on helpful protégé behaviours is scant, but investigators have written even less on what protégé behaviours hinder mentoring outcomes. Straus et al. (2013) listed a number of

characteristics of failed mentoring relationships including: poor communication, lack of commitment, personality differences, perceived or real competition, and conflicts of interest. Certainly protégé behaviours contributed to Straus et al.'s (2013) list, but surprisingly the mentors in the current study did not cite any of these characteristics as protégé behaviours that negatively affect the mentoring relationship. Instead the current study offers its own unique list of specific, hindering protégé behaviours, which would be: better if acknowledged, best avoided, and ideally investigated in-depth in future studies.

1. Unclear goals (UC). Not having a goal for mentoring means there is no direction to sculpt the behaviours and no topic about which the mentor can focus instruction or guidance. For this reason, mentors stated that it hindered the mentoring relationship outcome when a protégé did not clearly state his or her mentoring goals, his or her goals for the mentoring relationship, or his or her expectations for the roles of both mentor and protégé.

Though it may seem obvious that not having a goal would hinder the ability to reach that goal, a number of participants mentioned this type of unfocused, directionless behaviour. For example, one mentor commented, "The protégé articulated goals, but they didn't seem personal and important to her. Her goals were general, unspecific…vague." This type of comment also speaks to the quality of the goal-setting in terms of it needing to be specific and clear. Since no other research study has noted this category, this unique finding adds to the body of literature about mentoring. More importantly it opens the door for improving mentoring relationship outcomes, by redistributing the responsibilities of the mentoring success or failure onto the shoulders of both participants in the relationship.

2. Engage in dishonest behaviours. If a protégé acts in a dishonest manner, trust cannot be established, and/or maintained, in the relationship. If a mentor cannot depend upon the

protégé to act in a way that demonstrates that he or she is worthy of the mentor's trust, then the mentor will not share the personal information necessary for bonding, will not share private insights, and will not offer insider knowledge regarding the mentoring goals. The mentor will be more guarded and will not want to invest time or energy in either the protégé or the relationship.

Dishonesty can manifest itself in many forms, such as when a protégé misrepresents his or her background or qualifications, appears to have an ulterior motive, or asks the mentor to be deceitful on the protégé's behalf. For example, one mentor in the current study commented "She asked me to give a reference for a skill-set she did not have," while another complained that "My new protégé would send me his work and would ask me to correct and proof it. He wasn't applying what I was teaching him but was sneaky and deceitful in trying to get me to do his work for him." Where protégés call upon mentors to act unethically and perhaps immorally, the tension involved in such a request puts the relationship in jeopardy. In the current study, the participants terminated relationships over such a request.

Some authors have indirectly touched on the subject area of dishonesty. Scandura (1998) talked about how dysfunction can emerge when a mentor or protégé manipulates information to obtain compliance from the other person in the mentoring relationship. Tepper (1995) found that some protégés regulated their conversations with mentors by waiting until mentors were in a good mood to speak with them, which one could consider to be somewhat manipulative or disingenuous. Other protégés censored their conversations to directly manipulate a positive outcome (Tepper, 1995).

Engaging in dishonest behaviours, or asking the mentor to engage in dishonest behaviours, is damaging to the relationship and hinders the achievement of the mentoring goals. Other authors have touched on aspects of dishonesty such as manipulation and ingratiation,

which do fit within the category. This category adds to what researchers have already reported in the literature by specifying that it is unhelpful when the protégé engages in dishonest behaviours. However, as other studies mention similar concepts, this category is not unique although it does clarify the damaging effects of protégé dishonesty.

3. Use abusive language (UC). Only one mentor stated that the use of abusive language by a protégé hinders the mentoring goals. I hypothesize that only one mentor mentioned this as a theme because this behaviour is so damaging to the relationship that most protégés would not engage in it. Obviously, calling the mentor swear-words, or being verbally offensive, is highly injurious to the relationship and therefore to the mentoring outcome. The protégé need not direct the abusive language at the mentor for it to be harmful. The mentor in the current study noted that the protégé had "…lost his temper with me and behaved inappropriately. He yelled, screamed and swore at me, used disrespectful language and said to me, "I think you're being fucking unreasonable. I think this is b.s. and you're being a bitch." When I discussed with the mentor the impact of the protégé using abusive language, the mentor said it was this behaviour that resulted in the relationship ending. No studies in the mentoring literature have previously mentioned this category and therefore I believe it is a unique contribution.

4. Prioritize non-mentoring activities (UC). Generally speaking, mentoring is a process where a mentor provides direction and the protégé engages in activities, based on this direction, in order to reach a specific goal (see Appendix G – The Mentoring Construct – Definitions). To fully learn from the process, the protégé must both do these activities, and put in enough time doing the activities. "Enough time" is determined by the learning that must take place under the guidance of the mentor, and what activities have been established that the protégé needs to perform in order to learn.

In the current research study, mentors stated it hindering to the mentoring outcomes when protégés prioritized non-mentoring activities over mentoring activities. This is due to the fact that protégés, as a result, did not have sufficient time to dedicate to the mentoring activities; their learning suffered, which was detrimental to obtaining the mentoring goals. One mentor commented that the protégé "cancelled 3 or 4 times in a row. She was busy in her personal life. She just kept cancelling meetings so I couldn't teach her." Clearly, prioritizing non-mentoring activities can undermine the mentoring relationship as well. Straus et al. (2013) noted characteristics of a failed mentoring relationship included a lack of commitment, which is similar but different from prioritizing non-mentoring activities. For illustration, a protégé could be committed to the relationship and involved in activities as much as possible, and yet not prioritize mentoring activities over non-mentoring activities, such as parenting. This does not mean the person is not committed. The emphasis for this category is on engaging in non-mentoring activities regardless of commitment level. This category is a unique finding within the literature and further study regarding managing expectations, managing time, and techniques for prioritizing activities within a mentoring relationship would be of benefit.

5. Ignore advice (UC). A crucial component of the mentoring process occurs when the protégé is present for, listens to, and acts on, the mentor's guidance. Listening to advice is only beneficial if the protégé then follows through and implements this advice. A mentor can provide the best learning opportunity or advice possible, but if the protégé does not act on the advice, then this interferes with the learning.

In the current study, mentors said it was hindering to the mentoring outcomes when the protégé did his or her own things, despite the mentor directing, guiding, advising, or outright telling the protégé what to do. This was a common theme for which there were 13 separate

quotes such as ,“We had a dress-code of not wearing jeans, which I told him, and the protégé would always show-up in jeans,” and “I said clearly to the protégé, ‘This is the task you need to do by tomorrow.’ The protégé didn’t do it.” There was an undertone of frustration running through the quotes which seemed to indicate that the mentoring relationship could suffer if the protégés chose to ignore the mentors’ advice.

Williams et al. (2004) considered that it was beneficial for a protégé to selectively accept advice from a mentor, though the authors did not expand on this concept or provide more details. They also did not acknowledge that it was hindering to the mentoring outcomes when the protégé did not accept this advice. Finally, Williams et al. (2004) did not specify the circumstances in which the protégés would find it helpful to accept the mentors’ advice, as opposed to the occasions when the protégés would find it more helpful not to do so. In the research on mentoring, no authors have specifically mentioned this category, making “ignore advice” a unique contribution.

Clearly, the study of what behaviours hinder a mentoring relationship outcome is still in its infancy but there is as much that mentors and protégés can learn from what not to do, as there is from an examination of what to do. While protégés brought a broad range of hindering behaviours to the mentoring relationship, interestingly mentors’ hindering behaviours were considerably different from protégé hindering behaviours.

Mentor Behaviours That Hinder Mentoring Relationship Outcomes

Mentors, and their qualities and characteristics, have been studied much more so than protégés, (e.g., Cho et al, 2011; Donovan, 1990; Hall et al., 2008; Olian et al., 1993, Scandura et al., 1998) but the focus has largely been on what mentors do that helps, rather than hinders, a mentoring relationship outcome. Eby et al. (2002, 2004) studied protégés’ negative mentoring

experiences, concluding that two categories could account for the majority of experiences: 1. manipulative/distancing behaviours, and 2. poor didactic fit. Problems with Eby et al.'s (2002, 2004) definition of mentoring make it difficult to compare these studies with the current study. However, the current research has identified unique categories that broaden our understanding of the impact of hindering mentor behaviours.

1. Criticize (UC). Protégés are in the process of learning. This means, they do not know everything about the mentoring topic and are therefore going to make mistakes. Criticizing them for their actions, when both mentor and protégé clearly understand that the protégé is there to learn and improve, is counterproductive.

Protégés found it hindering to the mentoring goals when the mentor directly or indirectly criticized either the protégé or the protégé's work. A mentor's role is to teach and guide the protégé in order to increase his or her knowledge regarding the mentoring topic. Criticism, particularly when not followed by further instruction, or guidance about what to do differently, is really an indication that the mentor is not doing his or her job. This results in the protégé not learning effectively. After the mentor has criticized the protégé, the protégé may not want to approach the mentor with questions for fear of the mentor once again offering criticisms. This could cause long-term damage to the protégé's trust in the relationship and his or her feelings around self-expression and openness.

The criticism may be well intentioned, direct or indirect, but overall appears to be damaging. One protégé related that "The mentor verbally compared me with other protégés and highlighted their strengths and my weaknesses," while another expressed that the mentor had said, "Oh you don't know anything. That won't work." Criticism is an important category with seven quotes mentioning this as a mentor behaviour that hinders the outcomes of mentoring

relationships. No other author has specifically mentioned criticism in the mentoring literature, and, while it is arguable that there may be a place for constructive criticism, future research may better determine the extent of any benefits verses its damaging effects.

2. Inadequate instruction (UC). In the current study, protégés found that it hindered the mentoring relationship outcome when the mentor: (a) provided inadequate or outdated information, or instruction; (b) provided information or instruction too late; (c) gave bad advice; and/or (d) inadequately prepared the protégé, or inappropriately left the protégé alone to accomplish a task he or she was not able to successfully complete without more assistance. One protégé spoke to this category by saying that the mentor "gave me the wrong cut-off scores. I… didn't realize that she gave me the wrong information until the end of my thesis."

Koopman et al. (2005) talked about how, in unsatisfactory relationships, the protégé is vulnerable to the mentor. Koopmen et al. (2005) noted that a mentor imparts what he or she knows primarily through instruction and modelling. If the instruction is incorrect or inadequate, the protégé may not be aware of this, and may incorporate false or insufficient information in the learning process, with subsequent negative results. A protégé selects a mentor based, in part, on the fact that the protégé sees the mentor as having more discipline-specific knowledge than the protégé. But in some ways, the protégé is not a good judge of whom to choose as a mentor, because the protégé cannot necessarily accurately judge the mentor's level of knowledge and expertise. Only someone with more experience can reliably rank someone else, which means that the protégé should appeal to experienced others to assist in the critical mentor-selection process.

The protégé cannot know if the mentor's information is correct until the protégé fails. In the current study, one way in which the protégé is vulnerable is through not knowing whether the

mentor's instructions are trustworthy or adequate. This category is a unique contribution to the literature, that no other author has mentioned.

3. Model ineffective behaviour. Bandura's (1977) social learning theory states that people learn from watching others. In the current study, protégés found that it was hindering to the mentoring goals when mentors: (a) acted immorally; (b) engaged in unethical behaviour; (c) violated rules of conduct; (d) were dishonest or unreliable; (e) violated standards of professionalism; and/or (f) refused to apologize for their actions and words when an apology was warranted. Protégés reported examples such as "My mentor was disorganized… I went into the classroom and the classroom was hell -- there was garbage and stuff everywhere," and "My mentor modelled to me to lie and cover-up when a mistake was made, and to not talk about errors openly."

Scandura et al. (1998) discussed actions which contribute to dysfunctional mentoring such as when the mentor acts like a bully, acts out of a desire for revenge, or betrays the protégé, all of which fit within the current study's category of modelling ineffective behaviour. If the protégé enacts ineffective behaviours learned from the mentor, he or she cannot achieve the mentoring goals. If the protégé chooses not to model certain behaviours, perhaps because he or she finds the mentor's behaviour unpleasant or even repulsive, this may turn the protégé away from the mentoring relationship, and once again, he or she will not reach the mentoring goals. While not a unique finding, as the literature does support this category, it contributes to the importance of modelling to the potential success or failure of the mentoring relationship.

4. Misinterpret the protégé's needs (UC). The first step in understanding someone's needs is to listen and pay attention to what he or she is conveying. Sambunjak et al. (2010) stated that good mentors actively listen to the protégé. The authors went on to describe that a good

mentor also understands the protégé's needs. Sambunjak et al.'s study (2010) did not actually establish that the traits of a good mentor correlate with having a good outcome in the mentoring relationship. Protégés in the current study reported that it was hindering to the mentoring relationship when the mentor misinterpreted, or misunderstood, the protégé's wants or needs. Protégés' quotes illustrating this issue included comments such as "This wasn't what we had agreed to; she wasn't listening to what I needed," and "It's like she didn't understand what I wanted." Though Sambunjak et al.'s (2010) article supports the current study's category "Misinterpret the protégé's needs," the two studies are not saying the exact same thing. Stating that good mentors listen to their protégés and understand their needs is not the same as saying that when mentors misinterpret or misunderstand protégés needs, possibly because they are not listening, but possibly due to a host of other factors, that this will hinder the mentoring relationship outcome. No other authors have acknowledged that the act of the mentor misinterpreting the protégé's needs hinders the relationship outcome, which means that this is a unique contribution to the field.

5. Block work-accomplishments (UC). On a basic level, the role of a protégé is to learn information from the mentor and produce behaviours that show integration of this new information. If a mentor teaches the protégé, and the protégé integrates the lessons, but the mentor then blocks the protégé from then being able to reproduce the new skills, then it is difficult for the protégé to reach the mentoring goals.

In the current study, protégés commented that there were a variety of ways that a mentor could block work-accomplishments, such as when a mentor interrupted the protégé's work, took work away from the protégé, or took-up time so the protégé could not accomplish his or her work. Only a few participants cited incidents in relation to this behaviour. However, this unique

category was included as protégés reported that this mentor behaviour was so damaging that it was not possible for the protégés to progress toward the mentoring goals.

For example, as one protégé expressed, “She just took over during my speech even though I was doing well. This made me lose my train of thought and my focus because I was just reacting to her interrupting me and taking over.” Other protégés reported behaviours that seemed to be consistent with the mentor acting as though he or she was in competition with the protégé such as, “She was just really competitive about wanting to have this area of specialization all to herself. She took the couple away from me for no good reason, so I couldn't do the work.”

Scandura et al. (1998) determined that a dysfunctional relationship was one that was not working for one, or both, of the participants and referenced Duck’s (1994) research, which defined dysfunction as feeling: begrudging, vengeful, with hostile conflictive tensions. What causes or prevents this dysfunction, is ultimately the behaviours of the participants involved. This current study has categorized these behaviours into what helps and or hinders the final mentoring relationship outcome (see Appendix H: Behaviours that Help or Hinder a Mentoring Relationship Outcome). What was co-constructed is a spectrum of human behaviours that participants report help move the relationship toward a mentoring goal or away from it. Since a mentor or protégé can only change what he or she acknowledges, it is hoped that the behavioural categories co-constructed in this study will serve as a signpost guiding both mentors and protégés to acknowledge what they are doing right, what isn’t working, and what can be changed for the better.

Strengths and Limitations of the Study

One of main strengths of the current study is the creation of clear operational definitions for “mentor,” “protégé,” and “mentoring” (see Appendix G: The Mentoring Construct –

Definitions). I provided all participants, independent judges, and reviewers with these definitions so that everyone involved could operate and cooperate with these definitions in mind. Much of the research conducted on mentoring makes no mention of a definition of the constructs under investigation, or the authors use Kram's (1980, 1983, 1985) "definition," which was demonstrably flawed and not operationalized. The value of having clear operational definitions is that they offer a construct that can now be tested and, thereby, better understood. Outside of the bounds of this study, I hope that the definitions will be of use to other researchers in future, so that we can all "find ourselves on the same page, even as we turn it."

Another strength of this study is the use of a consistent epistemology that fits with the CIT and ECIT, but that adapts it to a qualitative methodology and interpretive/constructivist worldview. As previously discussed, I examined, critiqued, and ultimately decided not to use components of the ECIT which were not consistent with the constructivist epistemology. As a result, the epistemology of the newly modified version of the CIT and ECIT, called the ACIT, is consistent throughout the current study. Additionally, a strength of this research is the use of Wilber's (1998) three "strands of all valid knowing." I examined how other credibility checks from Creswell (1994) and Butterfield et al. (2005) fit within Wilber's concepts. I addressed credibility and demonstrated how abiding by Wilber's (1998) three "strands of all valid knowing" met the criteria of the credibility checks for Creswell (1994) and Butterfield et al. (2005, 2009), as well as meeting additional credibility checks. This resulted in a sound and thorough application of credibility checks to the research.

The present study provides rich and detailed data on what helps and hinders the outcomes of a mentoring relationship. However, as with any research, there are limitations. This study is exploratory and descriptive, with a small sample of participants who reside in the Canadian

Pacific North West. Therefore, the study is limited in its applicability and researchers should take care not to generalize the findings to other specific populations, or broadly, to the general population. Although the ethnicity, ages, education, and career experiences varied considerably among participants, their experiences may or may not be representative of other mentors and protégés from different regions or from differing demographics. Future research would benefit from a larger, more diverse sample, in order to acknowledge the experiences of mentors and protégés from a greater variety of regions, cultures, socioeconomic backgrounds, and careers.

An additional potential limitation arises from the gender balance of the participants. All of the six mentors were women, as were 8 of the 12, protégés, leaving male representation at four protégé-participants. Researchers state participants' gender has an influence on this type of data (Young, Cady, & Foxon, 2006). Young et al. (2006) noted that "female mentors will perceive themselves as having less ability to influence a protégé's career than will male mentors" (p.158), and "women will not be perceived by potential protégés as equally powerful to men in similar positions" (p.158). On the other hand, Young et al. (2006) also reported that a protégé's behaviours influence the benefits of mentoring more than his or her gender. The authors also stated that male and female mentors hold similar expectations for their protégés' behaviour regardless of the protégés' gender. In order to explore these potential gender differences and similarities, future researchers may benefit from more balanced representation from male participants and perspectives.

Another limitation derives from the subjective nature of how the participants understood and complied with the participation criteria. Participants were self-described mentors and protégés who declared that they fit with the current study's new definitions of "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring," provided to all potential participants (see Appendix D: Letter of

Invitation to Participate and Appendix E: Participant Consent Form). Though participants had to read the selection criteria and explicitly state that they fit the definitions provided, they may not have fully understood the definitions and participated regardless. The process was subjective and anyone who did not fit the exact criteria could have participated as long as they said that they met the criteria, resulting in some potential "false positives" or people who felt they met the criteria but ultimately did not. Future researchers could conduct thorough pre-screening interviews to ensure that participants meet criteria. However, one must achieve a balance between the pragmatic and the ideal as such in-depth pre-screening may also add unacceptable barriers to participation in a study.

A further potential limitation arises from the nature of the self-report, dialogical methodology. The critical incidents quoted and categorized in this study were self-reported, not observed by a third party. Flanagan (1954) found recalled incidents and observed incidents to be comparable as long as full and precise details were given by participants. I asked participants to provide as much detail as they could remember about the incidents, so as to obtain precise details. After each participant shared an incident, I inquired as to whether or not the incident was critical in terms of helping or hindering the outcome of the mentoring relationship. I removed a few incidents from the process when a participant identified them as not critical, but the process was not infallible. Participants could have included incidents that did not occur, or could have embellished incidents for purely personal reasons, to impress, to make themselves look better, or to push their own agendas. To the best of my knowledge, I do not believe this happened, but it is still possible.

Participants could also have forgotten aspects of the incidents due to memory lapses. Also, as the researcher, my demographics and identity (i.e., gender, ethnicity, age etc.) and the

questions I asked, doubtless had an influence on the research. Finally, as I progressed through the interviews, my skills improved and I became more adept as an interviewer. This too may have influenced the participants' responses and ultimately the results of the research.

Implications for Counselling Psychology

Prior to this study, counsellors may have spoken to clients about their mentoring relationships, not knowing: (a) the definition of "mentoring," "mentor," or "protégé"; what specific behaviours constitute a helpful or hindering mentoring relationship; or what questions to ask about how to assess or improve the mentoring relationship. Using the new definitions (see Appendix G: The Mentoring Construct – Definitions) and the results of this study, counsellors can now speak to clients with a better understanding of the roles of mentor and protégé, the process of mentoring, as well as which specific behaviours may help or hinder the mentoring outcome. I have collated these behaviours, and suggestions on how to best conduct a mentoring relationship based on the results of the current study, into an appendix (see Appendix H: Behaviours that Help or Hinder a Mentoring Relationship Outcome) for ease of reference.

Counsellors can inquire about their clients' relationship dynamics, evaluate the actions of both parties in the mentoring relationship, encourage clients to participate in known helpful behaviours, and address the presence of hindering behaviours. Further, counsellors can invite the clients themselves to review the mentoring definitions, and the categories of helpful or hindering behaviours for both protégés and mentors. This will encourage the clients to look at the suitability of their mentoring relationships and can help them to better understand the respective roles in these relationships. Career counsellors also stand to benefit from these findings, given the focus on work and career success in that particular branch of the counselling profession and the proliferation and popularity of mentoring programs in work settings.

Counsellors can draw from psychological theory and professional training to talk to their clients about developing specific helpful behaviours such as how to bond, how to show appreciation, how to take initiative, or how to seek information, within the mentoring relationships. Counsellors can further instruct and encourage clients to demonstrate support, teach effectively, model appropriate behaviours, and emotionally connect with the other parties in their mentoring relationships.

These behaviours may not be intuitive to some clients and it might be helpful to learn the nuances of these behaviours in an environment such as a counsellor's office. Techniques such as role-play, problem solving, and visualization can all be practiced in this safe environment, as can methods to handle hindering behaviours that may arise in the relationship, such as what to do if someone asks you to do something unethical, or how to deal with abusive, or undermining behaviours.

A further implication for the professional practice of counselling psychology applies to student-counsellors. Supervisors typically train student-counsellors in an academic and clinical setting. Although these relationships are not identical to mentoring relationships, it may be helpful for students and supervisors to receive training in the definitions of the mentoring construct, along with helpful and hindering mentoring behaviours. Training in these behaviours may enhance the relationship outcomes and help students to become better clinical counsellors. There are many programs that involve supervision and mentorship models to teach junior workers how to be more skilled. Any of these programs would benefit from this training for supervisors and students alike. Once again, for ease of reference and in consideration of the potential use for training purposes, I refer interested professionals to Appendix H: Behaviours that Help or Hinder a Mentoring Relationship Outcome as well as the definitions for

"mentoring," "mentor," and "protégé" which can be found in Appendix G: The Mentoring Construct – Definitions.

Recommendations

Based on the current research, I would recommend that workplaces, community organizations, and community members encourage the formation of mentoring relationships, as defined herein. Informal or more "organically formed" relationships may allow for a better relational fit between mentor and protégé, which is important because bonding, supporting, and connecting emotionally appear to be integral to the reported success of mentoring relationships outcomes.

Workplaces and organizations may need to re-structure work to allow room and time for mentors and protégés to meet regularly and prioritize their time together. The mentor and protégé need this time together in order to set up goals, to teach, to learn from modelling and instruction, and to give and receive feedback about performance. These things take time and it would be best if workplaces allowed for this time. Places that have formal mentoring programs may benefit from emphasizing the relational fit between participants, as connecting emotionally, feeling supported, and bonding are as important as teaching.

Mentors and protégés would benefit from knowing the definitions of their respective roles and the process of mentoring, as well as from receiving instructions about what behaviours help and hinder the relationship, so they can consciously choose to act in a helpful way. If a relationship is a poor fit, protégés need to feel empowered to leave the relationship. Koopman et al. (2005) talked about how protégés are more vulnerable in the relationship as they have less power than the mentor. It might be difficult for a protégé to leave a relationship if it is a poor fit. Therefore, it would be helpful if mentoring-program supervisors gave protégés additional

resources, and empowered them to advocate for themselves if their mentoring relationships were not ideal.

Regarding how best to conduct a mentoring relationship, I recommend that mentors and protégés start with stating explicit expectations of what the goals are and how each person will contribute to both the relationship and the achievement of these goals. Next, both parties should establish a pattern of contact, how often they will meet, and what they are each responsible for between meetings. They should also establish how meetings will go (i.e., structure and length). The protégé should bring questions and points for discussion to the meeting. The mentor should respond to these questions by providing instruction, and demonstration, and by modelling the desired skills. Once the protégé is able to attempt the skills, the mentor can provide feedback.

Both the mentor and protégé should work together and experience sharing the work; while at the same time, the mentor can provide the protégé with direct feedback in the moment. The protégé should demonstrate what he or she is learning so the mentor can not only provide feedback, but also see growth (i.e., that learning is taking place). The protégé should prioritize time in the relationship, should also make time for the activities suggested by the mentor, and should make sure to set aside an adequate amount of time to accomplish the activities effectively.

The mentor should look for ways to demonstrate support for the protégé, through compliments, encouragement, and generally offering emotional support, as well as by connecting the protégé with resources and people that will help him or her. The mentor should model effective work behaviour to the protégé. Both the protégé and mentor should take time to get to know each other, paying particular attention to bonding and connecting emotionally. The protégé should always show appreciation and gratitude (i.e., by thanking the mentor) for what the mentor is doing, the time and effort he or she has put into the relationship, and the ways in which the

mentor has assisted the protégé. Future studies will need to empirically establish a causal relationship between the behaviours described herein and mentoring outcomes. However, until that time, mentors and protégé's alike would do well to heed the findings of this study.

Implications for Future Research

Future research on mentoring, whatever the topic is, should include definitions of "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring" (see Appendix G: The Mentoring Construct – Definitions). Without the use of explicitly stated constructs, it is hard to know what is truly under investigation. Therefore, future studies might best begin by repeating versions of previous studies that did not originally include adequately defined constructs.

In addition, there are a number of surprising categories of behaviours from the current study that would be an excellent focus for further research. These categories of behaviour all pertain to the nature of the mentoring relationship itself, and speak to the importance of the personal connection between mentor and protégé. Participants reported that the behavioural categories that helped a mentoring relationship outcome were: (a) demonstrate support; (b) bond; and (c) connect emotionally.

It is interesting to note that these categories appear to enhance the outcomes of the relationships in a similar fashion to that of the working alliance in counselling, wherein demonstrated support and emotional connection assist with the outcomes. While I expected that teaching and modelling effective behaviour, as well as having clear goals and seeking information, would help the protégé to learn and thereby achieve his or her goals, I found that the mechanism by which bonding, connecting emotionally, and demonstrating support helps to obtain the goals is less clear.

Researchers could undertake future research directed at looking into a comparison of mentoring versus non-mentoring relationships. For example, it would be of interest to know whether outcomes might be easier to obtain, or if more goals might be reached, or if better results might be achieved, in mentoring relationships, versus non-mentoring situations wherein a person is given access to resources without personal guidance. In line with this, future research could investigate whether or not there is a better relationship fit achieved in informal mentoring programs (i.e., where the protégé chooses his or her own mentor) verses formal mentoring programs (i.e., wherein the protégé is assigned a mentor). Studies could also be conducted into whether a mentoring relationship, in which the parties perceive there to be an enhanced connection and personal compatibility, leads to better mentoring result, or whether this personal connection ever gets in the way of learning.

Finally, I think that it would be valuable to better understand the unique experiences of people from different genders, ethnicities, cultural backgrounds, and socio-economic strata, as they may provide different categories of helping or hindering behaviours and new information relevant to mentoring. The personality traits of the participants such as optimism, tenacity, ambition, communication skills, and how well someone gets along with others, may also impact mentoring relationship outcomes and would be valuable to examine in future studies. An empirical study that established causation between these behaviours and the outcomes of mentoring would also be helpful.

Conclusion

One of my incredible mentors once said to me “Learning begins where learning left off.” She always had a tremendous “treasure trove” of wisdom to share, but I believe that this phrase has a lot of application to the topic of mentoring. To me, the phrase means we can only continue

to learn and build knowledge about a topic once we have accurately learned previous material and created the foundation for growth. To get further growth, we have to go back to where we find gaps in our knowledge and then we can work to fill them in. From this basis, we can move forward in learning and build more complex and detailed understandings. With regard to mentoring and going to the place where learning left off, this meant going back to the beginning for me, and looking at the grammatical use of the words "mentor," "protégé," and "mentoring," and then venturing into the historical use and understanding of the concepts. From there I began to build the definitions of the terms, which led me to consider the importance of construct validity, Wilber's (1998) "eyes," and "perspectives" and knowing exactly what we are talking about when crafting valid research.

I felt privileged to bear witness to the experiences of what helped or hindered mentoring relationship outcomes that the participants recounted so openly, giving of their time and looking back on their own personal lives in the hope of adding to the personal lives of others. The result of my own experience with this study, from looking back to moving forward, trying to fill in gaps in our knowledge, is that, definitions in hand, I now know exactly where we are in the field of mentoring, and I am looking forward to seeing what future research will begin where today's learning has left off.

References

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. (1970). Attachment, exploration, and separation: Illustrated by the behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. *Child development*, 49-67.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. N. (2015). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*: Psychology Press.

Akinbobola, O. I. (2011). For the Protege: Growing Up Means Stepping Out. *IFE Psychology*, 112.

Allen, J., & Johnston, K. (1997). Mentoring. *Context, 4*(7), 15.

Allen, T., & Eby, L. (2003). Relationship effectiveness for mentors: Factors associated with learning and quality. *Journal of Management, 4*, 261-272.

Allen, T., Eby, L., Poteet, M., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career Benefits Associated With Mentoring for Proteges: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(1), 127. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.127

Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2000). Taking the Linguistic Turn in Organizational Research: Challenges, Responses, Consequences. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 36*(2), 136-158. doi:10.1177/0021886300362002

Anderson, E. M., & Shannon, A. L. (1995). Towards a conceptualization of mentoring. In T. Kerry & A. Mayes (Eds.), *Issues in Mentoring* (pp. 25-34). London, UK: Routledge.

Anderson, L. (2011). A learning resource for developing effective mentorship in practice. *Nursing Standard, 25*(51), 48.

Armitage, P., & Burnard, P. (1991). Mentors or preceptors? Narrowing the theory practice gap. *Nurse Education Today, 11*(3), 225. doi:10.1016/0260-6917(91)90064-h

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Bedi, R.P., & Alexander, D.A. (2009). Using multivariate concept-mapping for examining client understandings of counselling. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, 43, 76-91.

Bourke, B. (2014). Positionality: Reflecting on the research process. *The Qualitative Report, 19*(33), 1-9.

Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52*(4), 664-678. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.1982.tb01456.x

Bozeman, B., & Feeney, M. K. (2007). Toward a Useful Theory of Mentoring A Conceptual Analysis and Critique. *Administration & Society*, *39*(6), 719. doi:10.1177/0095399707304119

Bozionelos, N. (2004). Mentoring provided: Relation to mentor's career success, personality, and mentoring received. *Journal of vocational behavior, 64*(1), 24. doi:10.1016/s0001-8791(03)00033-2

Britten, L. (2014). *The Enhanced Critical Incident Technique: Using Semi-Structured Interviews to Work with Vulnerable and Marginalized Populations*. In Retrieved from http://methods.sagepub.com/case/critical-incident-semi-structured-interviews-vulnerable-marginalized doi:10.4135/978144627305013508499

Bryant, F. B. (2000). Assessing the validity of measurement. In L. G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), (pp. 99). Washington, DC US: American Psychological Association.

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1997). Benefits of Mentoring Relationships among Managerial and Professional Women: A Cautionary Tale. *Journal of vocational behavior, 51*(1), 43. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1997.1595

Butterfield, L. D., Borgen, W. A., Amundson, N. E., & Maglio, A. T. (2005). Fifty years of the critical incident technique: 1954-2004 and beyond. *Qualitative Research, 5*(4), 475. doi:10.1177/1468794105056924

Butterfield, L. D., Borgen, W. A., Maglio, A. T., & Amundson, N. E. (2009). Using the Enhanced Critical incident Technique in Counselling Psychology Research. *Canadian Journal of Counselling and Psychotherapy, 43*(4), 265-282.

Buydens, S. L. (2009). *The lived experience of women veterans of the Canadian Forces.* University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/1828/1670 UVicDSpace database.

Campbell, D. T. (1960). Recommendations for APA test standards regarding construct, trait, or discriminant validity. *American Psychologist, 15*(8), 546. doi:10.1037/h0048255

Carr, R. (March 8, 2016). A Guide to the Mentor Program Listings. Retrieved from www.mentors.ca

Chao, G. T. (1997). Mentoring Phases and Outcomes. *Journal of vocational behavior, 51*(1), 15. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1997.1591

Chao, G. T. (1998). Invited reaction: Challenging research in mentoring. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9*(4), 333-338.

Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992a). Formal and Informal Mentorships: a Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Nonmentored Counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(3), 619.

Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992b). Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and Contrast with Nonmentored Counterparts. *Personal Psychology, 45*, 619-636.

Chell, E. (1998). Critical Incident Technique. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods and Analysis in Organizational Research: A Pratical Guide* (pp. 51-72). London: Sage.

Cho, C. S., Ramanan, R. A., & Feldman, M. D. (2011). Defining the Ideal Qualities of Mentorship: A Qualitative Analysis of the Characteristics of Outstanding Mentors. *The American Journal of Medicine, 124*(5), 453-458. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2010.12.007

Chou, F., Kwee, J., Buchana, M., & Lees, R. (2016). Participatory Critical Incident Technique: A Participatory Action Research Approach for Counselling Psychology/Technique d'incident critique participative : une approche de recherche-action participative pour la psychologie du counseling. *Canadian journal of counselling and psychotherapy, 50*(1), 51.

Coaching (2016). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coaching

Colley, H. (2000). A Rough Guide to the History of Mentoring from a Marxist Feminist Perspective. Retrieved from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001500

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (3 ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 124-130.

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological bulletin, 52*(4), 281. doi:10.1037/h0040957

deTormes, M., Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Hoffman, B. J., Baranik, L. E., Sauer, J. B., . . . Evans, S. C. (2012). An Interdisciplinary Meta-Analysis of the Potential Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Protégé Perceptions of Mentoring. *Psychological bulletin*. doi:10.1037/a0029279

Donovan, J. (1990). The concept and role of the mentor. *Nurse Education Today, 10*(2), 294-298.

Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(5), 539-546. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.539

Duck, S. (1994). Strategems, spoils, and a serpent's tooth: On the delights and dilemmas of personal relationships, in Cupach, W.R. and Spitzberg, B.H. (Eds), *The Dark Side of Interpersonal Communication*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 3-24.

D'Abate, C. P., Eddy, E. R., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (2003). What's in a Name? A Literature-Based Approach to Understanding Mentoring, Coaching, and Other Constructs That Describe Developmental Interactions. *Human Resource Development Review, 2*(4), 360-384. doi:10.1177/1534484303255033

Eby, L., Butts, M., Lockwood, A., & Simon, S. A. (2004). Proteges' Negative Mentoring Experiences. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(2), 411.

Eby, L. T. (1997). Alternative forms of mentoring in changing organizational environments: A conceptual extension of the mentoring literature. *Journal of vocational behavior, 51*(1), 125. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1997.1594

Eby, L. T., & Allen, T. D. (2002). Further Investigation of Protégés' Negative Mentoring Experiences. *Group & Organization Management, 27*(4), 456.

Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*(2), 254-267. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.005

Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B., & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal Mentoring Programs in Education and Other Professions: A Review of the Literature. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(4), 518-540. doi:10.1177/0013161x04267118

Fagenson, E. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of proteges versus non-proteges. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*, 309-320.

Feeney, M. K., & Bozeman, B. (2008). Mentoring and network ties. *Human Relations, 61*(12), 1651.

Fenelon, F. D. (1699). *Fénelon: Telemachus* (P. Riley, Trans. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought ed.). Cambridge, UK and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological bulletin, 51*(4), 327.

Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. R. (2005). *Applying educational research: a practical guide* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Goh, S. (1991). Sex Differences in Perceptions of Interpersonal Work Style, Career Emphasis, Supervisor Mentoring Behavior, and Job Satisfaction. *Sex Roles, 24*(11), 701-710.

Guba, E. G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialogue. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialogue,* (pp. 17-30). Newsbury Park, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In Y. S. Lincoln (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed.),* (pp. 191). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Haggerty, B. (1986). A second look at mentors. *Nursing Outlook, 34*(1), 16-24.

Hall, K. M., Draper, R. J., Smith, L. K., & Bullough, R. V. (2008). More than a place to teach: Exploring the perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of mentor teachers. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16*(3), 328. doi:10.1080/13611260802231708

Haverkamp, B. E., & Young, R. A. (2007). Paradigms, Purpose, and the Role of the Literature: Formulating a Rationale for Qualitative Investigations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*(2), 265-294. doi:10.1177/0011000006292597

Hezlett, S. (2005). Proteges' learning in mentoring relationships: A review of the literature and an exploratory case study. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 4*, 505-526.

History of Apprenticeship, (2016). Washington State Department of Labor & Industries. Retrieved from http://www.lni.wa.gov/TradesLicensing/Apprenticeship/About/History/

Hollingsworth, M. A., & Fassinger, R. E. (2002). The role of faculty mentors in the research training of counseling psychology doctoral students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*(3), 324-330. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.49.3.324

Holloway, E. L., & Schwartz, H. L. (2014). *Critical Incident Technique: Exploring Meaningful Interactions between Students and Professors*. In H. L. Schwartz (Ed.) Retrieved from

http://methods.sagepub.com/case/critical-incident-technique-interactions-between-students-professors doi:10.4135/97814462730501453392 9

Hopkins, K. C., & Stanley, J. C. (1981). *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation* (6th ed.). Toronto, ON: Prentice-Hall.

Houts, A. C., & Baldwin, S. (2004). Constructs, operational definition, and operational analysis. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 11*(1), 45-46. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appsy.2004.02.007

Hoyt, W. T., Warbasse, R. E., & Chu, E. Y. (2006). Construct Validation in Counseling Psychology Research. *Counseling Psychologist, 34*(6), 769.

Karcher, M. J., Kuperminc, G. P., Portwood, S. G., Sipe, C. L., & Taylor, A. S. (2006). Mentoring programs: A framework to inform program development, research, and evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *34*(6), 709-725. doi:10.1002/jcop.20125

Kirchmeyer, C. (2005). The effects of mentoring on academic careers over time: Testing performance and political perspectives. *Human Relations, 5*, 637-660.

Koopman, R. J., & Thiedke, C. C. (2005). Views of family medicine department Chairs about mentoring junior faculty. *Medical Teacher, 27*(8), 734-737. doi:10.1080/01421590500271209

Kram, K. E. (1980). *Mentoring processes at work: Developmental relationships in managerial careers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yale University, New Haven, CT.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the Mentor Relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 608. doi:10.2307/255910

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, Illinois.: Scott Foresman.

Kuhn, Thomas N. (1972) (1970). Logic of Discovery or Psychology of Research. In Lakatos, I., and Musgrave, A., (Eds). *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (second ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 6.

Lane, R. E. (2000). *The loss of happiness in market democracies*. New Haven, CT US: Yale University Press.

Lankau, M. J., & Scandura, T. A. (2002). An Investigation of Personal Learning in Mentoring Relationships: Content, Antecedents, and Consequences. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(4), 779. doi:10.2307/3069311

Leslie, K., Lingard, L., & Whyte, S. (2005). Junior faculty experiences with informal mentoring. *Medical Teacher, 27*(8), 693-698. doi:10.1080/01421590500271217

Levene, A. (2010). Parish apprenticeship and the old poor law in London. *Economic History Review, 63*(4), 915. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0289.2009.00485.x

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *The Season's of a Man's Life*. New York: A.A Knopf.

Little, J. W. (1990). Chapter 6: The Mentor Phenomenon and the Social Organization of Teaching. *Review of Research in Education, 16*(1), 297-351. doi:10.3102/0091732x016001297

Liu, D., & Fu, P.-p. (2011). Motivating protégés' personal learning in teams: A multilevel investigation of autonomy support and autonomy orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(6), 1195. doi:10.1037/a0024716

Malmgren, R. D., Ottino, J. M., & Nunes Amaral, L. A. (2010). The role of mentorship in protégé performance. *Nature, 465*(7298), 622. doi:10.1038/nature09040

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and Protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33, 161-173.

Merriam, S. B., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M. Y., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *20*(5), 405-416.

Mishler, E. (1979). Meaning in Context: Is There Any Other Kind? *Harvard Educational Review*, *49*(1), 1-19. doi:10.17763/haer.49.1.b748n4133677245p

Monaghan, J., & Lunt, N. (1992). Mentoring: persons, processes, practice and problems. *The British Journal of Educational Studies*, *11*(3), 248-263.

Morrow, S. L. (2007). Qualitative Research in Counseling Psychology: Conceptual Foundations. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *35*(2), 209. doi:10.1177/0011000006286990

Olian, J., Carroll, S., & Giannantonio, C. (1993). Mentor reactions to proteges: An experiment with managers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*(43), 266-278.

O'Grady, E., Hinchion, C., & Mannix McNamara, P. (2011). The importance of respect in teaching and learning: perspectives of final year pre-service teachers in a regional university in Ireland. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *34*(4), 501. doi:10.1080/02619768.2011.592978

Parsloe, E. (1995). *Coaching, mentoring and assessing: a practical guide to developing competence*. London, UK: Kogan Page.

Pearson, M. (2012). Building bridges: higher degree student retention and counselling support. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *34*(2), 187-199. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2012.662743

Piantanida, M., & Garman, N. B. (2009). *The qualitative dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*: Corwin Press.

Public Funding for Mentoring (2016). Mentor: The National Mentoring Partnership Retrieved from http://www.mentoring.org/get-involved/advocacy/policy-agenda/public-funding-for-mentoring/

Rabatin, J. S., Lipkin, M., Rubin, A. S., Schachter, A., Nathan, M., & Kalet, A. (2004). A Year of Mentoring in Academic Medicine: Case Report and Qualitative Analysis of Fifteen Hours of Meetings Between a Junior and Senior Faculty Member. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 19*(5 Pt 2), 569-573. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.30137.x

Ragins, B., & Cotton, J. (1989). Barriers to mentoring: The female manager's dilemma. *Human Relations, 42*, 1-22.

Ragins, B., & Cotton, J. (1991). Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 939-951.

Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified Mentoring Relationships in Organizations: a Power Perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(2), 482. doi:10.5465/amr.1997.9707154067

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(6), 117. doi:10.2307/1556344

Roberts, A. (2000). Mentoring Revisited: a phenomenological reading of the literature. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 8*(2), 145. doi:10.1080/13611260050138382

Ragins, B. R., & Kram, K. E. (2007). The roots and meaning of mentoring. *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice*, 3-15.

Roche, G.R. (1979) Much ado about mentors, *Harvard Business Review* 57 (1) 14-28.

Roosevelt, E., Ragins, B.R., Kram, K.E.. (2008). *The Roots and Meaning of Mentoring. The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research, and Practice. SAGE Publications, Inc*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Rosenberg, A. (2000). *Philosophy of Science: A Contemporary Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Sambunjak, D., Straus, S., & Marusic, A. (2010). A Systematic Review of Qualitative Research on the Meaning and Characteristics of Mentoring in Academic Medicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 25*(1), 72-78. doi:10.1007/s11606-009-1165-8

Scandura, T. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 169-174.

Scandura, T. A. (1998). Dysfunctional Mentoring Relationships and Outcomes. *Journal of management, 24*(3), 449-467. doi:10.1177/014920639802400307

Scott, J. (1912). Apprenticeship under the English Gild System. *The elementary school teacher, 13*(1), 180-188.

Singh, V., Bains, D., & Vinnicombe, S. (2002). Informal Mentoring as an Organisational Resource. *Long Range Planning, 35*(4), 389-405. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(02)00064-X

Sperry, L. (1996). Executive consulting, psychotherapy, and coaching. *Corporate therapy and consulting. Philadelphia: Brumner/Mazel*.

Smith, G. T. (2005a). On Construct Validity: Issues of Method and Measurement. *Psychological assessment, 17*(4), 396. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.17.4.396

Smith, G. T. (2005). On the Complexity of Quantifying Construct Validity. *Psychological assessment, 17*(4), 413.

Smith, G. T. (2005b). On the Complexity of Quantifying Construct Validity: Reply. *Psychological assessment, 17*(4), 413. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.17.4.413

Smith, W. J., Howard, J. T., & Harrington, K. V. (2005). Essential formal mentor characteristics and functions in governmental and non-governmental organizations from the program administrator's and the mentor's perspective. *Public Personnel Management, 34*(1), 31-58.

Sosik, J., & Godshalk, V. (2004). Self-other rating agreement in mentoring: Meeting protege expectation for development and career advancement. *Group & Organization Management*(4), 442-469.

Stone, R., & Aryee, S. (1996). Early Career Outcomes of Graduate Employees: the Effect of Mentoring and Ingratiation. *Journal of management studies, 33*(1), 95-118.

Straus, S. E., Chatur, F., & Taylor, M. (2009). Issues in the mentor-mentee relationship in academic medicine: a qualitative study. *Academic medicine, 84*(1), 135-139. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31819301ab

Straus, S. E., Johnson, M. O., Marquez, C., & Feldman, M. D. (2013). Characteristics of successful and failed mentoring relationships: a qualitative study across two academic health centers. *Academic medicine, 88*(1), 82-89. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31827647a0

Tepper, B. J. (1995). Upward Maintenance Tactics in Supervisory Mentoring and Nonmentoring Relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(4), 1191. doi:10.2307/256626

Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among Supervisors' and Subordinates' Procedural Justice Perceptions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(1), 97. doi:10.2307/30040679

Thomas, D. A. (1993). Racial dynamics in cross-race developmental relationships. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 15*, 44-62.

Twelker, P. A. (2008). The Critical Incident Technique: A Manual for Its Planning and Implementation. Retrieved from http://www.twelker.com/Professional/critical_incident.htm

Villar, A., & Strong, M. (2007). Is mentoring worth the money? A benefit-cost analysis and five-year rate of return of a comprehensive mentoring program for beginning teachers. *ERS Spectrum, 25*(3), 1-17.

Wallis, P. (2008). Apprenticeship and Training in Premodern England. *The Journal of economic history, 68*(3), 832.

Westen, D., & Rosenthal, R. (2005). Improving construct validity: Cronbach, Meehl, and Neurath's ship: Comment. *Psychological assessment, 17*(4), 409. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.17.4.409

Whitely, W., Dougherty, T. W., & Dreher, G. F. (1992). Correlates of career-oriented mentoring for early career managers and professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*(2), 141.

Wilber, K. (1998). *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*. New York: Broadway Books.

Williams, L., Levine, J., Malhotra, S., & Holtzheimer, P. (2004). The Good-Enough Mentoring Relationship. *Academic Psychiatry, 28*(2), 111-115. doi:10.1176/appi.ap.28.2.111

Williams, R. A., Hagerty, B. M., Yousha, S. M., Horrocks, J., Hoyle, K. S., & Dawei, L. (2004). Psychosocial Effects of the Boot Strap Intervention in Navy Recruits. *Military medicine, 169*(10; 10), 814.

Wilson, P., Pereira, A., & Valentine, D. (2002). Perceptions of new social work faculty about mentoring experiences. *Journal of Social Work Education, 2*, 317-333.

Woolsey, L. K. (1986). The Critical Incident Technique: An Innovative Qualitative Method of Research. *Canadian Journal of Counselling, 20*(4), 242.

Wunsch, M. A. (1994). Developing mentoring programs: Major themes and issues. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 1994*(57), 27-34. doi:10.1002/tl.37219945705

Young, A. M., Cady, S., & Foxon, M. J. (2006). Demystifying Gender Differences in Mentoring:Theoretical Perspectives and Challenges for Future Research on Gender and Mentoring. *Human Resource Development Review, 5*(2), 148-175. doi:10.1177/1534484306287140

Zey, M. (1984). *The mentor connection*. Homewood, Il: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Table 1

Definitions of Mentoring from the Literature

Table 1 illustrates some definitions of mentoring, extracted from the literature.

"Mentoring relationships facilitate junior colleagues' (protégés') professional development and career progress" (Tepper, 1995).
"Mentoring is a relationship that encourages learning" (Parsloe, 1995).
"Mentoring is an intense developmental relationship whereby advice, counselling, and developmental opportunities are provided to a protégé by a mentor, which, in turn, shapes the protégé's career experiences…This occurs through two types of support to protégés: (1) instrumental or career support and (2) psychological support" (Eby, 1997).
"A formalised process whereby a more knowledgeable and experienced person actuates a supportive role of overseeing and encouraging reflection and learning within a less experienced and knowledgeable person, so as to facilitate that person's career and personal development" (Roberts, 2000).
"Mentoring is an intense long-term relationship between a senior, more experienced individual (the mentor) and a more junior, less experienced individual (the protégé)" (Eby & Allen, 2002).
"Mentoring…is…a working relationship that contributes to personal growth and is an important organizational process" (Lankau & Scandura, 2002).
"Mentoring refers to an intense interpersonal relationship between a senior, more experienced individual (the mentor) and a junior, less experienced individual (the protégé) whereby the mentor provides career and personal guidance to the protégé" (Eby et al., 2004).
"Mentoring is defined as a developmental relationship that involves organizational members of unequal status or, less frequently, peers" (Bozionelos, 2004).
"Mentoring: a process for informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and psychosocial support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or professional development; mentoring entails informal communication, usually face-to-face and during a sustained period of time, between a person who is perceived to have greater relevant knowledge, wisdom, or experience (the mentor) and a person who is perceived to have less (the protégé)" (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007).
"Mentoring, defined as interpersonal relationship between a more experienced (i.e., the mentor) and a less experienced person (i.e., the protégé)" (Liu & Fu, 2011).
"Mentoring is a paternalistic work relationship that encourages development and career growth for protégés" (Akinbobola, 2011).

"Mentoring is a developmentally oriented relationship between a younger or less experienced individual (the protégé) and an older or more experiences individual (the mentor) (Jacobi 1991; Kram 1985; Rhodes, 2005)" (deTormes et al., 2012).

Table 2

Categorization of the Elements of the Definitions of Mentoring from the Literature

Table 2 illustrates some of the core elements from the definitions of mentoring extracted from the literature.

Core Definition Elements	Authors
Relationship, mentor has more experience	(Eby & Allen, 2002), (Liu & Fu, 2011), (deTormes et al., 2012)
Relationship, encourages learning	(Parsloe, 1995)
Relationship, career enhancement	(Tepper, 1995)
Relationship, paternalistic, career growth	(Akinbobola, 2011)
Relationship, career related, enhances personal growth	(Lankau & Scandura, 2002)
Relationship, formalized process, career and personal development	(Roberts, 2000)
Developmental relationship, shape career, provide psychological support	(Eby, 1997)
Developmental relationship in an organization	(Bozionelos, 2004)
Relationship, career and personal guidance provided	(Eby et al., 2004)
Process for information transmission of knowledge, social capital and support, shape career development, involves communication	(Bozeman & Feeney, 2007)

Table 3

Mentor Definitions from the Literature

Table 3 illustrates a selection of mentor definitions extracted from the literature.

"A mentor … is an experienced nurse or midwife who has undertaken an approved mentorship preparation programme and is qualified to support and assess students in the practice setting" (Anderson, 2011).
"The term 'mentor' refers to a more senior person who takes an interest in sponsorship of the career of a more junior person" (Smith & Harrington, 2005).
"No word currently in use is adequate to convey the nature of the relationship we have in mind here. Words such as "counsellor" or "guru" suggest the more subtle meanings, but they have other connotations that would be misleading. The term "mentor" is generally used in a much narrower sense, to mean teacher, advisor, or sponsor. As we use the term it means all these things and more" (Levinson et al., 1978).
"Traditionally, mentors are defined as individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing upward mobility and support to protégés' careers" (Ragins, 1997).
"Mentors are generally defined as individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing up-ward mobility and career support to their protégés" (Ragins et al., 2000).
"Mentors are selected, trained senior organizational members, often managers, more experienced than protégés in status and probably age who share, guide, encourage and support less experienced protégés" (Akinbobola, 2011).

Table 4

Categorization of the Elements of the Definitions of Mentor from the Literature

Table 4 illustrates some of the core elements from the definitions of mentor extracted from the literature.

Core Definition Elements	Authors
Supports and assesses student's work, taken a programme on how to be a mentor	(Anderson, 2011)
Senior person, interested in junior person's career	(Smith & Harrington, 2005)
Mentor means teacher, advisor, or sponsor	(Levinson et al., 1978)
Advanced experience and knowledge, supports protégé's career advancement	(Ragins, 1997)
Advanced experience and knowledge, supports protégé's career advancement	(Ragins et al., 2000)
Older, trained, more experienced person, shares, guides, encourages and supports	(Akinbobola, 2011)

Table 5

Summary of Questions and Definitions

Table 5 illustrates a selection of questions (the basic concepts in questions 1, 3, 6, 9 and 11 are adapted from Bozeman & Fenney (2007)), and the corresponding excerpts from the newly-constructed mentoring definitions which attempt to answer, and which apply, to each question.

Questions	Mentor	Protégé	Mentoring
1) Who is the mentor and who is the protégé?	- "A person in a mentoring relationship who both parties perceive as having greater discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience" - "Possesses the desire and skills to pass along their knowledge in regards to the goals"	- "A person in a mentoring relationship who both parties perceived as having lesser discipline specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience" - "Possesses the desire and skills necessary to learn in regard to the goals by engaging in the relationship"	- "Activities created and/or suggestions by the mentor in which the protégé must engage to acquire the mentoring goals"
2) Do mentoring relationships have reciprocity?	- "Provides to, and receives from, the protégé, psycho-social support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, praise, attuning and responding to the protégés needs) and social cooperation"	- "Provides to and receives from the mentor, psycho-social support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, praise, attuning and responding to the mentor's needs) and social cooperation"	- "Informal communication between a mentor and a protégé, for reciprocally transmitting social cooperation, psycho-social support, and respect, and for conveying that mentor and protégé like one another, in order to promote a continued commitment to the mentoring relationship"
3) Does successful mentoring involve, or need to involve, liking one another?	- "Is perceived as liking, and genuinely likes, the protégé (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or	- "Is perceived as liking, and genuinely likes, the mentor (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or	- "Informal communication between a mentor and a protégé… for conveying that mentor

	congenial, to regard with favour)"	congenial, to regard with favour)"	and protégé like one another"
4) Do the mentor and protégé need to respect each other?	- "Is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or a sense of the worth or excellence of) the protégé"	- "Is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or a sense of the worth or excellence of) the mentor"	- "Informal communication between a mentor and a protégé for reciprocally transmitting... respect"
5) Is it mentoring if the protégé shares information with the mentor?	- "Is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired outcomes and invests in providing learning opportunities to assist the protégé in obtaining the goals"	- "Is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the mentor and is invested in the activities and process for achieving agreed-upon goals"	- "Activities created and/or suggested by the mentor, in which the protégé must engage, to acquire the mentoring goals"
6) Does there have to be a conscious recognition that mentoring is occurring, on the part of both the mentor and the protégé, for there to be a mentoring relationship?	- "Is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired outcomes"	- "Is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the mentor"	- "Conscious acknowledgement and commitment to the relationship"
7) Can both a boss and a non-supervisor be a mentor?	- "A person in a mentoring relationship who is perceived by both parties as having greater discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience"	- "A person in a mentoring relationship who is perceived by both parties as having lesser discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience"	- "A voluntary process"
8) Is trust an aspect of the relationship or can mentoring happen without trust?	- "Considered by the protégé, and considers himself or herself, as trustworthy to be in a relationship and pass along knowledge"	- "Considered by the mentor, and considers himself or herself, as trustworthy to be in a relationship and to receive the knowledge"	- "Trustworthy engagement in the relationship and the activities that pursue the mentoring goals"
9) When does mentoring begin and end?	- "Is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired	- "Is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the	- "Conscious acknowledgement and commitment to the

	outcomes" (begins at commitment and ends at achieving the goals, or upon termination)	mentor" (begins at commitment and ends at achieving the goals, or upon termination)	relationship... and the activities that pursue the mentoring goals" (begins at commitment and ends at achieving the goals, or upon termination)
10) What are the boundaries between socializing and mentoring?	- "Is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired outcomes and invests in providing learning opportunities to assist the protégé in obtaining the goals"	- "Is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the mentor and is invested in the activities and process of achieving agreed-upon goals"	- "Informal communication between a mentor and a protégé for the transmission of knowledge perceived by the protégé and/or mentor as relevant to the goals"
11) What part of knowledge-transmission is mentoring and what part is not?	- "Is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired outcomes and invests in providing learning opportunities to assist the protégé in obtaining the goals"	- "Is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the mentor and is invested in the activities and process of achieving agreed-upon goals"	- "Informal communication between a mentor and a protégé for the transmission of knowledge perceived by the protégé and/or mentor as relevant to the goals"

Table 6

Participation Rates, Categories, and Frequency of Incidents

Table 6 illustrates a list of the behavioural categories of what helped or hindered mentoring outcomes, the participation rates for each category, and the frequency of the critical incidents reported.

Category	**Frequency of Incidents** Total = 207	**Participation Rate** Total n = 18
Mentor Speaking About Protégé, Helped	Subtotal # of incidents = 56	Subtotal n = 6
State Explicit Goals	6	6 (100%)
Seek Information	14	4 (66.7%)
Demonstrate Integration	6	3 (50%)
Prioritize Time	5	2 (33.3%)
Show Appreciation	3	3 (50%)
Bond	5	4 (66.7%)
Take Initiative	17	5 (83.3%)
Mentor Speaking About Protégé, Hindered	Subtotal # of incidents = 27	Subtotal n = 6
Unclear Goals	3	2 (33.3%)
Engage in Dishonest Behaviours	4	3 (50%)
Use Abusive Language	2	1 (16.7%)
Prioritize Non-Mentoring Activities	5	4 (66.7%)
Ignore Advice	13	4 (66.7%)
Protégé Speaking about Mentor, Helped	Subtotal # of incidents = 91	Subtotal n = 12
Demonstrate Support	21	9 (75%)
State Explicit Expectations	7	6 (50%)
Teach	38	12 (100%)

Model Effective Behaviour	7	6 (50%)
Connect Emotionally	12	5 (41.7%)
Work Together	6	6 (50%)
Protégé Speaking about Mentor, Hindered	Subtotal # of incidents = 33	Subtotal n = 12
Criticize	7	5 (41.7%)
Inadequate Instruction	9	6 (50%)
Model Ineffective Behaviour	8	5 (41.7%)
Misinterpret the Protégé's Needs	6	3 (25%)
Block Work-Accomplishments	3	1 (8.3%)

Table 7

Mentor Demographics

Table 7 illustrates a list of demographics for the participants in the study who were mentors.

Participant #	Gender	Age	Relationship Status	Ethnicity	Occupation	Education
1	F	65	Single	Scottish	Retired senior bureaucrat. Management consultant	BA, MA
5	F	53	Divorced. Living with boyfriend	Caucasian	Office manager	Some high school
15	F	52	Divorced. Single	Caucasian	Director of Fundraising	Diploma. Certificates. BA, MA
16	F	29	Single	Caucasian, Portuguese	Teacher	BA Eng., BEd, MA student
17	F	52	Single	Caucasian	Professor	BEd, MEd, PhD
18	F	54	Divorced. Single	Caucasian	High School Teacher	BA, BEd, Med
	N= 6 F	**Mean = 50.9**				

Table 8

Additional Mentor Demographics

Table 8 illustrates a list of additional demographics for the participants in the study who were mentors.

Participant #	**# Relationships Spoke About**	**Length Relationships**	**# Times a Mentor**	**# Times a Protégé**	**Want to be in a Mentoring Relationship Again?**
1	3	6 mos., 3 yrs, 4 yrs	10	5	Yes
5	3	6 yrs, 5 yrs, 12 yrs	20	6	Yes
15	3	1.5yrs, 2 yrs, 2.5 yrs	8	0	Yes
16	2	1 mos., 1 mos.	5	3	Yes
17	8	3 mos. x 7, 20 yrs	12	3	No
18	1	1 mos.	10	6	No
	Total=20	**Range: 1mos. to 20yrs**	**Mean=10.8**	**Mean=3.8**	**Yes=4** **No=2**

Table 9

Protégé Demographics

Table 9 illustrates a list of demographics for the participants in the study who were protégés.

Participant #	Gender	Age	Relationship Status	Ethnicity	Occupation	Education
2	F	33	Single	Caucasian, European descent	Healthcare Professional	BA, MA
3	M	36	Common law married	Caucasian	Graduate student	BA, BSc., MA student
4	M	31	Common law married	Jewish	Acupuncturist	6 years post-secondary, acupuncture Diploma
6	F	44	Living with boyfriend	Caucasian, European descent	Registered Clinical Counsellor	BA, MA
7	M	31	Married	Caucasian	Telephone surveyor	BA, MA
8	F	75	Divorced. Married	Caucasian	Psychologist	BEd, PhD
9	F	44	Divorced. Married	Caucasian, German	Counsellor, research coordinator	BA, MA
10	M	30	Married	Métis	Research Technician	BSc
11	F	69	Married	Danish-American	Retired registered nurse	BEd, Nursing Diploma
12	F	33	Single	Caucasian	Graduate student	BA, MA, PhD Candidate
13	F	37	Single	Francophone, Caucasian	Teacher	BA, BEd, MA student
14	F	49	Married	Caucasian	Psychologist, Professor	BA, MA, PhD
	N= 12 Total F=8; M=4	**Mean= 39.7yrs**				

Table 10

Additional Protégé Demographics

Table 10 illustrates a list of additional demographics for the participants in the study who were protégés.

Participant #	**# Relationships Spoke About**	**Length Relationships**	**# Times a Mentor**	**# Times a Protégé**	**Want to be in a Mentoring Relationship Again?**
2	3	4 mos., 1.5 yrs, 7 yrs.	14	4	Yes
3	5	4 mos., 4 mos., 3 yrs, 10 yrs, 10yrs.	5	9	Yes
4	1	3yrs	0	3	Yes
6	1	5yrs	1	3	Yes
7	1	4.25yrs	2	2	Yes
8	2	1 yr, 7 yrs	5	2	Yes
9	2	10 mos., 2 yrs	6	4	Yes
10	1	6 mos.	0	1	Yes
11	1	1 yr	2	1	Yes
12	1	2 yrs	0	4	Yes
13	5	3 wks, 3wks, 4wks,	0	8	Yes
14	1	14 yrs	8	4	Yes
	Total=24	**Range: 3wks to 14 yrs**	**Mean=3.8**	**Mean=3.5**	**Yes=12**

Table 11

Number and Type of Mentoring Relationships

Table 11 illustrates descriptions of the nature and quantity of the mentoring relationships involved in this study.

Mentors Speaking About Protégés	
Type of Relationship	**# of Relationships**
Formal work program	1
Formal volunteer program	1
Informal work	12
Informal friends/family	2
Protégés Speaking About Mentors	
Type of Relationship	**# of Relationships**
Formal work program	2
Informal work	1
Formal school/training/academic	16
Informal hobby (martial arts)	1
Informal philosophical teachings	1
Informal friend (former psychologist)	1

Table 12

Independent Judges and Rater Agreement

Table 12 illustrates the results of multiple, random, card sorts from the critical-incident quotes, given to the independent judges, demonstrating their rates of agreement on which quotes belonged in which category.

Judge Number	Rater Agreement %
1	67%
2	67%
3	86%
4	96%
5	90.4%
6	94%
7	90.4%
8	90.4%
9	90.4%

Note. I prepared a card sort with 25% of the quotes, randomly selected, from the categories. I sent this card sort, along with the categories, to the first of nine judges with each subsequent judge receiving a new card sort. I asked each judge to place the quotes under the category that was the best fit. I analyzed the first judge's category placements to determine the rate of agreement between where the researcher had put the quotes and where the independent judge had put the quotes. Each card sort sent out had a new combination of 25% of the quotes selected at random. The first two judges had an agreement rate of 67% each. After making changes, I sent a new card sort to Judge 3, who scored an 86% agreement rate with the researcher. This process continued for the remaining judges. Between each card sort, I re-evaluated and refined the quotes and the categories so as to clear up any confusion that the judges' decisions had brought to light.

I decided to stop sending the material to new judges when the last six judges had consistently scored above 90%. At each step, before altering categories or quotes, I consulted my research supervisor.

Appendix A

Preparation for the Mentoring Research Interview

The goal of the research interview is:

- To have you speak about situations (behavioural incidents), involving the other person in the mentoring relationship, that substantially helped or hindered the mentoring goals.

In preparation for the interview, please identify a minimum of 2 helping and 2 hindering situations where the other person's behaviour helped or hindered achieving the goals of the mentoring relationship. Please write these down and bring them to the interview. You will be asked to discuss these verbally.

Specifically, in the interview, you will be asked:

a) Tell me about specific situations when the other person did something that helped achieve the mentoring goal.
b) Tell me about specific situations when the other person did something that hindered achieving the mentoring goal.
c) What do you believe would have helped achieve the goals of the mentoring relationship if the behaviours were present? (this can include anything, not just behaviours)

You will be asked how the situations listed in questions 1 and 2 impacted the mentoring goals.

Appendix B

Invitation Letter

Hello (name),

You are receiving this email because you may be interested in participating in this research or you may know others who are.

Sarah Buydens is a PhD student at UVic where she is working on her dissertation **"What do Self-Described Protégés and Mentors Report Helped and/or Hindered the Outcomes of the Mentoring Relationship?"**

Sarah is looking for individuals who are, or have been, mentors or mentored, to participate in interviews.

Do the following apply?:

- Have you received help from someone with greater knowledge, wisdom, or experience who was committed to helping you achieve your goals?
- Have you invested in a relationship to share your knowledge, wisdom, or experience to help someone reach his or her goals?
- Was this relationship voluntary?
- Did this person treat you with respect and provide you with support?
- Are you willing to share the incidents that helped or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationship?

All participants' information will be kept private and confidential.

What is Involved?

You will be asked to discuss incidents that helped or hindered the outcomes of your mentoring relationship. There will be two interviews (the first in person at UVic and the second by email and/or over the phone). Time commitment is 2-4 hours.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose is to explore what helps or hinders the outcomes of mentoring relationships.

Importance of this Research

Previous research on mentoring has not included a clear, accurate definition of mentoring. This has led to unclear research results. The current study is based on detailed definitions created by the researcher, the results of which will provide beneficial information for the field of mentoring.

Individuals that may be contacted regarding this study:

- *The researcher,* **Sarah Buydens, XXXX@uvic.ca or 250-XXX-XXXX**.
- *The research supervisor, Dr. Tim Black,* **XXXX** *@uvic.ca or 250-* **XXX-XXXX**.
- *Ethics approval #XX-XXX, ethics@uvic.ca or 250-472-4545.*

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research must be completely voluntary. Individuals who feel obliged, coerced, manipulated, or influenced to participate in this study are asked to not participate or can withdraw at any time. Colleagues, friends, or acquaintances of the researcher are asked to not let this relationship influence their decision to participate.

Please circulate this email and poster widely, forwarding it to anyone you think may be interested.

Sincerely, Sarah Buydens

Appendix C

Invitation Poster

UVic MENTOR STUDY

HAVE YOU BEEN MENTORED OR BEEN A MENTOR?

Do the following apply?:

- **Have you received help from someone with greater knowledge, wisdom, or experience who was committed to helping you achieve your goals?**
- **Have you invested in a relationship to share your knowledge, wisdom, or experience to help someone reach his or her goals?**
- **Was this relationship voluntary?**
- **Did this person treat you with respect and provide you with support?**

What is Involved?

You will be asked to discuss incidents that helped or hindered the outcomes of your mentoring relationship. There will be two interviews (the first in person at UVic and the second by email and/or over the phone). Time commitment is 2-4 hours.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose is to explore what helps or hinders the outcomes of mentoring relationships.

Importance of this Research

Previous research on mentoring has not included a clear, accurate definition of mentoring. This has led to unclear research results. The current study is based on detailed definitions created by the researcher, the results of which will provide beneficial information for the field of mentoring.

For more information contact: Sarah Buydens XXX@uvic.ca 250-XXX-XXXX

*Sarah is a PhD Candidate at UVic who is working under the supervision of Dr. Tim Black (**XXXX**@uvic.ca).*

All participants' information will be kept private and confidential.

UVic Mentor Study (phone #)	UVic Mentor Study (phone #)	UVic Mentor Study (phone #)	UVic Mentor Study (phone #)	UVic Mentor Study (phone #)	UVic Mentor Study (phone #)	UVic Mentor Study (phone #)

Appendix D

Letter of Invitation to Participate

Dear Interested Person,

My name is Sarah Buydens and I am a PhD student at the University of Victoria in the department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies. I am working on my dissertation "**What do Self-Described Protégés and Mentors Report Helped and/or Hindered the Outcomes of the Mentoring Relationships?**"

I have outlined below a number of things you may be interested in knowing about the research. At the end of the document, I have listed contact information. Please do not hesitate to contact me for further information.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to explore what helps or hinders the outcomes of the mentoring relationships using Critical Incident Technique, a research methodology. Participants will be asked to talk about their experiences of being in mentoring relationships and what helped or hindered the outcomes.

Participant Selection Criteria

I am looking for mentors and protégés who:

(a) speak conversational English to be able to participate in the research fully;

(b) are available to participate in face-to-face as well as telephone or email interviews;

(c) can provide detailed descriptions of what helped or hindered the mentoring outcomes;

(d) self-identify as a protégé and/or a mentor, having engaged in mentoring that fits with the following definitions.

Definitions:

Mentor (noun): a person in a mentoring relationship who: both parties perceive as having greater discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience; possesses the desire and skills to pass along their knowledge, in regards to the goals, by engaging in a relationship with someone he or she views as a protégé; is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired outcomes and invests in providing learning opportunities to assist the protégé in obtaining the goals; is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or sense of the worth or excellence of) the protégé and who is perceived as "liking, and genuinely likes, the protégé" (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or congenial, to regard with favour); provides to, and receives from, the protégé, psychosocial support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, praise, attuning and responding to the protégé's needs) and social cooperation; is considered by the protégé and considers himself or herself as trustworthy to be in relationship with and pass along knowledge.

Protégé (noun): a person in a mentoring relationship who: both parties perceive as having lesser discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience; possesses the desire and skills necessary to learn, in regards to the goals, by engaging in a relationship with someone he or she views as a mentor; is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the mentor and is invested in the activities and process of achieving agreed-upon goals; makes changes based on the information acquired in the mentoring relationship; is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or sense of worth or excellence of) the mentor, and who is perceived as liking, and genuinely likes, the mentor (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or congenial, to regard with favour); provides to, and receives from, the mentor, psychosocial support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, attuning and responding to the mentor's needs) and social

cooperation; is considered by the mentor and considers himself or herself as trustworthy to be in relationship with and to receive the knowledge; integrates the information learned in the mentoring relationship and changes or alters behaviours, perceptions, beliefs etc. based on this integration.

To Mentor, or Mentoring (verb): a voluntary process involving: activities created and/or suggested by the mentor in which the protégé must engage to acquire the mentoring goals; informal communication between a mentor and a protégé for the transmission of knowledge perceived by the protégé and/or mentor as relevant to the goals; informal communication between a mentor and protégé for reciprocally transmitting social cooperation, psychosocial support, respect, and for conveying that mentor and protégé like one another, in order to continue a commitment to the mentoring relationship; conscious acknowledgement and commitment to the relationship, and trustworthy engagement in the relationship and the activities that pursue the mentoring goals.

What is Involved?

Participants will be asked to discuss specific critical (important, essential) incidents that helped or hindered the mentoring outcomes and to describe how these aspects helped or hindered. You will be asked to participate in two interviews. The first interview (at UVic) involves a discussion about incidents that helped or hindered the outcomes of mentoring. The interviews will be conducted individually. Your data from the interview will be transcribed and analyzed. Once your data has been analyzed, a second interview will take place, most likely via email, or over the phone. In the second interview, you will be invited to verify the data and add or change any material from your interview. I anticipate the combined time to complete the two interviews will be between two to four hours.

Importance of this Research

This research is highly meaningful because previous research on mentoring has not had a clear, accurate definition of mentor, protégé, or mentoring. This has led to confusion and uncertain research results. The current research study is based on detailed definitions which will provide beneficial information for the field of mentoring.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research must be voluntary. If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw at any time without any consequences or explanation. Participants who feel obliged, coerced, manipulated, or influenced to participate in this study are asked to withdraw and not participate. Colleagues, friends, or acquaintances of the researcher are asked to not let this relationship influence their decision to participate. Participants have the right to refuse to discuss any aspect of their mentoring experience. If a participant decides to leave during the study, the audiotapes of this interview will be erased and any notes will be shredded, unless the participant gives written consent to use the material already obtained.

Researcher's Relationship with Participants

The researcher may have a relationship with a potential participant as a friend, acquaintance, or colleague. To help prevent this relationship from influencing your decision to participate, you are asked that if you feel obliged, coerced, manipulated, or influenced to participate in this study that you withdraw and not participate.

Anonymity

Interviews will be tape recorded. The written text of the interviews will be kept for future conferences and papers. A pseudonym will be used in place of the participant's real name. Only

the researcher, Sarah Buydens, will know the participant's real identity. All information obtained will be kept confidential, and will be kept in a locked file cabinet.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality will be maintained throughout. Due to British Columbia law, there are a few situations where the researcher is lawfully bound to break confidentiality. These include, hearing about a child or vulnerable person at risk of abuse, a participant at risk of suicide, or person at risk of harm or death. Should the need arise to break confidentiality, the researcher will protect the participant's identity as much as possible.

Participant confidentiality will be protected by securing audiotapes, transcribed data, and consent forms in a locked file cabinet. Data stored on computer will be password protected.

On-going Consent

To confirm your consent to participate in this research, I will ask participants to sign a consent form at the beginning of the first interview which provides consent to participate in the first (in-person) and second (via email and/or phone) interview.

Dissemination of Results

It is anticipated the results of this study will be shared with others in the following ways: directly to participants, published articles, dissertation, on the internet (UVic will publish this dissertation on "d-space" on the UVic library web site), presentations at conferences or to the public and scholarly meetings, and possibly in the media (e.g., newspaper, radio, TV).

Disposal of Data

Paper copies of transcripts will be kept for 10 years in a locked file cabinet for future reference. This data will be destroyed after 10 years. Audiotapes will be destroyed 1 year after transcriptions are made.

Contacts

Individuals that may be contacted regarding this study include:

- The researcher, Sarah Buydens, at XXX@uvic.ca or 250-XXX-XXXX
- The research supervisor, Dr. Tim Black at XXX@uvic.ca or 250-XXX-XXXX In addition, you may verify the ethical approval of this study, or raise any concerns you might have, by contacting the Human Research Ethics Office at the University of Victoria at 250-472-4545 or ethics@uvic.ca.

Want to Participate?

If you want to participate in the study, please contact Sarah Buydens and indicate to her that you meet all of the selection criteria and that the definitions of mentor or protégé and mentoring fit your experience.

Thank you for your interest in this study!

Sincerely, Sarah Buydens, PhD Candidate

Appendix E

Participant Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study entitled, "**What do Self-Described Protégés and Mentors Report Helped and/or Hindered the Outcomes of the Mentoring Relationships?**" that is being conducted by Sarah Buydens.

Sarah Buydens is a PhD Candidate in the department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies (specialized in Counselling Psychology) at the University of Victoria.

As a graduate student, I am required to conduct research as part of the requirements for a PhD. This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Tim Black.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this research project is to study what helps and/or hinders the outcomes of the mentoring relationships.

Importance of this Research

Research of this type is important because previous research has not used clear and accurate definitions of mentor, protégé, or mentoring, thereby leaving it uncertain what was actually under investigation in the research. For example, in some previous studies the terms mentor, protégé, and mentoring were not explained, thereby leaving the participants to define and interpret the terms however they wanted, which for some, could mean confusing mentoring with the terms coaching, teaching, or supervising etc.

In the current research, a definition of mentor, protégé, and mentoring has been constructed so that the data gathered in the study will be solely about the same definition of mentor, protégé, and mentoring. Thereby, the data from the research will fill in a gap in the research on mentoring by providing information about what helps and/or hinders the outcomes of mentoring.

Participants Selection

You are being asked to participate in this study because you are, or were, a mentor or protégé and therefore are the best informant about what truly helped and/or hindered the outcome of your mentoring relationship.

What is Involved

If you consent to voluntarily participate in this research, your participation will include two interviews (the first interview will be audiotaped and in person at the University of Victoria, and second interview will be via email and/or the phone). In the first interview you will be asked to provide verbal examples of critical (substantial) incidents of things that occurred that helped and/or hindered the mentoring outcomes. The first interview will take between one to two hours, depending on how much information you have to share. After the first interview, your interview audiotape will be transcribed and analyzed into categories and themes. The themes (which will have a corresponding quote from your interview) will be compared against other participants' themes and quotes to deduce what themes are present across all of the participants' interviews. You will be contacted for a second interview during which you will be asked to go over the themes that correspond to all of the interviews and your quotes that relate to that theme. You will be asked to validate whether the theme is accurate and reflects something that helped and/or hindered the outcomes in your mentoring relationship. At this time you will also be invited to add to or alter your existing data. The second interview may take between one and two hours.

Inconvenience

Participation in this study may cause some inconvenience to you such as travel to and from the interview as well as the time needed for the interviews.

Risks

There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research. It is a possible risk, however, that you may experience emotional stress or discomfort while recounting and telling incidents. Mentors and protégés are invested in their mentoring relationships and it might have been personally disappointing or hurtful to have the outcomes hindered. By recounting the incidents that hindered the outcomes, you might feel sad. Also, if what hindered the mentoring outcome was something you did that you found embarrassing or shameful, recounting the incident might bring up a sense of embarrassment or shame again.

To prevent or deal with this risk, I have compiled a list of agencies for participants to contact for support should they encounter emotional discomfort from the interviews. Should you experience distress at any time during the interviews, you can take a break, end the interview and resume the interview another time, or withdraw from the study. Any of this may be done without any risk or consequence.

Victoria Resources

Vancouver Island Crisis Line (open 24 hrs)	1-888-494-3888
Suicide Crisis Line	1-800-784-2433
Mental Health and Addiction	250-370-8175
Urgent Short Term and Treatment (USTAT)	250-213-4400
Sooke Family Resource Society Counselling Centre	250-642-5152 ext. 229
Pacific Centre Family Services Association	250-478-8357
Women's Sexual Assault Centre	250-383-5545 ext. 119
Women's Sexual Assault Centre Crisis Line	250-383-3232
Mental Health Support Line	310-6789 (no area code needed)

Single Parent Resource Centre	250-385-1114
Women's Transition House, Victoria, Crisis Line	250-385-6611
Citizens' Counselling Centre of Greater Victoria	250-384-9934
Men's Trauma Centre	250-381-6367

Benefits

The potential benefits of your participation in this research include:

- The opportunity to share your experience and have it impact research. You will have the opportunity to reflect on your experiences, perhaps gaining a new perspective or self-reflection from the process.
- Potential benefits to society by providing research about what helps and/or hinders the outcomes of mentoring, which can inform and enhance mentoring programs and the use of mentoring in the workplace and personal life.
- Potential benefits to the state of knowledge as results emerging from this study can inform knowledge, theory, and practice in respect to mentoring. This can assist in improving programs, services, and support systems for people in the workplace.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research must be completely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without any consequences or explanation. If you feel obliged, coerced, manipulated, or influenced to participate in this study, I ask that you withdraw and not participate. Colleagues, friends, or acquaintances of the researcher are asked to not let this relationship influence their decision to participate or not; a decision to participate or not in no way affects any relationship the researcher may have with you. You have the right to refuse to discuss any aspect of your mentoring experience. If you decide to leave during the study, the audiotape of the interview will be erased and any notes will be shredded, unless you give written consent to use the material already obtained.

Researcher's Relationship with Participants

The researcher may have a relationship with potential participants as a friend, acquaintance, or colleague. To help prevent this relationship from influencing your decision to participate you are asked that if you feel obliged, coerced, manipulated, or influenced to participate in this study that you withdraw and not participate.

On-going Consent

To confirm your consent to participate in this research, I will ask you to sign a consent form at the beginning of the first interview which provides consent to participate in both the first and second interviews.

Anonymity

Numerical and name pseudonyms will be used for participants and any people identified in the interviews. Individual interviews will be audiotaped. The audiotapes will be erased upon completion of the dissertation (anticipated date of December 2013). The written text of the interviews will be kept for future conferences and papers. Only the researcher, Sarah Buydens, will know the participants' real identities. All information obtained will be kept confidential and interview results will be kept in a locked file cabinet.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality will be maintained throughout the research. Due to British Columbia law, there are a few situations where the researcher is lawfully bound to break confidentiality. These include hearing about a child or vulnerable person at risk for abuse, a participant at risk for suicide, or person at risk for harm or death (other than related to military duty). Should the need arise the researcher will protect participants' identities as much as possible.

Participant confidentiality and the data will be protected by securing audiotapes, transcribed data, and consent forms in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher's home. Any data stored on computer will be password protected.

Confidentiality will be protected by having participants meet alone with the researcher, and by using pseudonyms for the participants and the mentors or protégés they might speak about. If major identifying information comes up (e.g., a major project worked on etc.) this information will be altered to protect anonymity.

You will be asked to inform others you believe are suitable for this research about the study in the hopes that they too might participate. You will not know if your recommended acquaintance participated in the study, but upon reading the research, it may be easier to identify your acquaintance through choice of language in the quotes or other identifying information (e.g., type of work environment). Likewise, your acquaintance will know you participated in the study and might be able to identify your quotes. This means there is a slight limit to confidentiality if people accurately guess who their acquaintance is in the study.

Dissemination of Results

It is anticipated that the results of this study will be shared with others in the following ways: directly to participants, published articles/chapter/book, dissertation (which is available to the public on the internet through the UVic library system), presentations at conferences or to the public, presentations at scholarly meetings, to the media (newspapers, radio, TV), over the internet, and scholarly meetings. The data will not be shared with others for their future use.

Disposal of Data

Audiotaped data from this study will be erased upon completion of the dissertation. Paper copies of transcripts will be kept for 10 years in a locked file at the researcher's home for future reference. This data will be destroyed after 10 years.

Verifying Definitions

The definitions of mentor, protégé, and mentoring used in this study are as follows:

Mentor (noun): a person in a mentoring relationship who: both parties perceive as having greater discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience; possesses the desire and skills to pass along their knowledge in regards to the goals by engaging in a relationship with someone he or she views as a protégé; is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired outcomes and invests in providing learning opportunities to assist the protégé in obtaining the goals; is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or sense of the worth or excellence of) the protégé, and is perceived as "liking, and genuinely likes, the protégé" (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or congenial, to regard with favour); provides and receives psychosocial support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, praise, attuning and responding to the protégé's needs) and social cooperation to the protégé; is considered by the protégé and considers himself or herself as trustworthy to be in relationship with and pass along knowledge.

Protégé (noun): a person in a mentoring relationship who: both parties perceive as having lesser discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience; possesses the desire and skills necessary to learn, in regards to the goals, by engaging in a relationship with someone he or she views as a mentor; is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the mentor and is invested in the activities and process of achieving agreed-upon goals; makes changes based on the information acquired in the mentoring relationship; is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for

(i.e., esteem for, or sense of worth or excellence of) the mentor, and who is perceived as "liking, and genuinely likes, the mentor" (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or congenial, to regard with favour); provides to, and receives from, the mentor, psychosocial support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, attuning and responding to the mentor's needs) and social cooperation; is considered by the mentor and considers himself or herself as trustworthy to be in relationship with and to receive the knowledge; integrates the information learned in the mentoring relationship and changes or alters behaviours, perceptions, beliefs etc. based upon it.

To Mentor, or Mentoring (verb): a voluntary process involving: activities created and/or suggested by the mentor in which the protégé must engage to acquire the mentoring goals; informal communication between a mentor and a protégé for the transmission of knowledge perceived by the protégé and/or mentor as relevant to the goals; informal communication between a mentor and protégé for reciprocally transmitting social cooperation, psychosocial support, respect, and for conveying that mentor and protégé like one another, in order to continue a commitment to the mentoring relationship; conscious acknowledgement and commitment to the relationship and trustworthy engagement in the relationship and the activities that pursue the mentoring goals.

By signing this form you are verifying that the definitions of mentoring, mentor and/or protégé, as listed above, fit your experience.

Contacts

You may contact the researcher, Sarah Buydens, at XXXX@uvic.ca or 250-XXX-XXXX. You may contact the PhD supervisor, Dr. Tim Black, at XXXX@uvic.ca or 250-XXX-XXXX. You may verify the ethical approval of this study, or raise any concerns you might have, by

contacting the Human Research Ethics Office at the University of Victoria at 250-472-4545 or ethics@uvic.ca.

Your signature below indicates that you understand the above conditions of participation in this study, that you have had the opportunity to have your questions answered by the researchers, and that you consent to participate in this research project.

I, the undersigned, give my permission to take part in the study described above (Interview 1 and 2).

Name of Participant	*Signature*	*Date*

Please provide your email address and phone number for use in Interview 2:

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Future Use of Data

I consent to the use of my data in future research: _____

(Participant to provide initials)

I **do not** consent to the use of my data in future research: _____

(Participant to provide initials)

I consent to be contacted in the event my data is requested for future research: _____

(Participant to provide initials)

A copy of this consent will be left with you, and a copy will be taken by the researcher.

Appendix F

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Pseudonym: _____

Preamble:

In this interview I'll ask a number of questions to help you recount situations you believe helped or hindered the outcomes of the mentoring relationship.

The goal of the interview is:

- For you to speak about things that the other person in the mentoring relationship did that helped or hindered
- Remember, I'm looking for situations (behaviours) with a significant impact

As the interview is being recorded, please speak at a good pace and clearly.

For this interview I ask you to select to speak as a mentor or a protégé. (You can speak about multiple relationships within this role)

1. **Contextual Component**

a) Please tell me whether you were the mentor or protégé? Answer: _____

b) How did you pick this person to be in a mentoring relationship?

c) How and when did the mentoring relationship start?

d) What was the goal(s) of the mentoring relationship? What specifically was the mentoring relationship there to assist with (personal or professional aspect?)

Answer:

_____

_____

2. **Critical Incident Component**

Helping

You said that the goal(s) of the mentoring relationship was/were _____. Tell me about a specific situation you observed when the other person did something (behaviours) critical or significant that helped achieve the goal(s)?

Alternative Question:

Can you think of a time that really stands out where the other person did something that had a significant positive contribution to achieving the mentoring goal(s)?

Example of a Redirection:

Having a smart/kind/funny mentor is helpful. What behaviours or actions did the person do that was smart/kind/funny that helped achieve the goal? Tell me something your mentor did that was smart/kind/funny that helped you.

Examples of Probes:

Who else was involved in the incident?

What else was going on?

When and where did the incident happen?

Why do you think the incident happened?

Why was this Incident Critical?

What was it about the incident that you found helpful or important in achieving the mentoring goals?

Notes for helpful incidents:

_____

_____

Hindering

Tell me about a specific situation you observed when the other person did something (behaviours) that was critical or significant in hindering achieving the goal(s)?

Alternative Question:

Can you think of a time that really stands out where the other person did something that had a significant negative impact on achieving the mentoring goal(s)?

Example of a Redirection:

Having a mean or cold mentor is hindering. What behaviours or actions did the person do that was mean or cold that hindered achieving the goal? Tell me something your mentor did that was mean or cold that hindered.

Examples of Probes:

Who else was involved in the incident?

What else was going on?

When and where did the incident happen?

Why do you think the incident happened?

Why was this Incident Critical?

What was it about the incident that you found helpful or important in achieving the mentoring goals?

Why was this Incident Important?

What was it about the incident that you found hindering to the mentoring goals?

Notes for hindering incidents:

_____

_____

(Reminder -- as the interview is being recorded, please speak at a good pace and clearly.)

3. **Wish-List Items**

Are there other things that were not present during the relationship that you believe would have helped achieve the mentoring goals? These items do not have to be specific to behaviours but can be anything.

Alternative Question:

I wonder what else might be helpful to the mentoring goals that you or the other person in the relationship didn't have access to?

Notes for Wish-List Items:

_____

_____

Summarize before moving on.

4. **Relationship Context**

a) Would you say overall the mentoring relationship met its goal(s)? (circle one)

Yes	No	Relationship 1
Yes	No	Relationship 2
Yes	No	Relationship 3
Yes	No	Relationship 4

b) Aside from meeting the goal(s), overall, would you say the mentoring relationship was positive or negative? (circle one)

Positive	Negative	Relationship 1
Positive	Negative	Relationship 2
Positive	Negative	Relationship 3
Positive	Negative	Relationship 4

c) Has the mentoring relationship ended or is it continuing? (circle one)

Ended	Continuing	Relationship 1
Ended	Continuing	Relationship 2
Ended	Continuing	Relationship 3
Ended	Continuing	Relationship 4

d) How long did the mentoring relationship last?

Relationship 1 _____ months/years

Relationship 2 _____ months/years

Relationship 3 _____ months/years

Relationship 4 _____ months/years

e) Do you want to be in another mentoring relationship? (circle one)

Yes No

f) How many mentoring relationships have you been in as a mentor? #_____

g) How many mentoring relationships have you been in as a protégé? # _____

5. **Demographics Component**

In order to make sure I have a range of participants, I have a few demographic questions. You may skip any question you do not wish to answer.

a) Occupation _____

b) Age _____

c) Gender M F Trans

d) Marital/ partner status _____

e) Highest education level _____

f) Ethnicity _____

4. Is there anything else you would like to add? (Repeat and keep asking)

If anything else comes up, please call or email me.

Thank you for your participation!

Interview end time: _____

Length of interview: _____

Appendix G

The Mentoring Construct - Definitions

***To Mentor,* or *Mentoring* (verb):** a voluntary process involving:

a) Activities created and/or suggested by the mentor, in which the protégé must engage, to acquire the mentoring goals;

b) Informal communication between a mentor and a protégé for the transmission of knowledge perceived by the protégé and/or mentor as relevant to the goals;

c) Informal communication between a mentor and protégé for reciprocally transmitting, social cooperation, psychosocial support, and respect, and for conveying that mentor and protégé like one another, in order to continue a commitment to the mentoring relationship;

d) Conscious acknowledgement of, and commitment to, the relationship, and trustworthy engagement in the relationship and the activities that pursue the mentoring goals.

***Mentor* (noun):** a person in a mentoring relationship who both parties perceive as having greater discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience and who:

a) Possesses the desire and skills to pass along his or her knowledge, in regard to the goals, by engaging in a relationship with someone he or she views as a protégé;

b) Is committed to helping the protégé achieve the desired outcomes and invests in providing learning opportunities to assist the protégé in obtaining the goals;

c) Is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or a sense of the worth or excellence of) the protégé, and who is perceived as "liking, and genuinely likes, the protégé" (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or congenial, to regard with favour);

d) Provides to, and receives from, the protégé, psycho-social support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, praise, attuning to and responding to the protégé's needs) and social cooperation;

e) Is considered by the protégé, and considers himself or herself, as trustworthy to be in a relationship and pass along knowledge.

Protégé **(noun):** a person in a mentoring relationship who both parties perceive as having lesser discipline-specific knowledge, wisdom, or experience and who;

a) Possesses the desire and skills necessary to learn, in regard to the goals, by engaging in a relationship with someone he or she views as a mentor;

b) Is committed to learning the desired outcomes from the mentor and is invested in the activities and process of achieving agreed-upon goals;

c) Makes changes based on the information acquired in the mentoring relationship;

d) Is perceived as having, and has, an attitude of respect for (i.e., esteem for, or a sense of the worth or excellence of) the mentor, and who is perceived as

"liking, and genuinely likes, the mentor" (i.e., to take pleasure in, find agreeable or congenial, to regard with favour);

e) Provides to, and receives from, the mentor, psycho-social support (such as, but not limited to, encouragement, praise, attuning to and responding to the mentors needs) and social cooperation;

f) Is considered by the mentor, and considers himself or herself, as trustworthy to be in a relationship and to receive the knowledge;

g) Integrates the information learned in the mentoring relationship and changes or alters behaviours, perceptions, beliefs etc. based on this integration.

Appendix H

Behaviours that Help or Hinder a Mentoring Relationship Outcome

<u>What Helps a Mentoring Relationship?</u>

To help a relationship a ***protégé*** could:

1. State explicit goals

- ✓ State his or her goals explicitly (This enables a mentor to know the purpose and focus of the relationship, and to be able to provide the protégé with targeted activities to reach the mentoring goals)
- ✓ State the expectations for how the mentor and protégé will conduct themselves in the relationship
- ✓ State how mentor and protégé will conduct the process of the mentoring relationship

It is not enough to state the goal without knowing what the other person is willing to do to achieve it, what the mentoring will look like, and how the mentoring will unfold. Otherwise, how will either party know if the other can and will be able to work toward the goal?

2. Seek information

- ✓ Ask specific questions looking for advice and information from the mentor
- ✓ Come primed for learning, having looked at what he or she does not know
- ✓ Come to a meeting with a list of questions prepared in order to best target the specific learning goals

3. Demonstrate integration

- ✓ Do something to demonstrate his or her integration of the knowledge learned, to the mentor

This is about showing behavioural change. It is one thing to talk about change, quite another to enact the change so that it is able to be perceived by another. Examples are teaching (with the mentoring-learning incorporated) or performing a task in the way that the mentor has previously demonstrated.

4. Prioritize time

- ✓ Prioritize the mentoring relationship or mentoring activities over other things
- ✓ Fully engage in the mentoring activities in order to reap the most benefits

This means there will be times when the protégé has to sacrifice some time away from other life activities and reprioritize so as to give the time needed to the mentoring activities.

5. Show appreciation

- ✓ Express appreciation, thanks, or gratitude to the mentor

6. Bond

- ✓ Bond through sharing details about the protégé's personal life
- ✓ Ask about the mentor's personal life
- ✓ Genuinely get to know each other and bond over shared moments that allow both mentor and protégé to laugh together

A bond indicates that there is a degree of familiarity, trust and security that strengthens the mentor and protégé's sense of unity.

7. Take initiative

- ✓ Take the initiative to do things without the need for the mentor's direction such as producing work independently, fitting into the social or cultural surroundings, or brain-storming ideas ahead of time

To help a relationship a ***mentor*** could:

1. Demonstrate support

- ✓ Demonstrate support for the protégé in the form of advocating for, praising, encouraging, boosting, and endorsing, the protégé

2. State explicit expectations

- ✓ State explicit expectations for the mentoring process and activities, for the mentoring relationship, and for the roles of both parties

In conjunction with each goal, it is helpful for both mentor and protégé to know how they will achieve the goal and the process involved in accomplishing it. The mentor should explain to the protégé what to do and why, what he/she as the mentor will be doing and why, the purpose of what both parties are there to do (i.e., the goals) and how they are going to work together in order to do that.

3. Teach

- ✓ Give instructions, provide advice, give guidance or perspective
- ✓ Give feedback on the protégé's performance
- ✓ Explain concepts to the protégé
- ✓ Make up activities to help the protégé learn

4. Model effective behaviours

- ✓ Model, show, or demonstrate an example for the purposes of imitation, or the comparison of skills, knowledge, or competence
- ✓ Model effective behaviours for protégés
- ✓ Model effective mentoring

5. Connect emotionally

- ✓ Genuinely ask how the protégé is feeling

- ✓ Speak about understanding the protégé's feelings
- ✓ Honestly share his or her own feelings to deepen the emotional connection, while encouraging the protégé to do the same

6. Work together (i.e., with the protégé)

- ✓ Provide the protégé with opportunities to work with the mentor (i.e., with both working together)
- ✓ Provide feedback during and after the experience

What Hinders a Mentoring Relationship?

To hinder a relationship a ***protégé*** could:

1. Have unclear goals

- ✓ Fail to clearly state his or her mentoring goals
- ✓ Fail to clearly state his or her goals for the mentoring relationship
- ✓ Fail to clearly state his or her expectations for the roles of both mentor and protégé

2. Engage in dishonest behaviours

- ✓ Misrepresent his or her background or qualifications
- ✓ Appear to have an ulterior motive
- ✓ Ask the mentor to be deceitful on the protégé's behalf
- ✓ Agree with the mentor's opinion even when he or she does not, or flatter the mentor to curry favours

3. Use abusive language

- ✓ Direct abusive or offensive language at the mentor
- ✓ Direct abusive or offensive language at someone else in the mentor's presence

4. Prioritize non-mentoring activities

- ✓ Choose not to take time to do the mentoring activities suggested by the mentor
- ✓ Choose to make other activities in his or her life take precedent over the mentoring meetings, relationship, learning and activities

5. Ignore advice

- ✓ Choose not to listen to the mentor's advice
- ✓ Choose not to follow through and act on the mentor's advice

To hinder a relationship a ***mentor*** could:

1. Criticize

- ✓ Directly or indirectly criticize the protégé or the protégé's work
- ✓ Fail to follow perceived criticism with further instruction, or guidance about what to do differently

2. Give inadequate instruction

- ✓ Pass on inadequate knowledge or inaccurate knowledge to the protégé

3. **Model ineffective behaviours**

- ✓ Act immorally
- ✓ Engage in unethical behaviour
- ✓ Violate rules of conduct
- ✓ Be dishonest or unreliable
- ✓ Violate standards of professionalism
- ✓ Refuse to apologize for his or her actions and words when warranted
- ✓ Bully, or betray the protégé

4. Misinterpret the protégé's needs

- ✓ Fail to listen to, misinterpret, or misunderstand, what the protégé needs in order to best achieve the mentoring goals

5. Block work-accomplishments

- ✓ Interrupt the protégé's work
- ✓ Take work away from the protégé
- ✓ Take-up time so the protégé cannot accomplish his or her work
- ✓ Compete with the protégé, or otherwise impede his or her work-related efforts

How to Conduct a Mentoring Relationship

Mentors and protégés should start by stating explicit expectations of what the goals are and how each person will contribute to both the relationship and the achievement of these goals. Next both parties should establish a pattern of contact, how often they will meet, and what they are each responsible for between meetings. They should also establish how meetings will go (i.e., structure and length). The protégé should bring questions and points for discussion to the meetings. The mentor should respond to these questions by providing instruction, and demonstration, and by modelling the desired skills.

Both the mentor and protégé should work together and experience sharing the work, while at the same time the mentor can provide the protégé with direct, in-the-moment feedback. The protégé should demonstrate what he or she is learning so the mentor can not only provide feedback, but also see growth (i.e., that learning is taking place). The protégé should prioritize time in the relationship and should also prioritize the activities suggested by the mentor, making sure to spend adequate time accomplishing the activities effectively.

The mentor should look for ways to demonstrate support for the protégé, through compliments, encouragement, and generally offering emotional support, as well as by connecting the protégé with resources and people that will help him or her. The mentor should model effective work behaviour to the protégé. Both the protégé and mentor should take time to get to know each other, paying particular attention to bonding and connecting emotionally. The protégé should always show appreciation and gratitude (i.e., should thank the mentor) for what the mentor is doing, the time and effort he or she has put into the relationship, and the ways in which the mentor has assisted the protégé.